**Terms of Reference**

**Terminal evaluation of the Regional GEF Project “Clean Rural Electrification for African Countries”**

**Type of Contract:** IC (Consultant)

**Languages Required:** *English, knowledge of French is an asset*

**Duration:** *January 28- March 23, 2020 (approximately 20 working days)*

**Location:** *home based*

***Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.***

**1. Background**

The project was designed to develop a distinctive approach and accelerate the deployment of rural electrification utilizing renewable mini-grids. The overall objective will be achieved by co-developing a cost-reduction roadmap with minigrid value chain stakeholders (equipment suppliers, developers, funders, governments) and then developing a proposal for a series of pilots to prove out and refine the cost-reduction road map for countries selected during implementation. The project is targeting all countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) with a need for electrification in rural areas, but as it progresses through its implementation and more information is obtained, culminating in a shortlist of countries’ proposals for child projects at the project end. The project is meant to:

* Identify barriers to minigrid cost reduction and investment in minigrids
* Propose potential solutions to those barriers
* Refine the strategy to address those barriers through a minigrid summit and engagement with national counterparts, donor partners, and private sector stakeholders
* Based on the above, develop a program proposal for Global Environment Facility (GEF)-supported minigrid pilots to prove out the impact of cost reductions, clear and consistent regulations, and the benefit of a collective minigrid market vision in scaling mini-grids

The GEF grant covers what is essentially an initial project preparation phase before large scale program (regional project and national child project) implementation.

The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

**2. Description of Responsibilities**

This final project evaluation will provide assessment on the potential impact of project interventions on the targeted groups. The Evaluation also aims to provide information about project implementation to ensure accountability for the expenditures to date and the implementation of the activities. In addition, the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) and stakeholders would like to derive lessons learned, so to improve the quality of the project design and implementation and thus to maximise the potential impact of similar interventions in the future programming. The results of this evaluation will be shared with the Project Board and relevant UNDP country offices. The evaluation should also include a chapter on lessons learned.

**EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES:**

This evaluation is expected to evaluate the GEF project: *Clean Rural Electrification for African Countries*. The evaluation will cover the full implementation period (2018-2020) of the project.

**Objectives of the evaluation are the following:**

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The evaluation will:

* Review effectiveness of the overall project interventions, their main achievements, compliance with expanding country’s needs;
* Review and evaluate the extent to which project activities have reached the intended beneficiaries;
* Assess the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outputs and benefits after completion of the project - analyze how far the system of exit policy in the project ensures the sustainability of the project benefits;
* Identify gaps/weaknesses in the project design and provide recommendations as to their improvement;
* Identify lessons learned from projects interventions.

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project and will be done through a desk review with no anticipated travel to the project countries. The evaluator will compare expected outputs of the project to actual achieved outputs, assess the development results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. They will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outcomes and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues that contributed to targets not adequately achieved. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct phone/Skype interviews with stakeholders, the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP, and Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI), as well as CO/government representatives from selected participating countries of the GEF-7 Africa Mini-grids Program. The exact list of countries will be specified by UNDP at the beginning of the contract.

.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Progress Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR), project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF core indicators, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of the GEF template for the Terms of Reference enclosed an Annex 1 to this TOR and a set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included in [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)of the GEF template for the Terms of Reference enclosed an Annex 1. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons. These final conclusions, recommendations and lessons will be based on consultation with project team on both, UNDP, GEF as well as RMI side, donor representatives, SC members, as well as other key stakeholders. Interviews are expected to be conducted through email and telephone/ Skype and will inform the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

Central to the evaluation are the following concepts:

**Relevance**-this is directly related to the consistency of activities and targets with national and local development programmes and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. This also relates to the relevance to UNDP’s corporate and human development priorities.

**Effectiveness:** measures the manner in which the intended output targets were achieved. Measuring effectiveness involves an assessment of cause and effect in that how far can observable changes be attributed to project activities. This includes the following steps:

* Measuring change in the observed output and outcome;
* Attributing observed changes or progress towards the project;
* Assessing the value of the change (positive and/or negative).

**Efficiency** measures how economically resources (funds, expertise and time) are converted into results.

**Sustainability** is a key issue for the activities implemented under component II. It is important to measure to what extend the benefits of the activities will continue after the project has ended. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating to what extend the capacity can be maintained.

