

*NOTE: This file contains two TE ToR templates – Template 1 (page 1) is formatted for the UNDP Procurement website and Template 2 (page 19) is formatted for the UNDP Jobs website*

## **Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) Template for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects**

*Template 1 - formatted for attachment to the [UNDP Procurement website](#)*

### **1. 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 (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled Low Carbon Development Path (LCDP) project (PIMS 4969) implemented through the United Nations Development Programme Barbados and the OECS (Executing Agency) and the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment (Implementing Partner). The project started on the December 1st, 2016 and is in its 4th year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects' ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)).

### **2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

*Provide a brief introduction to the project being evaluated, including but not limited to the following information: project goal, objective and key outcomes, location, timeframe, justification for the project, institutional arrangements, total budget, planned co-financing, key partners, key stakeholders, observed changes since the beginning of implementation and contributing factors, linkages to relevant cross-cutting aspects (i.e. vulnerable groups, gender, human right, etc.), relevance of the project to the partner Government's strategies and priorities, linkages to SDGs, and linkages to UNDP corporate goals. Identify the critical social, economic, political, geographic and demographic factors within which the project operates that have a direct bearing on the evaluation. This section should be focused and concise (a maximum of one page) highlighting only those issues most pertinent to the evaluation.*

The Commonwealth of Dominica has some of the world's highest electricity costs due to its dependence on imported fossil fuels for power generation.

Under the country's Low Carbon Climate Resilience Strategy (LCCRS) of 2012, the Draft National Sustainable Energy Plan (NSEP), the National Resilience Development Strategy (NRDS) and the recent Sustainable and Renewable Energy Policy (S-REP), the Government of Dominica has outlined some of its plans to assure a more sustainable Energy Sector.

The Low Carbon Development Project (LCDP) complements these ongoing efforts, with the main objective being the removal of the policy, technical and financial barriers to energy-efficient applications and solar photovoltaic technologies in Dominica's streets, outdoor areas and public buildings nationwide for further scale up.

The LCDP hopes to achieve this object through three (3) Main Components:

- Component 1: Institutional and technical knowledge, awareness and capacity for EE applications and renewable energy technologies (RETs)
- Component 2: Policy measures and enforcement of EE applications and RETs
- Component 3: Financing options and mechanisms for EE applications and RET diffusion

These objectives will be achieved through the removal of systemic barriers, through the following project components:

**Component 1: Institutional and technical knowledge, awareness and capacity for EE applications and RETs:** This component is intended to address the barriers associated with the lack of technical knowledge and capacity in Dominica to plan, design, implement, operate and maintain RE/EE projects. The expected outcome from the deliverables of the activities to be conducted under this component is improved knowledge, awareness and institutional capacity on EE applications and solar PV through demonstrations of their deployment in Dominica. The outputs from this component will contribute to: (a) awareness of policymakers and government personnel with significant roles in low carbon development; (b) strengthening the capacity of technical and trades personnel from Dominican-based private sector contractors and supply entrepreneurs on low carbon equipment and installations; and (c) raised public awareness of the benefits of EE applications and RE installations

**Component 2: Policy measures and enforcement of EE applications and RETs.** This component would address gaps in existing policies and standards that have not provided the necessary confidence for investors and donors into low carbon deployment in the Dominican energy market. The expected outcome from the outputs under this component is the uptake of EE applications and solar PV technology is promoted through adoption of new institutional arrangements, and policy and enforcement measures.

**Component 3: Financing options and mechanisms for EE applications and RET diffusion:** This component will address the financial barriers and the associated lack of financial incentives for EE applications and RE installations in Dominica. The outcome will be scaled-up EE applications and RET investments through implementation UNDP Environmental Finance Services Page 42 of newly proposed financial and institutional mechanisms.

**Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation:** This component will contain activities related to monitoring and evaluation of Project activities. Through activities in this component, the ability of the Project to be adaptively managed will lead to an outcome of sustained low carbon development in Dominica during the Project period, and the increased likelihood of this outcome after the EOP. This component includes conducting the final evaluation.

Project Title:	Low Carbon Development Path (LCDP) Project: Promoting energy efficient applications and solar photovoltaic technologies in streets, outdoor areas and public buildings in island communities nationwide			
GEF Project ID:			<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00091623	GEF financing:	\$ 1,726,484	\$ 1,726,484
Country:	Dominica	IA/EA own:	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000
Region:	Latin America & the Caribbean	Government:	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 6,800,000
Focal Area:	Climate Change - Mitigation	Other:	\$ 540,000	\$ 540,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	1.5.1 Solutions adopted to achieve universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy  2.5.1 Solutions developed, financed and applied at scale for energy efficiency and transformation to clean energy and zero-carbon development, for poverty eradication and structural transformation	Total co-financing:	\$ 8,940,000	\$ 8,940,000
Executing Agency:	United Nations Development Program (UNDP)	Total Project Cost:	\$ 10,666,484	\$ 10,666,484
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	December 1, 2016	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 24 December 2020	Actual: 24 March 2021 (date extended)

In terms of project delivery, implementation has been quite slow in meeting planned targets as scheduled. The LCDP project was designed as a four-year project. Following a late project start, and delays caused by Hurricane Maria in 2017, challenges with the initial project implementing partner, changes in and within the newly appointed project implementation partner, and then COVID-19, the project sought a no-cost extension to be able to conduct all the project activities needed to adequately meet project objectives. The project sought a 6-month extension; a bit less than 4 months was granted.

The world is currently facing the COVID-19 pandemic which affected people everywhere and brought a halt to global and local economic activity and transport systems, as well as unprecedented disruptions to daily life that undercut the societal fabric of opportunities for human interaction<sup>1</sup>. In order to ensure the

<sup>1</sup> Guidance Note: Good practices during COVID-19. OECD/DAC and IEO/UNDP, April 2020

well-being and safety of UNDP’s staff and contractors, as well as to ensure no harm is done to partners, communities and interlocutors, the implementation of this TE shall be undertaken virtually, according to item “Evaluation Approach and Method” of this TOR.

### **3. TE PURPOSE**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, future projects with similar objectives, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE will also be important in determining completeness of the project, and if the activities and indicators identified during project development justly reflected the project objectives. It could also provide some guidance on how request for project extensions could be fairly correlated to time granted.

*(Expand on the above text to clearly explain why the TE is being conducted, who will use or act on the TE results and how they will use or act on the results. The TE purpose should explain why the TE is being conducted at this time and how the TE fits within the Commissioning Unit's evaluation plan.)*

### **4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE Consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE Consultant will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools.

The TE Consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to organizations and persons listed in Table A below; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

*Table A: List of Individuals/ Institutions*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency/Department</b>
Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy
Ms. Kimisha Thomas	National Project Coordinator (LCDP)
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson	Project Associate (LCDP)
Ms. Mandra Fagan	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment
Ms. Careen Prevost	Former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment
Ms. Ludmilla Diniz	Regional Technical Adviser
Mr. Luis Ruiz	Head, Dominica Project Office
Mr. Rafael Robillard	UNDP Denmark
Mr. Paul Hattle	Chief Technical Adviser (LCDP)
Mr. Dexter Newton	Low Carbon Officer
Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere	UNDP, Monitoring and Evaluation
Anderson Parillon	UNDP Focal Point for Dominica
Culver Lawrence	Financial Centre
Annie St. Luce	Dominica Infirmary
Francis Julien	Morne Rchet Emergency Operations Center
Lorenzo Sanford	St. Cyr Community Resource Center
Merlyn Rolle	San Sauveur Primary School
Ms Roberts (Vice Principal)	Isaiah Thomas Secondary School
Ronald Austrie	Portsmouth Secondary School

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE Consultant and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE Consultant must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE Consultant. **The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.**

*(Note: The TOR should retain enough flexibility for the evaluation team to determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analysing data. For example, the TOR might suggest using questionnaires, field visits and interviews, but the evaluation Consultant should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.)*

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

## 5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)). *(The scope of the TE should detail and include aspects of the project to be covered by the TE, such as the time frame, and the primary issues of concern to users that the TE needs to address.*

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

### Findings

#### i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

#### ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

### iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
- Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

### Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE Consultant will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE Consultant should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Low Carbon Development Pathway (LCDP)***

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating <sup>2</sup>
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **25 working days** over a time period of **9 weeks** starting on 15 January 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
<b>27 December 2020</b>	Application closes
<b>8 January 2021</b>	Selection of TE Consultant
<b>15 January 2021</b>	Preparation period for TE Consultant (handover of documentation)
<b>22 January 2021- 4 days</b>	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report. The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.
<b>29 January 2021- 2 days</b>	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
<b>12 February 2021- 10 days</b>	TE Virtual mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc.
<b>15 February 2021</b>	Wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE virtual mission

<sup>2</sup> Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)



22 February 2021- 5 days	Preparation of draft TE report
24 February 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
5 March 2021	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
12 March 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
17 March 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

## 7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE Consultant clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: January 22, 2021	TE Consultant submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management. The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: February 12, 2021	TE Consultant presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report ( <i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i> ) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: February 22, 2021	TE Consultant submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report ( <i>See template in ToR Annex H</i> )	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: <i>March 17, 2021</i>	TE Consultant submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

\*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

## 8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Barbados & the Eastern Caribbean. The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will support the implementation of remote/visual meetings over the period of the TE.

*(in the case of single-country projects, the Commissioning Unit is the UNDP Country Office. In the case of regional projects and jointly-implemented projects, typically the principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the country or agency or regional coordination body – please confirm with the RTA in the region – that is receiving the larger portion of GEF financing. For global projects, the Commissioning Unit can be the Nature, Climate and Energy Vertical Fund Directorate or the lead UNDP Country Office.)*

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 9. TE CONSULTANT

One International Consultant will conduct the TE – the *consultant will have experience and exposure to projects and evaluations*. The consultant will *be responsible for the overall design and writing of the Inception Report<sup>4</sup>, Draft and Final TE reports, and serve as the main liaison between the Commissioning Unit and the TE Consultant. She/he will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary.*

The evaluator cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

### CRITERIA

#### Education

- Master's degree in *Environmental Management/ Science or Engineering* or other closely related field;

#### Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *Climate Change*
- Experience in evaluating projects;

---

<sup>4</sup> The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.