**Impact**, especially from UNDP’s perspective, measures the changes on human development that are caused by the project activities. Impact evaluation not only provides useful information for the continuation of phase II, it will also allow evaluating the success of the projects. Impact evaluation faces a number of challenges, first of all it is very often difficult to attribute impacts to certain activities. Furthermore, it is difficult to evaluate impact in a certain time span. Indeed, an impact evaluation ideally should be conducted sometime after the completions of the project.

Evaluations in UNDP are guided by the principles of **human rights** and **gender equality**. As a result, when collecting data, evaluator need to ensure that women and disadvantaged groups are adequately represented.

Deliverables and payment schedule:

* 10% of total amount - Following submission of an evaluation design matrix, and a data collection plan and tools and approval of work plan (Inception Report), by February 10, 2020
* 40% of total amount - Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report, by March 9, 2020
* 50% of total amount - Following submission and approval (UNDP-IRH and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor) of the final terminal evaluation report, by March 20, 2020

**3. Competencies**

**Corporate competences:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
* Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

**Functional competencies:**

* Strong technical and analytical capabilities and demonstrated ability to gain the assistance and cooperation of others in a team endeavour through technical leadership in a broad range of operational areas;
* Strong knowledge and understanding of UNDP corporate monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures;
* Ability to work in a team
* Ability to handle effectively multiple tasks without compromising quality, team spirit and positive working relationships;
* Strong analytical, communication, presentation and report writing skills.

**4. Qualifications**

Academic Qualifications/Education:

* Master’s degree in environmental sciences, climate change mitigation, energy, engineering or other closely related field; a PhD will be considered as an advantage.

Experience:

* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience.
* Experience with UNDP corporate monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures.
* Previous experience with results‐based M&E methodologies.
* Experience in climate change mitigation, renewable energy or closely related field.
* Experience with engaging various stakeholders.
* Prior experience in sub-Saharan Africa with off-grid electrification, is an asset.

Language skills:

* Excellent writing, editing, and oral communication skills in English
* Knowledge of French is an asset

**6. Application procedures**

Qualified candidates are requested to submit an application containing:

* **Financial Proposal\*** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days, travel, per diems and any other possible costs).

*\*Please note that the* ***financial proposal is all-inclusive*** *and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination, personal security needs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). All envisaged* ***travel costs*** *must be included in the financial proposal.*

***Payments*** *will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.*

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have* ***vaccinations****/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN* ***security directives*** *set forth under dss.un.org*

*General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.*

*Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.*

*Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.*

**Annex 1:**

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (GEF TEMPLATE)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the GEF-6 medium-sized project on *Clean Rural Electrification for African Countries* (PIMS 6182).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | *Clean Rural Electrification for African Countries* | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 9931 |  | | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | PIMS 6182  Project # 00110204 | GEF financing: | | 950,000 |  |
| Country: | | Regional | IA/EA own: | |  |  |
| Region: | | Africa | Government: | |  |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change | Other: | | 550,000 |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | CCM-1 Program 1 | Total co-financing: | | 550,000 |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Rocky Mountain Institute | Total Project Cost: | | 1,500,000 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | UNDP | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 16 November 2018 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  16 November 2019 | | Actual:  31 March 2020 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to develop a distinctive approach and accelerate the deployment of rural electrification utilizing renewable mini-grids. The overall objective will be achieved by co-developing a cost-reduction roadmap with minigrid value chain stakeholders (equipment suppliers, developers, funders, governments) and then developing a proposal for a series of pilots to prove out and refine the cost-reduction road map for countries selected during implementation. The project is targeting all countries in SSA with a need for electrification in rural areas, but as it progresses through its implementation and more information is obtained, culminating in a shortlist of countries’ proposals for child projects at the project end. The project is meant to:

* Identify barriers to minigrid cost reduction and investment in minigrids
* Propose potential solutions to those barriers
* Refine the strategy to address those barriers through a minigrid summit and engagement with national counterparts, donor partners, and private sector stakeholders
* Based on the above, develop a program proposal for GEF-supported minigrid pilots to prove out the impact of cost reductions, clear and consistent regulations, and the benefit of a collective minigrid market vision in scaling mini-grids