- Experience working in *the Caribbean Region*;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *Climate Change*; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

#### Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

## **10. EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The TE Consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## **11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%<sup>5</sup>:

---

<sup>5</sup> The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

[https://popp.undp.org/\\_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP\\_POPP\\_DOCUMENT\\_LIBRARY/Public/PSU\\_Individual%20Contract\\_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default)

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

## 12. APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>6</sup>

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>7</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>8</sup>);
- c) Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other costs related to a virtual consultation, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Low Carbon Development Path (LCDP) project*” or by email at the following address ONLY: **(insert email address)** by 5:00PM UTC-4 on December 27, 2020. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

## 13. TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

<sup>6</sup> Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP  
<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

<sup>7</sup><https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20C%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

## ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

<p><b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.</b></p>					
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 CC4 Strategic Program SP3: Increased production of renewable energy in electricity grids</b></p>					
<p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Total avoided GHG emissions from on-grid RE electricity generation</b></p>					
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Market penetration of on-grid renewable energy (% from renewables); GHG emissions from electricity generation (tons CO<sub>2eq</sub>/kWh); and \$/ tons CO<sub>2eq</sub></b></p>					
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<p><b>Project Objective:</b><sup>9</sup> The removal of the policy, technical and financial barriers to energy-efficient applications and solar photovoltaic technologies in Dominica's streets, outdoor areas and public buildings nationwide, initially targeting up to 5 communities including Dubuc, Boetica, Roseau, Portsmouth, for further scale up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative direct and total post project direct CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions resulting from the Project support for outdoor EE lighting and solar PV pilot installations and investments in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>889 100,010<sup>10</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project final report</li> <li>Annual surveys of energy consumption &amp; reductions for each project where RE and EE measures have been undertaken</li> <li>Government electricity bills for specific buildings where RE and EE measures undertaken</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government capacity is available to support more diversified EE and RE development and utilization beyond geothermal development</li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

<sup>10</sup> Include the impact of GoCD co-financing that is added to CCTF at EOP (5.84 MW is expected to be installed in additional capacity in the 10 years following the EOP through the Climate Change Trust Fund). See attached GEF spreadsheet for detailed calculations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Total MWh of renewable energy generated by EOP</li> <li>▪ Total MWh of energy saved from installation of LED lights</li> <li>▪ % reduction in electricity costs in public buildings from RE and EE measures by EOP</li> <li>▪ % of households and commercial establishments experiencing lower electricity costs from EE and RE installations by EOP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 0</li> <li>▪ 0</li> <li>▪ 0</li> <li>▪ 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RE- 683 MWh</li> <li>▪ EE – 14.3 MWh</li> <li>▪ 10</li> <li>▪ 1</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 1:<sup>11</sup></b> Improved knowledge, awareness and institutional capacity on EE applications and solar PV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of studies for selected EE applications and RETs to be piloted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk study on cost effectiveness of EE measures and RE technologies for Dominica.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government budgets for technical training for RE are</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.

<p>through demonstrations of their deployment in Dominica</p>	<p>through an EPC arrangement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of pilot installation of EE applications and RE technologies with and without battery storage carried out.</li> <li>• Combined installed capacity of “scaled up investment” through CCTF in RE and EE applications targeting vulnerable groups e.g. low-income female-headed households.</li> <li>• Number of electrical technicians and EE/RE equipment installation personnel trained in best practices for the installation of various EE applications and various EE technologies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0</li> <li>• 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 solar PV installations with battery and 60 grid-tied solar PV installations with 50% of installations directly benefitting vulnerable communities e.g. low-income female-headed households in Dubic</li> </ul> <p>18 units of outdoor LED street lights</p> <p>700 units of public lighting in buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 365 kW of RE installations (PV and hydropower) and EE installations (mostly EE lighting)<sup>12</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training evaluation feedback from parliamentarians, policymakers, architects, technicians</li> <li>• Reports on pilot EE and RE installations and their energy consumption and GHG emissions in comparison with baseline technologies</li> <li>• Draft of green building codes</li> <li>• Awareness raising survey</li> </ul>	<p>replenished on an annual basis</p>
---	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

<sup>12</sup> Break down of sub elements and individual projects/installations between RET not provided however, these projects are additive to above RET installations



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>60 persons trained, with at least 50% of those receiving training being female</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b></p> <p>Uptake of EE applications and solar PV technology is promoted through adoption of new institutional arrangements, and policy and enforcement measures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of draft strategic plans and institutional arrangements developed that are gender responsive and are informed by relevant gender-based research, analysis and advocacy</li> <li>Number of RE and EE technologies with mandatory MEPS by Year 2</li> <li>Number of MoHE officers involved with the enforcement of MEPS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1</li> <li>3<sup>13</sup></li> <li>6, with 50% female</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drafts of institutional arrangements and strategic plan for EE and RE growth</li> <li>MEPS documentation</li> <li>Training evaluations by participants on MEPS and quality standards workshops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued government support for legislative and regulatory reform to promote and accelerate RE development</li> <li>Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects</li> </ul>

<sup>13</sup> Solar PV, hydropower installations and LED lighting

	and green building codes by EOP				
<p><b>Outcome 3:</b></p> <p>Scaled-up EE applications and RET investments through implementation of newly proposed financial and institutional mechanisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative number of commercial establishments and households accessing financial assistance from the CCTF by EOP. There will be emphasis on promoting economic opportunities for women and vulnerable groups e.g. low-income female-headed households</li> <li>Annual MWh of EE and RE measures planned or installed by EOP (based on combined total of 591 kW installed capacity during project period)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10</li> <li>1778<sup>14</sup></li> <li>20 – Installation jobs, with 50% female</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCTF fund charter and fund design documentation</li> <li>Bankable documents with business plans for RE scaled-up projects along with applications for CCTF financing assistance</li> <li>EPC documents for local ESCO for the installation of EE and/or RE equipment</li> <li>Work inspection reports</li> <li>Plans for rooftop solar PV and/or mini hydropower installations</li> <li>Surveys of electricity consumption after completion of RE and EE installations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient annual replenishment of RE development funds</li> <li>Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects</li> </ul>

<sup>14</sup> Based on MWh generated of RE and EE (1748 MWh) and LED lighting (30 MWh) by 2019

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of technicians who are employed in the installation and maintenance of EE and RE equipment by EOP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>60 – O&amp;M jobs, with 50% female</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 4:</b> Low carbon development is sustained through effective monitoring and evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of monthly reports submitted by EOP</li> <li>Number of completed final evaluations completed by EOP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission of monthly and quarterly reports as well as PIRs</li> <li>Completed final evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued government support for low carbon development throughout the duration of the Project.</li> </ul>

## ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports and Spot Checks
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**

- i. Title page
  - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
  - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
  - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
  - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
  - TE Team
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
  - Project Information Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Ratings Table
  - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
  - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
  - Purpose and objective of the TE
  - Scope
  - Methodology
  - Data Collection & Analysis
  - Ethics
  - Limitations to the evaluation
  - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
  - Project start and duration, including milestones
  - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
  - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Expected results
  - Main stakeholders: summary list
  - Theory of Change
4. Findings  
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating<sup>15</sup>)

---

<sup>15</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
  - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- 4.1 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
  - Project Finance and Co-finance
  - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
  - UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
  - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- 4.2 Project Results and Impacts
  - Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
  - Relevance (\*)
  - Effectiveness (\*)
  - Efficiency (\*)
  - Overall Outcome (\*)
  - Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Gender equality and women's empowerment
  - Cross-cutting Issues
  - GEF Additionality
  - Catalytic/Replication Effect
  - Progress to Impact
- 5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
  - Main Findings
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations
  - Lessons Learned
- 6. Annexes
  - TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
  - List of persons interviewed
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results

- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

## ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators</li> <li>The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc.</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project results framework adequately measures impact</li> <li>The project indicators are SMART</li> <li>Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are</li> <li>The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement.</li> <li>Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder Consultation Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>SES Annex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Monitoring Reports</li> <li>Beneficiary testimony</li> <li>Site visit/field reports</li> <li>Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Site visits</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>M&amp;E Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How were risks related to COVID19 managed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COVID-related risks were defined against project activities with mitigating actions proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PME COVID-updated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legislation</li> <li>• Policy Documents</li> <li>• Action/Implementation Plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A gender mainstreaming plan was completed</li> <li>• The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant.</li> <li>• Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective</li> <li>• The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender Mainstreaming Plan</li> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b></li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Work Plans</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation</li> <li>• Any changes to the project’s planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee</li> <li>• Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> <li>• Revised Project Results Framework</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements.</li> <li>• Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VFM, RFI, Market Surveys</li> <li>• Procurement Evaluation Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates</li> <li>• Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified</li> <li>• Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Work Plans</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality.</li> <li>• Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s)</li> <li>• UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents)</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP</li> <li>• An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds</li> <li>• The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HACT Assessment(s)</li> <li>• Capacity Assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the M&amp;E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M&amp;E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded</li> <li>• The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&amp;E tool</li> <li>• There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality)</li> <li>• Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>• AWP</li> <li>• FACE forms</li> <li>• Quarterly Narrative Reports</li> <li>• Site visit reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks</li> <li>• Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice</li> <li>• Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement/Recruitment reports</li> <li>• FACE forms</li> <li>• CDRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings.</li> <li>• Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Audit Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy</li> <li>• MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> <li>• MOU(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Site visits</li> </ul>

## ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

### Evaluators/Consultants:

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. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators 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. Evaluators 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, evaluators 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, evaluators 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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

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: \_\_\_\_\_

## ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

## ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

<p><b>Terminal Evaluation Report for <i>(Project Title &amp; UNDP PIMS ID)</i> Reviewed and Cleared By:</b></p>	
<p><b>Commissioning Unit (M&amp;E Focal Point)</b></p>	
<p>Name: _____</p>	
<p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Date: _____</p>
<p><b>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</b></p>	
<p>Name: _____</p>	
<p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Date: _____</p>



## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

*The following is a template for the TE Consultant to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.*

**To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)**

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

# Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) Template for UNDP-supported GEF-finance projects

Template 2 - formatted for the [UNDP Jobs website](#)

## **BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location: Home Based/ Virtual**

**Application Deadline: December 27, 2020**

**Type of Contract: Consultancy**

**Assignment Type: International/ Local**

**Languages Required: English**

**Starting Date: 15 January 2021**

**Duration of Initial Contract: 8 weeks**

**Expected Duration of Assignment: 25 Working Days**

## **BACKGROUND**

### **1. 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 (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled Low Carbon Development Path (LCDP) project (PIMS 4969) implemented through the United Nations Development Programme Barbados and the OECS (Executing Agency) and the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment (Implementing Partner). The project started on the December 1st, 2016 and is in its 4th year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects' ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)).

### **2. Project Description**

The Commonwealth of Dominica has some of the world's highest electricity costs due to its dependence on imported fossil fuels for power generation.

Under the country's Low Carbon Climate Resilience Strategy (LCCRS) of 2012, the Draft National Sustainable Energy Plan (NSEP), the National Resilience Development Strategy (NRDS) and the recent Sustainable and Renewable Energy Policy (S-REP), the Government of Dominica has outlined some of its plans to assure a more sustainable Energy Sector.

The Low Carbon Development Project (LCDP) complements these ongoing efforts, with the main objective being the removal of the policy, technical and financial barriers to energy-efficient applications and solar photovoltaic technologies in Dominica's streets, outdoor areas and public buildings nationwide for further scale up.

The LCDP hopes to achieve this object through three (3) Main Components:

- Component 1: Institutional and technical knowledge, awareness and capacity for EE applications and renewable energy technologies (RETs)
- Component 2: Policy measures and enforcement of EE applications and RETs
- Component 3: Financing options and mechanisms for EE applications and RET diffusion

These objectives will be achieved through the removal of systemic barriers, through the following project components:

**Component 1: Institutional and technical knowledge, awareness and capacity for EE applications and RETs:** This component is intended to address the barriers associated with the lack of technical knowledge and capacity in Dominica to plan, design, implement, operate and maintain RE/EE projects. The expected outcome from the deliverables of the activities to be conducted under this component is improved knowledge, awareness and institutional capacity on EE applications and solar PV through demonstrations of their deployment in Dominica. The outputs from this component will contribute to: (a) awareness of policymakers and government personnel with significant roles in low carbon development; (b) strengthening the capacity of technical and trades personnel from Dominican-based private sector contractors and supply entrepreneurs on low carbon equipment and installations; and (c) raised public awareness of the benefits of EE applications and RE installations

**Component 2: Policy measures and enforcement of EE applications and RETs.** This component would address gaps in existing policies and standards that have not provided the necessary confidence for investors and donors into low carbon deployment in the Dominican energy market. The expected outcome from the outputs under this component is the uptake of EE applications and solar PV technology is promoted through adoption of new institutional arrangements, and policy and enforcement measures.

**Component 3: Financing options and mechanisms for EE applications and RET diffusion:** This component will address the financial barriers and the associated lack of financial incentives for EE applications and RE installations in Dominica. The outcome will be scaled-up EE applications and RET investments through implementation UNDP Environmental Finance Services Page 42 of newly proposed financial and institutional mechanisms.

**Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation:** This component will contain activities related to monitoring and evaluation of Project activities. Through activities in this component, the ability of the Project to be adaptively managed will lead to an outcome of sustained low carbon development in Dominica during the Project period, and the increased likelihood of this outcome after the EOP. This component includes conducting the final evaluation.

Project Title:	Low Carbon Development Path (LCDP) Project: Promoting energy efficient applications and solar photovoltaic technologies in streets, outdoor areas and public buildings in island communities nationwide			
GEF Project ID:			<i>at endorsement</i> (Million US\$)	<i>at completion</i> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00091623	GEF financing:	\$ 1,726,484	\$ 1,726,484
Country:	Dominica	IA/EA own:	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000
Region:	Latin America & the Caribbean	Government:	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 6,800,000
Focal Area:	Climate Change - Mitigation	Other:	\$ 540,000	\$ 540,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	1.5.1 Solutions adopted to achieve universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy  2.5.1 Solutions developed, financed and applied at scale for energy efficiency and transformation to clean energy and zero-carbon development, for poverty eradication and structural transformation	Total co-financing:	\$ 8,940,000	\$ 8,940,000
Executing Agency:	United Nations Development Program (UNDP)	Total Project Cost:	\$ 10,666,484	\$ 10,666,484
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	December 1, 2016	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 24 December 2020	Actual: 24 March 2021 (date extended)

In terms of project delivery, implementation has been quite slow in meeting planned targets as scheduled. The LCDP project was designed as a four-year project. Following a late project start, and delays caused by Hurricane Maria in 2017, challenges with the initial project implementing partner, changes in and within the newly appointed project implementation partner, and then COVID-19, the project sought a no-cost extension to be able to conduct all the project activities needed to adequately meet project objectives. The project sought a 6-month extension; a bit less than 4 months was granted.