The GEF grant covers what is essentially an initial project preparation phase before large scale program (regional project and national child project) implementation.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct phone/Skype interviews with stakeholders, the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP, and Rocky Mountain Institute and CO/government representatives from selected participating countries of the GEF-7 Africa Mini-grids Program. The exact list of countries, individuals and institutions, including contacts, will be specified by UNDP at the beginning of the contract.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF core indicators, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental: |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH). IRH will contract the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation consultant is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation interviews | Evaluator submits to project management, UNDP-GEF and UNDP IRH |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation interviews | Evaluator to arrange a Skype call with project management, UNDP-GEF and UNDP IRH |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks following the evaluation interviews | Sent to and reviewed by project management, UNDP-GEF and UNDP IRH |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP IRH for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international evaluator.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* A Master’s degree in environmental sciences, climate change mitigation, energy, engineering or other closely related field; a PhD will be considered as an advantage.
* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience.
* Experience with UNDP corporate monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures.
* Previous experience with results‐based M&E methodologies.
* Experience in climate change mitigation, renewable energy or closely related field.
* Experience with engaging various stakeholders.
* Prior experience in sub-Saharan Africa with off-grid electrification, is an asset.
* Excellent writing, editing, and oral communication skills in English, knowledge of French is an asset

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Following submission of an evaluation design matrix, and a data collection plan and tools and approval of work plan (Inception Report), by January 31, 2020 |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report, by February 28, 2020 |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-IRH and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report, by March 10, 2020 |

Application process

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV/P11 for this position. The application should contain a current and complete CV/P11 in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Technically qualified candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including breakdown of costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the qualifications of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** SDG 7 and 13 | | | | | | |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:** Regional, so does not apply | | | | | | |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**  1.5.1 Solutions adopted to achieve universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy, with focus on (b) In rural areas. | | | | | | |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators**  **(no more than a total of 15 -16 indicators)** | **Baseline[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Mid-term Target[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **End of Project Target** | **Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions[[5]](#footnote-5)** |
| **Project Objective:**  **To develop a distinctive approach and accelerate the deployment of rural electrification utilizing renewable minigrids** | Number and proportion of households in rural areas benefiting from clean, affordable and sustainable energy access[[6]](#footnote-6) | Currently a small minority of rural communities benefiting from clean and affordable energy access. Also, there are no GEF-7 projects identified to tackle rural electrification in SSA | A minimum of 2 rural electrification projects identified for funding under the GEF-7 cycle | A minimum of 5 rural electrification projects identified for funding under the GEF-7 cycle  Scaling strategy presented to GEF-7 in June 2018 with follow on support for implementation through January 2019. | Data sourced during workshops taking place at both summits |
|  | Risks: Lack of political will and engagement from Governments and Stakeholders  Assumptions: Governments and stakeholders invited to attend summit to so and feasible projects eligible for GEF funding identified. |
| **Component/ Outcome[[7]](#footnote-7) 1**  **Design scaling mechanisms for minigrids funded by GEF-7 replenishment** | *Indicator 1:* Number of recommendations created for scaling minigrids through subsequent GEF programs | 0 | 15 initial recommendations identified | 10 final recommendations  provided | The creation and delivery of scaling recommendations to GEF will be used to assess target completion. |
|  | Risks: Project unable to be completed within time frame, a smaller number of recommendations for scaling are developed  Assumptions: Stakeholders engage in process and provide input into the process thereby creating multiple recommendations for scaling minigrids |
| *Indicator 2:* Number of countries identified for pilots | 0 | 4 potential countries identified | 2 finalist countries identified with expressions of interest in a minigrid pilot program signed | The identification of countries and number of signed expressions of interest will be used to assess target completion |
|  | Risks: Participating countries unable or unwilling to contribute to road map and recommended pilots  Assumptions: Cost benefits attract governments to participate in pilot design. |
| **Component/ Outcome 2**  **Minigrid summit** | *Indicator 3:* Number of minigrid summit participants | 0 | 40 participants invited to summit | 40 participants attend summit | The invitation and final participant list will be used to assess target completion. |
|  | Risks: Summit participation is low  Assumptions: The value proposition of collectively developing a cost-reduction and minigrid-scaling roadmap will attract participants |
| *Indicator 4:* Number of cost-reduction, regulatory reform, business model innovation concepts developed during the summit | 0 | 20 | 20 | The number of concepts in the post summit summary will be used to assess target completion |
|  | Risks: new concepts are not generated during summit  Assumptions: There are many concepts for scaling yet to be articulated in the minigrid market |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluator

1. *Project Document*
2. *Program Framework Document, including Child Project Concept Notes and Letters of Endorsement*
3. *Inception Report*
4. *FACE Forms*
5. *Quarterly Narrative Progress Reports*
6. *Annual Reports (PIRs)*
7. *Minigrid Summit Pre-Read*
8. *Minigrid Summit participant list*
9. *Minigrid Summit Post-Summit Report*
10. *Site Visit/Field Reports*
11. *Minigrid charrette report*
12. *Validation Workshop Minutes ((if available)*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives? | * The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators * The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals (e.g. SE4ALL) | * Project Document * GEF 6 Focal Area Strategies | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project aligned to National development objectives of participating SSA countries, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically? | * The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies | * Project Document * National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc. | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project relevant to stated regional environmental and development objectives? | * Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives | * Project Document | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project’s Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? | * The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/ technical capacity and financial) | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels? | * The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project’s results framework relevant to the development challenges have the planned results been achieved? | * The project results framework adequately measures impact * The project indicators are SMART * Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are * The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? | * The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. * Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive | * Inception report * Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Stakeholder Interviews |
|  | * Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area? | * A partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities | * Project Document * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting | * Desk Review of Documents * Stakeholder Interviews |
|  | * Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? | * The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified | * Project Document * SES Annex | * Desk Review of Documents |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? | * The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Site visit/field reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? | * Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end | * Validation Workshop Minutes *(if available)* * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed? | * A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) | * ATLAS Risk Log * M&E Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the Project Board? | * The Project Board participation included representatives from key institutions in Government | * Project Board Minutes *(if available)* | * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
| * Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? | * The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities * Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation * Any changes to the project’s planned activities were approved by the Project Board * Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Project Board and donor, as required | * Annual Work Plans * Validation Workshop Minutes * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Project Board meeting minutes *(if available)* | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Was the process of achieving results efficient? Did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred? Were the resources effectively utilized? | * The project achieved the planned results in an efficient manner * Funds used for project implementation were utilized affectively and contributed to achievement of project results | * Annual Workplans * Quarterly Reports * Project document | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries | |
|  | * What are the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation modality (NGO implementation)? |  | * Annual Reports (PIR) * Quarterly reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries | |
|  | * How effective were the partnership arrangements under the project and to what extend did they contribute to achievements of the project results? | * A partnership framework has been developed that ensured coordination of parallel initiatives, involvement of key partners and identification of complementarities | * Annual Reports (PIR) * Quarterly reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors | |
|  | * Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing? | * Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates * Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified * Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation | * Annual Work Plans (AWPs) * Validation Workshop Minutes *(if available)* * Quarterly Reports, including financial reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, other donors and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)? | * Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. * Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate | * UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/ recruitment documents) * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel | |
|  | * Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation? | * The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded * The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool * There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) * Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels | * Project Document * M&E Plan * AWPs * FACE forms * Quarterly Narrative Reports * Site visit reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders | |
|  | * Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? | * Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. * Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices | * Project Audit Reports | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| * Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Are there political, social or financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? | * The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure sustainability of relevant activities | * Program Framework Document * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * To what extent are the project results contributing to the sustainability of the GEF7 project proposal and what are the lessons learned to enhance sustainability of the GEF 7 project? What are the factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability and potential for replication? | * The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure sustainability of relevant activities and identifies relevant factors requiring attention in the future | * Program Framework Document | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? | * The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same | * Program Framework Document * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? | * Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy | * Program Framework Document * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? | * The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same | * Program Framework Document * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? | * The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluator:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluator must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluator are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluator should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluator must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluator should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[8]](#footnote-8)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[10]](#footnote-10)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[11]](#footnote-11)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by UNDP IRH and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP IRH Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Data collection methods should outline specific tools used to collect data and additional information as necessary to support monitoring. The PIR cannot be used as a source of verification. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. At the time of project formulation, this was a mandatory indicator. However, as the CREAC project is not a typical GEF project in the sense that it is more of a large-scale project preparation exercise, the targets do not match the indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Outcomes are short to medium term results that the project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the longerterm objective. Achievement of outcomes will be influenced both by project outputs and additional factors that may be outside the direct control of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)