The world is currently facing the COVID-19 pandemic which affected people everywhere and brought a halt to global and local economic activity and transport systems, as well as unprecedented disruptions to daily life that undercut the societal fabric of opportunities for human interaction<sup>16</sup>. In order to ensure the

<sup>16</sup> Guidance Note: Good practices during COVID-19. OECD/DAC and IEO/UNDP, April 2020

well-being and safety of UNDP’s staff and contractors, as well as to ensure no harm is done to partners, communities and interlocutors, the implementation of this TE shall be undertaken virtually, according to item “Evaluation Approach and Method” of this TOR.

### **3. TE Purpose**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, future projects with similar objectives, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE will also be important in determining completeness of the project, and if the activities and indicators identified during project development justly reflected the project objectives. It could also provide some guidance on how request for project extensions could be fairly correlated to time granted.

## **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **4. TE Approach & Methodology**

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE Consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the Consultant considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE Consultant will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools.

The TE Consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to organizations and persons listed in Table A below; executing agencies, senior officials and task

team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

*Table B: List of Individuals/ Institutions*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency/Department</b>
Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy
Ms. Kimisha Thomas	National Project Coordinator (LCDP)
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson	Project Associate (LCDP)
Ms. Mandra Fagan	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment
Ms. Careen Prevost	Former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment
Ms. Ludmilla Diniz	Regional Technical Adviser
Mr. Luis Ruiz	Head, Dominica Project Office
Mr. Rafael Robillard	UNDP Denmark
Mr. Paul Hattle	Chief Technical Adviser (LCDP)
Mr. Dexter Newton	Low Carbon Officer
Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere	UNDP, Monitoring and Evaluation
Anderson Parillon	UNDP Focal Point for Dominica
Culver Lawrence	Financial Centre
Annie St. Luce	Dominica Infirmary
Francis Julien	Morne Rchet Emergency Operations Center
Lorenzo Sanford	St. Cyr Community Resource Center
Merlyn Rolle	San Sauveur Primary School
Ms Roberts (Vice Principal)	Isaiah Thomas Secondary School
Ronald Austrie	Portsmouth Secondary School

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE Consultant and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE Consultant must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE Consultant.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

## 5. Detailed Scope of the TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see TOR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)). *(The scope of the TE should detail and include aspects of the project to be covered by the TE, such as the time frame, and the primary issues of concern to users that the TE needs to address.*

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

### Findings

#### iv. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

#### v. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

#### vi. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements

- Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
- Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

vii. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE Consultant will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE Consultant should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the ToR Annex.

## 6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The TE consultant shall prepare and submit:



- TE Inception Report<sup>17</sup>: TE Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than **2 weeks** before the TE mission. TE team submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *(22 January, 2021)*
- Presentation: TE team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *12 February, 2021*
- Draft TE Report: TE team submits full draft report with annexes **within 3 weeks** of the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *22 February, 2021*
- Final TE Report\* and Audit Trail: TE Consultant submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit **within 1 week** of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: *17 March, 2021*

\*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.<sup>18</sup>

## 7. TE Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Barbados & the Eastern Caribbean.

*(in the case of single-country projects, the Commissioning Unit is the UNDP Country Office. In the case of regional projects and jointly-implemented projects, typically the principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the country or agency or regional coordination body – please confirm with the RTA – that is receiving the larger portion of GEF financing. For global projects, the Commissioning Unit can be the Vertical Fund Directorate or the lead UNDP Country Office.)*

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **25 working days** over a time period of **8 weeks** starting on 15 January 2021 and shall not exceed five months from when the TE Consultant is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

- **27 December 2020**: Application closes
- **8 January 2021**: Selection of TE Consultant
- **15 January 2021**: Prep the TE Consultant (handover of project documents)
- **22 January 2021 - 4 days**: Document review and preparing TE Inception Report

<sup>17</sup> The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.

<sup>18</sup> Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

- 29 January 2021- 2 days: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission
- 12 February 2021- 10 days: TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews
- 15 February 2021: Wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission
- 22 February 2021- 5 days: Preparation of draft TE report
- 24 February 2021: Circulation of draft TE report for comments
- 5 March 2021- 2 days: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
- 12 March 2021: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- 17 March 2021: Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is 15 January, 2021.

## 9. Duty Station

This consultancy will be conducted virtually.

## **REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

### 10. TE Consultant Required Qualifications

An International Consultant will conduct the TE. The Consultant will have *experience and exposure to projects and evaluations*. The consultant will *be responsible for the overall design and writing of the Inception Report, Draft and Final TE reports, and serve as the main liaison between the Commissioning Unit and the TE Consultant*. He/she will *assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary*.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas: *(Adjust the qualifications as needed and provide a weight to each qualification)*

#### CRITERIA

##### Education

- Master's degree in *Environmental Management/ Science or Engineering* or other closely related field;

##### Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *Climate Change*
- Experience in evaluating projects;

- Experience working in *the Caribbean Region*;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *Climate Change*; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

## **11. Evaluator Ethics**

The TE Consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## **12. Payment Schedule**

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

*(Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)*

### 13. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

#### Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

### 14. Recommended Presentation of Proposal

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#));
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other cost related to a virtual consultation, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *(project title)*” or by email at the following address ONLY: *(insert email address)* by *(time and date)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

### 15. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

### 16. Annexes to the TE ToR

*Suggested ToR annexes include:*

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales and TE Ratings Table
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template

## **Annexes to Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

*[Share ToR Annexes directly with short-listed applicants. Include link to 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects' and other existing literature or documents that will help candidates gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required.]*

- **ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**
- **ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant**
- **ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**
- **ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**
- **ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**
- **ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales and TE Ratings Table**
- **ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**
- **ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template**

## ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

## ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.</b>					
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 CC4 Strategic Program SP3: Increased production of renewable energy in electricity grids</b>					
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Total avoided GHG emissions from on-grid RE electricity generation</b>					
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Market penetration of on-grid renewable energy (% from renewables); GHG emissions from electricity generation (tons CO<sub>2eq</sub>/kWh); and \$/ tons CO<sub>2eq</sub></b>					
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>Project Objective:</b> <sup>19</sup> The removal of the policy, technical and financial barriers to energy-efficient applications and solar photovoltaic technologies in Dominica's streets, outdoor areas and public buildings nationwide, initially targeting up to 5 communities including Dubuc,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative direct and total post project direct CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions resulting from the Project support for outdoor EE lighting and solar PV pilot installations and investments in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>889</li> <li>100,010<sup>20</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project final report</li> <li>Annual surveys of energy consumption &amp; reductions for each project where RE and EE measures have been undertaken</li> <li>Government electricity bills for specific buildings where</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government capacity is available to support more diversified EE and RE development and utilization beyond geothermal development</li> </ul>

<sup>19</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

<sup>20</sup> Include the impact of GoCD co-financing that is added to CCTF at EOP (5.84 MW is expected to be installed in additional capacity in the 10 years following the EOP through the Climate Change Trust Fund). See attached GEF spreadsheet for detailed calculations

<p><i>Boetica, Roseau, Portsmouth, for further scale up</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Total MWh of renewable energy generated by EOP</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Total MWh of energy saved from installation of LED lights</i></li> <li>▪ <i>% reduction in electricity costs in public buildings from RE and EE measures by EOP</i></li> <li>▪ <i>% of households and commercial establishments experiencing lower electricity costs from EE and RE installations by EOP</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>0</i></li> <li>▪ <i>0</i></li> <li>▪ <i>0</i></li> <li>▪ <i>0</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>RE- 683 MWh</i></li> <li>▪ <i>EE – 14.3 MWh</i></li> <li>▪ <i>10</i></li> <li>▪ <i>1</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>RE and EE measures undertaken</i></p>	
---	--	--	---	---	--

<p><b>Outcome 1:<sup>21</sup></b></p> <p>Improved knowledge, awareness and institutional capacity on EE applications and solar PV through demonstrations of their deployment in Dominica</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of studies for selected EE applications and RETs to be piloted through an EPC arrangement.</li> <li>• Number of pilot installation of EE applications and RE technologies with and without battery storage carried out.</li> <li>• Combined installed capacity of “scaled up investment” through CCTF in RE and EE applications targeting vulnerable groups e.g. low-income female-headed households.</li> <li>• Number of electrical technicians and EE/RE equipment installation personnel trained in best practices for the installation of various EE applications and various EE technologies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0</li> <li>• 0</li> <li>• 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1</li> <li>• 23 solar PV installations with battery and 60 grid-tied solar PV installations with 50% of installations directly benefitting vulnerable communities e.g. low-income female-headed households in Dubic</li> <li>18 units of outdoor LED street lights</li> <li>700 units of public lighting in buildings</li> <li>• 365 kW of RE installations (PV and hydropower) and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk study on cost effectiveness of EE measures and RE technologies for Dominica.</li> <li>• Training evaluation feedback from parliamentarians, policymakers, architects, technicians</li> <li>• Reports on pilot EE and RE installations and their energy consumption and GHG emissions in comparison with baseline technologies</li> <li>• Draft of green building codes</li> <li>• Awareness raising survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government budgets for technical training for RE are replenished on an annual basis</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---	---	---

<sup>21</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.



			<p>EE installations (mostly EE lighting)<sup>22</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>60 persons trained, with at least 50% of those receiving training being female</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b></p> <p>Uptake of EE applications and solar PV technology is promoted through adoption of new institutional arrangements, and policy and enforcement measures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of draft strategic plans and institutional arrangements developed that are gender responsive and are informed by relevant gender-based research, analysis and advocacy</li> <li>Number of RE and EE technologies with mandatory MEPS by Year 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1</li> <li>3<sup>23</sup></li> <li>6, with 50% female</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drafts of institutional arrangements and strategic plan for EE and RE growth</li> <li>MEPS documentation</li> <li>Training evaluations by participants on MEPS and quality standards workshops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued government support for legislative and regulatory reform to promote and accelerate RE development</li> <li>Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects</li> </ul>

<sup>22</sup> Break down of sub elements and individual projects/installations between RET not provided however, these projects are additive to above RET installations

<sup>23</sup> Solar PV, hydropower installations and LED lighting

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of MoHE officers involved with the enforcement of MEPS and green building codes by EOP</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Outcome 3:</b></p> <p>Scaled-up EE applications and RET investments through implementation of newly proposed financial and institutional mechanisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative number of commercial establishments and households accessing financial assistance from the CCTF by EOP. There will be emphasis on promoting economic opportunities for women and vulnerable groups e.g. low-income female-headed households</li> <li>Annual MWh of EE and RE measures planned or installed by EOP (based on combined total of 591 kW installed capacity during project period)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10</li> <li>1778<sup>24</sup></li> <li>20 – Installation jobs, with 50% female</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCTF fund charter and fund design documentation</li> <li>Bankable documents with business plans for RE scaled-up projects along with applications for CCTF financing assistance</li> <li>EPC documents for local ESCO for the installation of EE and/or RE equipment</li> <li>Work inspection reports</li> <li>Plans for rooftop solar PV and/or mini hydropower installations</li> <li>Surveys of electricity consumption after completion of RE and EE installations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient annual replenishment of RE development funds</li> <li>Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects</li> </ul>

<sup>24</sup> Based on MWh generated of RE and EE (1748 MWh) and LED lighting (30 MWh) by 2019

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of technicians who are employed in the installation and maintenance of EE and RE equipment by EOP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>60 – O&amp;M jobs, with 50% female</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 4:</b> Low carbon development is sustained through effective monitoring and evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of monthly reports submitted by EOP</li> <li>Number of completed final evaluations completed by EOP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission of monthly and quarterly reports as well as PIRs</li> <li>Completed final evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued government support for low carbon development throughout the duration of the Project.</li> </ul>

## ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports and Spot Checks
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**

- v. Title page
  - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
  - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
  - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
  - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
  - TE Consultant
- vi. Acknowledgements
- vii. Table of Contents
- viii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 7. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
  - Project Information Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Ratings Table
  - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
  - Recommendations summary table
- 8. Introduction (2-3 pages)
  - Purpose and objective of the TE
  - Scope
  - Methodology
  - Data Collection & Analysis
  - Ethics
  - Limitations to the evaluation
  - Structure of the TE report
- 9. Project Description (3-5 pages)
  - Project start and duration, including milestones
  - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
  - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Expected results
  - Main stakeholders: summary list
  - Theory of Change
- 10. Findings  
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating<sup>25</sup>)

---

<sup>25</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

#### 4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

#### 4.3 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

#### 4.4 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness (\*)
- Efficiency (\*)
- Overall Outcome (\*)
- Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

### 11. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

### 12. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results

- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

## ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators</li> <li>The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc.</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project results framework adequately measures impact</li> <li>The project indicators are SMART</li> <li>Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are</li> <li>The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement.</li> <li>Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder Consultation Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• SES Annex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Beneficiary testimony</li> <li>• Site visit/field reports</li> <li>• Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>• Site visits</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>• M&amp;E Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How were risks related to COVID19 managed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COVID-related risks were defined against project activities with mitigating actions proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PME COVID-updated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legislation</li> <li>• Policy Documents</li> <li>• Action/Implementation Plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A gender mainstreaming plan was completed</li> <li>• The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant.</li> <li>• Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective</li> <li>• The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender Mainstreaming Plan</li> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b></li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Work Plans</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation</li> <li>• Any changes to the project’s planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee</li> <li>• Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> <li>• Revised Project Results Framework</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements.</li> <li>• Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VFM, RFI, Market Surveys</li> <li>• Procurement Evaluation Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates</li> <li>• Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified</li> <li>• Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Work Plans</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality.</li> <li>• Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s)</li> <li>• UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents)</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP</li> <li>• An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds</li> <li>• The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HACT Assessment(s)</li> <li>• Capacity Assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the M&amp;E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M&amp;E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded</li> <li>• The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&amp;E tool</li> <li>• There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality)</li> <li>• Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>• AWP</li> <li>• FACE forms</li> <li>• Quarterly Narrative Reports</li> <li>• Site visit reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks</li> <li>• Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice</li> <li>• Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement/Recruitment reports</li> <li>• FACE forms</li> <li>• CDRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings.</li> <li>• Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Audit Reports</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy</li> <li>• MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> <li>• MOU(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Site visits</li> </ul>

## ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

### Evaluators/Consultants:

10. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
11. 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.
12. 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. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
13. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
14. 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, evaluators 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, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
15. 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.
16. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
17. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
18. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

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: \_\_\_\_\_

## ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

## ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

<p><b>Terminal Evaluation Report for <i>(Project Title &amp; UNDP PIMS ID)</i> Reviewed and Cleared By:</b></p>	
<p><b>Commissioning Unit (M&amp;E Focal Point)</b></p>	
<p>Name: _____</p>	
<p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Date: _____</p>
<p><b>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</b></p>	
<p>Name: _____</p>	
<p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Date: _____</p>



## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

*The following is a template for the TE Consultant to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.*

**To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)**

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken