|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **International Consultant for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of full-sized UNDP-GEF project** | |
| **Location:** | home-based with possible trip to Turkmenistan in case of ease of travel restrictions, TURKMENISTAN |
| **Application Deadline:** | 20-Aug-21 **(Midnight New York, USA)** |
| **Time left:** | -d --h –m |
| **Additional Category:** | Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction |
| **Type of Contract:** | Individual Contract |
| **Assignment Type:** | International Consultant |
| **Languages Required:** | English |
| **Starting Date:** (date when the selected candidate is expected to start) | 10-Oct-2021 |
| **Duration of Initial Contract:** | Two months period from the start date of the assignment |
| **Expected Duration of Assignment:** | 26 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 *full-sized* project titled “Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for Sustainable Water Management in Turkmenistan” (PIMS# 4947) implemented through the State Committee for Water Economy of Turkmenistan (SCWE). The project started on 17 July 2015 and is in its sixth 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>).

1. **Project Description**

The $6.185 million UNDP - GEF “Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for Sustainable Water Management in Turkmenistan” project started in July 2015 and is scheduled to finish in April 2022. The project is financed by the Global Environment Facility and implemented through the United Nations Development Programme.

Through technology transfer, investment and policy reform, this project seeks to promote an integrated approach to water management that is energy and water efficient, reduces root causes of land degradation, and enhances local livelihoods and public service delivery. Co-financing of $72.1 million USD has been committed from various sources. Through various interventions, the project aims to achieve some 3.4 million GJ of direct energy savings per year by the end of the project and some 448,000 tonnes of CO2 per year by the end of project.

The objectives of this UNDP/GEF project are as follows:

* Development objective: Provide for sufficient and environmentally sustainable water supply to support and enhance social conditions and economic livelihood of the population of Turkmenistan;
* Environmental objectives: Reduce GHG emissions associated with water management (448,000 tonnes of CO2 per annum by the end of the project); Prevent and remediate salinization of lands.

The project’s activities are organized into four components:

* Component 1 introduces new technologies in irrigated agriculture and pumping for energy efficiency, water conservation, and sustainable land management (SLM);
* Component 2 scales-up investment in new and expanded efficient water-management infrastructure;
* Component 3 delivers local and region-specific planning and educational outreach for IWRM and SLM among farmers and water-sector designers and managers;
* Component 4 develops and supports implementation of policy reform for IWRM.

The first two components of the project constitute the technical foundation of the project. For agriculture and infrastructure, respectively, these components are identifying, verifying, and documenting the most promising ways to save water, increase energy efficiency, and reduce water-related root causes of land degradation in Turkmenistan. The components are generating technical and financial performance data and practical experience to be used to plan and provide necessary justification to scale-up public investment and technology deployment nationwide.

While the first two components define the technical opportunity and priorities for replication, the second two components are seeking to carry actual replication out on a national scale. The third component supports replication from the bottom up via development of action plans at the regional and district levels across the country, as well as educational outreach and capacity-building among farmers and local water-management personnel. The fourth component works from the top down, defining and implementing policies, programmes, and investment plans for IWRM and SLM at the national level.

1. **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, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project’s results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC)](http://erc.undp.org/index.aspx?module=Intra).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project’s results.

**Duties and ResponsibilitieS**

**4. TE Approach & Methodology**

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

The TE team 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, lessons learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team 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 that must be completed before the TE field mission or online interviews with relevant stakeholders and counterparts begin.

The TE team 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 Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), the Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. For this reason, in case if travel restrictions due to COVID-19 pandemic are eased, it is absolutely essential that shortly after the start of the assignment the international consultant travels to Turkmenistan for a period of 2 weeks (10 working days, not including weekends) to meet with all relevant stakeholders. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (State Committee of Water Economy of Turkmenistan (SCWE), Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection of Turkmenistan (MAEP), State Agricultural University, Municipality of Ahal region, Municipality of Kaahka district and Municipality of Geokdepe district); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to (Kaahka and Geokdepe project sites), including the following project sites (Kaahka water pipeline and Green Polygon) as the travel conditions due to COVID-10 permit.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team 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 team, however, 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 team.

The final TE 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>

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 drivenness
* Project Strategy and objectives
* 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

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

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 (improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, capacity development, knowledge management, etc., as relevant)
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to impact

iv. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

* The TE team 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 team 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 F.

**6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The TE Consultantshall prepare and submit:

* + **TE Inception Report**: TE team clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than *2 weeks* before the TE mission or online interviews with relevant stakeholders. TE team submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *(19/10/2021)*
  + Presentation: TE team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE mission online interviews with relevant stakeholders and counterparts. Approximate due date: *(09/11/2021)*
  + Draft TE Report: TE team submits full draft report with annexes *within 3 weeks* of the end of the TE mission or online interviews with relevant stakeholders. Approximate due date: *(01/12/2021)*
  + Final TE Report\* and Audit Trail: TE team 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: *(10/12/2021)*

\*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. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/>

**7. TE Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is the UNDP Country Office in Turkmenistan.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country (if applicable) for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team 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 *26 working days* over a time period of 9 *weeks* starting on 10/10/2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

* + 20/08/2021: Application closes
  + 05/10/2021: Selection of TE Team
  + 10/10/2021: Preparation of the TE team (handover of project documents)
  + 10/10/2021: 4 days: Document review and preparing TE Inception Report
  + 19/10/2021: 1 day: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission
  + 28/10/2021: 10 days: TE mission or online consultations: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits or online interviews with relevant stakeholders and counterparts
  + 09/11/2021: 1 day: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission
  + 15/11/2021: 8 days: Preparation of draft TE report
  + 01/12/2021: 1 day: Circulation of draft TE report for comments
  + 10/12/2021: 1 day: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
  + 15/12/2021: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
  + 06/01/2022: Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is 10/10/2021*.*

**9. Duty Station**

The TE assignment is expected to be home-based in case if current travel restrictions due to COVID-19 pandemic are not eased. However, in case if travel restrictions are eased it is absolutely essential that shortly after the start of the assignment the international consultant travels to Turkmenistan for a period of 2 weeks (10 working days, not including weekends) to meet with all relevant stakeholders and conducts field missions to Kaahka and Geokdepe project sites.

**Travel:**

* + International travel might be required to Turkmenistanduring the TE mission;
  + The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
  + Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
  + Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: https://dss.un.org/dssweb/
  + All related travel expenses should be included to the **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability.**

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**10. TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications**

A team of *two independent evaluators* will conduct the TE – *one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one local team expert*. The team leader will *be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report.* The team expert will *assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.*

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 “team” qualities in the following areas:

Corporate Competencies:

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

Functional Competencies:

* Competence in adaptive management;
* Knowledge of and work experience in the energy efficiency related water and agriculture projects, including those funded by the GEF;
* Excellent training, facilitation and communication skills;
* Results driven, ability to work under pressure and to meet required deadlines;
* Good understanding and experience in the field of GHG emissions calculation and monitoring.

Education

* Advanced University degree, Masters or preferably a PhD, in Energy, Environment, Business Administration, Economics, Engineering or related field is required;

Experience

* Extensive (at least 10-year) work experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in climate change and or water efficiency (including at least some experience with climate change and/or water projects) in transition economies is required;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF project evaluations within the past seven years including experience with SMART based indicators (Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset) is required;
* Experience working with international technical assistance projects in the Eastern Europe countries or CIS region in the past seven years (experience in Turkmenistan will be an asset) is required;
* Excellent communication and presentation skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills.
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English is required, knowledge of Russian will be an asset.

**11. Evaluator Ethics**

The TE team 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 TE reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**13. Recommended Presentation of Proposal**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

All experts applying for this position are required to provide:

* 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);
* Financial Proposal with the references to (1) the daily rate for the assignment and within the timing scale indicated in the present TOR, and (2) any other expenses (including transportation costs, accommodation costs, the possibility of vaccination and etc.). Template of the **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** can be found at: http://www.tm.undp.org/content/turkmenistan/en/home/procurement.html. The UNDP will enter into an Individual Contract based on a lump sum amount. The financial proposal shall represent a detailed, justified and “all inclusive” amount.  In order to assist UNDP in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount, including: a daily fee for the tasks and an estimated duration as specified in this announcement, travel (to and from the missions), per diems, any other possible costs (including vaccinations, dwelling, communication etc.);
* Cover letter explaining why they are the most suitable candidate for the assignment;
* Resume /CV.

Note (Conflict of Interest): Any individual who participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) is ineligible to participate in this bidding.

**15. Criteria for the Selection of 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 financial 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.

When using this method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* Responsive/compliant and having received the highest score – out of 100 points.

Out of the maximum score, the score for technical criteria equals 70% - maximum 70 points, and for financial criteria 30%.

The technical evaluation will take into account the following as per the scoring provided:

* Educational background (Advanced University degree, Masters or preferably a PhD, in Energy, Environment, Business Administration, Economics, Engineering or related field) – 10 points max; (PhD related to Energy/Environment/Natural Resources/Water/Climate Change = 10 points, PhD related to other relevant topic = 8 points, Masters related to Energy/Environment = 6 points, Masters related to other relevant topic = 4 points, combined (2 or more) Masters related to relevant topics = 8);
* Extensive (at least 10-year) work experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in climate change and or water efficiency (including at least some experience with climate change and/or water projects) in transition economies – 20 points max (more points if experience specifically includes experience related to both climate change and/or water efficiency projects; more than 20 years = 17 points, 15-20 years = 12 points, 14-10 years = 7 points, 6-9 years = 2 points.) The consultant shall score +3 points if they have specific work experience related to other projects dealing with the issues of both climate change and also specifically related to water efficiency. If the consultant has only specific experience related to one of these two areas then they shall score +1 point;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF project evaluations within the past seven years including experience with SMART based indicators (Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset) – 20 points max (excellent evidences of the required experience = 20 points (3 assignments or more); very good evidence (2 or more assignments) = 14 points satisfactory evidences (1 other relevant GEF evaluation experience) = 8 points; no evidence of ever having evaluated a GEF project = 0 points);
* Experience working with international technical assistance projects in the Eastern Europe countries or CIS region in the past seven years (experience in Turkmenistan will be an asset and persons who have worked in Turkmenistan before on technical assistance projects will score 10 points) – 20 points max (strong experience (4 assignments or more or at least 1 prior assignment in Turkmenistan) = 20 points; very good experience (3 other assignments or more) = 14 points, good experience (2 assignments or more) = 8 points, satisfactory experience (1 assignment or more) – 6 points, no experience = 0);
* Methodology on how IC will approach and complete the assignment – 10 points max;
* Interview – 10 points max;
* Language skills (English required, knowledge of Russian will be an asset) – 10 points max (10 points for superior writing and oral skills in English + at least some knowledge of Russian; 7 points for superior writing and oral skills in English but no Russian, 4 points for average English and satisfactory writing skills, 1 point for poor English fluency and poor writing skills). Writing skills will be judged by the quality of the 1-page cover letter with the brief description of the approach to the work to be carried out to be sent with this application.

Maximum available technical (education, experience and competencies) score – 100 points.

Additional requirements for recommended contractor:

Recommended contractors aged 65 and older, and if the travel is required, shall undergo a full medical examination including x-ray, and obtain medical clearance from the UN-approved doctor prior to taking up their assignment. The medical examination is to be cleared by the UN physicians, and shall be paid by the consultant.

**15. Annexes to TE ToR**

* **ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**
* **ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**
* **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***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  Environmentally sustainable use of natural resources contributes to effectiveness of economic processes and increased quality of life | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators (from CPAP):**  **Output 3.2.1 – National authorities better plan, manage, and monitor the environment sector**  Indicator 2. Number of laws revised to align national legislation with international standards  Indicator 3. Number of sectoral plans/strategies revised to integrate respective environmental priorities and concerns, and incorporate strategic adaptation measures  Indicator 5. Number of municipalities apply improved waste disposal and better water/sanitation management  **Output 3.2.2 – Local communities contribute to and benefit from sustainable use of natural resources**  Indicator 3. Number of laws and policies revised and aligned internationally for better water governance  Indicator 4. Number of pilot areas practice integrated water resource management  **Output 3.2.3 – Government introduces carbon reduction and energy saving technologies.**  Indicator 1. Comprehensive policy framework is in place regulating long-term measures for sustainable use of energy resources and promotion of alternatives/renewables  Indicator 5. Number of pilot projects are in place promoting alternative and renewable sources of energy | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:** 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** CCM-1, CCM-2, LD-1 | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  CCM Outcome 1.1: Technologies successfully demonstrated, deployed, and transferred  CCM Outcome 2.1: Appropriate policy, legal and regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced  LD Outcome 1.2: Improved agricultural management | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator**  **(units)** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**  Provide for sufficient and environmentally sustainable water supply to support and enhance social conditions and economic livelihood of the population of Turkmenistan | 1. Reduction of yearly energy consumption per ha of irrigated land (J/ha/year) | 9 million GJ/year | 3.4 million GJ/year of direct energy savings | Pump audits and other evaluation of energy consumption in water sector  Measurements of water consumption | Baseline data are based largely on national-level statistics and estimates, but not on metering. Metering data at the level of end users are largely absent for both energy and water. |
| 2. Reduction of GHG emissions (tonnes) | 6,900,000 per year | 448,000. The baseline is estimated in yearly values; however, the project reports in direct reductions of GHG emissions. | Evaluation of demonstration projects and national statistics | Scaling up of project results depends directly on allocation of state budget investment in low-water irrigation, drainage, canal linings, and infrastructure improvements. One major goal of this project is to provide technical and financial justification for such budget allocations. |
| 3. Reduction of normalised water consumption (m3/ha/year) | 120,000 | 48,000. An estimation of the exact area of land under interventions needs to be finalised in 2016. | Evaluation reports on demonstration projects |  |
| 4. Area of land protected and/or reclaimed from salinisation (# ha) | To be defined in the first year during agro-chemical investigation of the pilot polygon | 145 ha of arable land directly improved as a result of project interventions and condition of up to 20,000 ha of land is improved by the end of the project period via indirect impact such as replication activities and from improved irrigation and prevention of water losses | *Ditto* |  |
| 5. Regulatory documents directly related to efficient water use or energy consumption/ savings leading to GHG reductions are adopted at national and sub-national level and implementation started (#) | A detailed analysis of potential regulations, norms, and standards related to activities within the project is to be carried out. The list of potential regulations is to be consulted with the main partners for prioritisation. | 6 (with at least 1 national and others - sub-national). | Project reports, official documents endorsed by the Government. | There are a number of activities, which potentially could lead to the development and endorsement of national-wide regulations, e.g. pump audit, crop-specific irrigation norms, etc. |
| 6. Resources and co-funding mobilised by the Project from state and other sources on water and energy efficiency, as well as land reclamation techniques (US$) | 0 | US$ 72.1 M | Financial reports of the Project, national statistics on state (budget) investments. | This is about 100% of the project budget. It’s an estimate. Further, leveraging will be estimated and considered instead. Reporting will be cumulative starting from 2016. |
| 7. Number of people directly (and indirectly) benefiting from measures on better water management, efficient water use, energy saving and land degradation in Turkmenistan - #(#) | 0 | 35,000 | Project reports, social surveys, M&E reports |  |
| **Component 1: Technology transfer and knowledge development in support of innovation in EE water management and SLM (cont’d).** | 8. Reduction of water used for specific soil types (m3/ha/year) | For medium and heavy loam soils norms are 6700 m3/ha for cotton; 4500 m3/ha for winter wheat; and 29000 m3/ha for rice | 40% (at the project demonstration sites) | Project reports, research results, communication materials, M&E reports |  |
| 9. Normalised energy consumption reduced (compared with average values for similar soil types) | 0 | 30% (at the project demonstration sites) | Project reports, research results, communication materials, M&E reports |  |
| 10. Number of pump audits completed by project: total and (diesel pumps) - # (#) | 0 | 100 total (25 diesel) | Project reports, communication materials, M&E reports |  |
| 11. Energy saving achieved by replacement and/or fixing of old pumps (%) | 0 | 20% | Project reports, research results, communication materials, M&E reports |  |
| 12. Area of land protected or reclaimed from salinisation as a result of demonstration projects (# ha) | 0 | 300 | Evaluation of demonstration projects and national statistics |  |
| 13. Number of people directly benefiting from measures on renewable-energy water supply in remote locations (#) | 0 | 1100 | Project reports, social surveys, communication materials, M&E reports | Total population of the village of Byori. |
| **Project Component 2 - Scaling-up investment in improved water management infrastructure** | 14. Reduction in water loss between withdrawal and entrance point of the Kaakhka town Water Treatment facility (%). | 50% | 5% | Project reports, data from direct measurement, communication materials, M&E reports | To be proved by direct measurement or water allocation through water dividing installations. |
| 15. Direct energy savings due to decommissioning of up to 41 wells (MWh/year) | 0 | Up to 486 MWh of direct energy savings per year |  |  |
| 16. Number of similar projects initiated in other similar (or mountainous areas) districts of Akhal and Balkan velayats of Turkmenistan (#). | 0 | At least 1 similar project under implementation | Nat’l statistics, communication with government agencies | Actual funding of the replication project could be found later but an agreement on such project would be a requirement. |
| 17. Number of production lines established (from at least 3 potential options) to produce materials for modern canal linings and pipes (#) and kilometres of canals newly lined | 0 | 2 production lines established and up to 400 kilometers of canals newly lined | Project reports, communication materials, M&E reports |  |
| **Project Component 3 - Planning and capacity-building at the regional and local levels, plus evaluation and compilation of lessons learned** | 18. Number of regional Integrated Water Distribution Plans developed and formally submitted for approval (#) | 0 | At least 3 velayat TAPs developed and submitted for approval, recommendations are developed for other 2 velayats (Lebap and Balkan) | National media, project reports, M&E reports, communications |  |
| 19. Number of participants and new content of training seminars | Training delivered by MWE to an estimated 78 specialists and 36 farmers annually | Expanded training delivered annually in all five velayats on integrated water management, to a total of 100 specialists and 300 farmers by the end of the project |  |  |
| **Project Component 4 - National policy and regulatory framework established for integrated water resource management** | 20. Number of regulations, norms, and/or standards developed and adopted in support of the new Water Code (#) | 0 | At least 3 acts related to pump audits, crop-specific irrigation norms, and water/energy saving practices (incl. irrigation infrastructure) to lead to GHG emission reduction. | Training feedback forms processing results | Adoption of these standards could happen after the project will have ended; however, it is critical that the corresponding documents are formally accepted for approval. |
| 21. There is a formal commitment of the government to allocate resources for demonstrated by the project technologies (e.g. inclusion in state-funded programmes and budgets) (Yes/No). | No | Yes | Commitment letters, state budget lines, communications with key agencies |  |
| 22. Programme for water measurement is developed and made operational at focus demonstrational sites (Yes/No). | No | Yes | Commitment letters, state budget lines, communications with key agencies |  |

***ToR ANNEX B: Project information package to be reviewed by TE team:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions 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 and Annual Work Plans (AWPs) |
| 10 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board 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) |
| 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 |
| 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 | 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) |
| 21 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 22 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 23 | List/map of project sites |
| 24 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 25 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |

***ToR ANNEX C: Contents of the TE Report***

1 Executive Summary (maximum 4 pages)

A concise Executive Summary (maximum 4 pages) should precede the Introduction section of the TE report and must include:

* + a Project Information Table (ToR Table 1);
  + a brief description of the project;
  + a completed Evaluation Ratings Table (ToR Table 2) using the specified rating scales (ToR Table 3);
  + a concise summary of findings and conclusions
  + synthesis of the key lessons learned (bullet points; one-page maximum);
  + a Recommendations Summary Table. (ToR Table 4).

ToR Table 1 Project Information Table

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Details |  | Project Milestones |  |
| Project Title |  | PIF Approval Date: |  |
| UNDP Project ID (PIMS #): |  | CEO Endorsement Date (FSP) / Approval date (MSP): |  |
| GEF Project ID: |  | ProDoc Signature Date: |  |
| UNDP Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID: |  | Date Project Manager hired: |  |
| Country/Countries: |  | Inception Workshop Date: |  |
| Region: |  | Mid-Term Review Completion Date: |  |
| Focal Area: |  | Terminal Evaluation Completion date: |  |
| GEF Operational Programme or Strategic Priorities/Objectives: |  | Planned Operational Closure Date: |  |
| Trust Fund: |  | | |
| Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Agency) |  | | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement: |  | | |
| Private sector involvement: |  | | |
| Geospatial coordinates of project sites: |  | | |
| Financial Information |  | | |
| PDF/PPG | at approval (US$M) | at PDF/PPG completion (US$M) | |
| GEF PDF/PPG grants for project preparation |  |  | |
| Co-financing for project preparation |  |  | |
| Project | at CEO Endorsement (US$M) | at TE (US$M) | |
| [1] UNDP contribution: |  |  | |
| [2] Government: |  |  | |
| [3] Other multi-/bilaterals: |  |  | |
| [4] Private Sector: |  |  | |
| [5] NGOs: |  |  | |
| [6] Total co-financing  [1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5]: |  |  | |
| [7] Total GEF funding: |  |  | |
| [8] Total Project Funding [6 + 7] |  |  | |

ToR Table 2: Evaluations Ratings Table for “*Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for*

*Sustainable Water Management in Turkmenistan” project*

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

ToR Table 3 TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Table 4 Recommendations Table

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rec # | TE Recommendation | Entity Responsible | Time frame |
| A | Category 1: |  |  |
| A.1 | *Key recommendation:* |  |  |
| A.2 |  |  |  |
| A.3 |  |  |  |
| B. | Category 2: |  |  |
| B.1 | *Key recommendation:* |  |  |
| B.2 |  |  |  |
| B.3 |  |  |  |
| C. | Category 3: |  |  |
| C.1 | *Key recommendation:* |  |  |
| C.2 |  |  |  |
| C.3 |  |  |  |
| D. | Category 4: |  |  |
| D.1 | *Key recommendation:* |  |  |
| D.2 |  |  |  |
| D.3 |  |  |  |
| E. | Category 5: |  |  |
| E.1 | *Key recommendation:* |  |  |
| E.2 |  |  |  |
| E.3 |  |  |  |

2. Introduction (2-3 pages maximum)

A) Evaluation purpose

B) Scope of the Evaluation

C) Methodology

D) Data Collection and Analysis

E) Ethics

F) Limitations

3. Project description (3-6 pages maximum)

* **Project start and duration**, including project cycle milestones.
* **Development context**: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope: Significant socio-economic and environmental changes since the beginning of project implementation and any other major external contributing factors.
* **Problems that the project sought to address**: How the project objectives fit into the partner government’s strategies and priorities; GEF and UNDP priorities and programming; and how they are linked to relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) targets/indicators
* **Immediate and development objectives** of the project
* **Description of the project’s Theory of Change** including description of the outputs, outcomes, intermediate states, and intended long-term environmental impacts of the project; the causal pathways for the long-term impacts; and, implicit and explicit assumptions. The project’s objective(s) should also be included within the theory of change. Where appropriate, after consultations with project stakeholders, the TE team may refine the theory of change. Where an explicit theory of change is not provided for the project, the TE team should develop one based on information provided in the project documentation and through consultations with stakeholders.
* Expected results
* **Total resources** that have been identified for the project, including approved grant financing from the GEF Trust Fund (GEF TF), Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) or Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and expected co-financing from other sources
* Summary of **main stakeholders** involved in implementation and their roles
* **Key partners involved in the project**, including UNDP, other joint implementing partners, executing agencies, country counterparts – including the GEF Operational Focal Point – and other key stakeholders
* How this evaluation fits within the **context of other ongoing and previous evaluations**, for example if a Mid-Term Review was also carried out for the project, or if another implementing partner has evaluated this or a closely linked project

The TE report should include geo-referenced maps and/or coordinates that demarcate the planned and actual area covered by the project. Also, where feasible, the TE report should include geo-referenced photos of the sites where GEF-supported interventions were undertaken.

1. Findings
   1. Project Design/Formulation

*4.1.1 Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators*

*4.1.2 Assumptions and Risks*

*4.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design*

*4.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation*

*4.1.5 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector*

*4.1.6 Gender responsiveness of project design*

* + 1. *Social and Environmental Safeguards*

4.2 Project Implementation

*4.2.1 Adaptive Management*

*4.2.2 Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements*

*4.2.3 Project Finance and Co-finance*

ToR Table 5: Co-financing Table

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

ToR Table 6. Confirmed Sources of Co-financing at TE stage

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sources of Co-Financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Co-financing | Investment Mobilized | Amount (US$) |
| Select one:  • GEF Agency  • Donor Agency  • Recipient Country Gov’t  • Private Sector  • Civil Society Organization  • Beneficiaries  • Other |  | Select one:  • Grant  • Loan  • Equity Investment  • Public Investment  • Guarantee  • In-Kind  • Other | Select one:  • Investment mobilized\*  • Recurrent expenditure\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Co-Financing |  |  |  |  |

*Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), overall assessment of M&E (\*)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |

ToR Table 7. Monitoring and Evaluation Rating Scale

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | Description: |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)  5 = Satisfactory (S)  4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  2 = Unsatisfactory (U)  1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | There were no short comings; quality of M&E design/implementation exceeded expectations  There were minor shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation met expectations  There were moderate shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation more or less met expectations  There were significant shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was somewhat lower than expected  There were major shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was substantially lower than expected  There were severe shortcomings in M&E design/implementation  The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design/implementation. |

*UNDP implementation/oversight (\*), Implementing Partner execution (\*) and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution (\*)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UNDP Implementation/Oversight & Implementing Partner Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Oversight and Execution |  |

ToR Table 8. **Implementation/Oversight and Execution Ratings Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | Description: |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)  5 = Satisfactory (S)  4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  2 = Unsatisfactory (U)  1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | There were no short comings; quality of implementation/execution exceeded expectations  There were minor shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution met expectations  There were moderate shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations  There were significant shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was somewhat lower than expected  There were major shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was substantially lower than expected  There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation/execution  The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design/implementation. |

* + 1. *Risk Management*

4.3 Project Results and Impacts

*4.3.1 Progress Towards Objective and Expected Outcomes*

*4.3.2 Relevance (\*)*

*4.3.3 Effectiveness (\*)*

*4.3.4 Efficiency (\*)*

*4.3.5 Overall Project Outcome (\*)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |

ToR Table 9. **Outcome Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | Description: |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)  5 = Satisfactory (S)  4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  2 = Unsatisfactory (U)  1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings  Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings  Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.  Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.  Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings  The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements |

*4.3.6 Sustainability: financial(\*), socio-political(\*), institutional framework and governance(\*), environmental(\*), overall likelihood of sustainability(\*)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial sustainability |  |
| Socio-political sustainability |  |
| Institutional framework and governance sustainability |  |
| Environmental sustainability |  |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability |  |

ToR Table 10. **Sustainability Ratings Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | Description: |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)  5 = Satisfactory (S)  4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  2 = Unsatisfactory (U)  1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | There are little or no risks to sustainability  There are moderate risks to sustainability  There are significant risks to sustainability  There are severe risks to sustainability  Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability |

*4.3.7 Country ownership*

*4.3.8 Gender equality and women’s empowerment*

*4.3.9 Cross-cutting Issues*

*4.3.10 GEF Additionality*

ToR Table 11. **Six Areas of GEF’s Additionality**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GEF’s Additionality** | **Description** |
| Specific Environmental Additionality | The GEF provides a wide range of value-added interventions/services to achieve the Global Environmental Benefits (e.g. CO2 reduction, Reduction/avoidance of emission of POPs). |
| Legal/Regulatory Additionality | The GEF helps stakeholders transformational change to environment sustainable legal /regulatory forms. |
| Institutional Additionality/Governance additionality | The GEF provides support to the existing institution to transform into efficient/sustainable environment manner. |
| Financial Additionality | The GEF provides an incremental cost which is associated with transforming a project with national/local benefits into one with global environmental benefits. |
| Socio-Economic Additionality | The GEF helps society improve their livelihood and social benefits thorough GEF activities. |
| Innovation Additionality | The GEF provides efficient/sustainable technology and knowledge to overcome the existing social norm/barrier/practice for making a bankable project. |

*4.3.11 Catalytic/Replication Effect*

ToR Table 12. **Assessment of Catalytic Role**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scaling up | Approaches developed through the project are taken up on a regional / national scale, becoming widely accepted, and perhaps legally required |
| Replication | Activities, demonstrations, and/or techniques are repeated within or outside the project, nationally or internationally |
| Demonstration | Steps have been taken to catalyze the public good, for instance through the development of demonstration sites, successful information dissemination and training |
| Production of public good | The lowest level of catalytic result, including for instance development of new technologies and approaches. ƒ No significant actions were taken to build on this achievement, so the catalytic effect is left to ‘market forces’ |

*4.3.12 Progress to Impact*

*4.3.13 Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations, Lessons Learned*

* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned

4.3.14 Annexes

* Annex 1. Glossary of Terms

**ToR Annex D. Evaluation Matrix Template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Data Collection Method** |
| Evaluation Criteria: Relevance - How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level? | | | |
| * Does the project’s objective align with the priorities of the local government and local communities? | * Level of coherence between project objective and stated priorities of local stakeholders | * Local stakeholders Document review of local development strategies, environmental policies, etc. | * Local level field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Does the project’s objective fit within the national environment and development priorities? | * Level of coherence between project objective and national policy priorities and strategies, as stated in official documents | * National policy documents, such as National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Capacity Self-Assessment, etc. | * Desk review * National level interviews |
| * Did the project concept originate from local or national stakeholders, and/or were relevant stakeholders sufficiently involved in project development? | * Level of involvement of local and national stakeholders in project origination and development (number of meetings held, project development processes incorporating stakeholder input, etc.) | * Project staff * Local and national stakeholders * Project documents | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Does the project objective fit GEF strategic priorities? | * Level of coherence between project objective and GEF strategic priorities (including alignment of relevant focal area indicators) | * GEF strategic priority documents for period when project was approved * Current GEF strategic priority documents | * Desk review |
| * Was the project linked with and in-line with UNDP priorities and strategies for the country? | * Level of coherence between project objective and design with UNDAF, CPD | * UNDP strategic priority documents | * Desk review |
| Evaluation Criteria: Efficiency - Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
| * Is the project cost-effective? | * Quality and adequacy of financial management procedures (in line with UNDP, and national policies, legislation, and procedures) * Financial delivery rate vs. expected rate * Management costs as a percentage of total costs | * Project documents * Project staff | * Desk review * Interviews with project staff |
| * Is the project implementation approach efficient for delivering the planned project results? | * Adequacy of implementation structure and mechanisms for coordination and communication * Planned and actual level of human resources available * Extent and quality of engagement with relevant partners / partnerships * Quality and adequacy of project monitoring mechanisms (oversight bodies’ input, quality and timeliness of reporting, etc.) | * Project documents * National and local stakeholders * Project staff | * Desk review * Interviews with project staff * Interviews with national and local stakeholders |
| * Is the project implementation delayed? If so, has that affected cost-effectiveness? | * Project milestones in time * Planned results affected by delays * Required project adaptive management measures related to delays | * Project documents * Project staff | * Desk review * Interviews with project staff |
| * What is the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation? | * Level of cash and in-kind co-financing relative to expected level | * Project documents * Project staff | * Desk review * Interviews with project staff |
| * To what extent is the project leveraging additional resources? | * Amount of resources leveraged relative to project budget | * Project documents * Project staff | * Desk review * Interviews with project staff |
| Evaluation Criteria: Effectiveness - To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
| * Are the project objectives likely to be met? To what extent are they likely to be met? | * Level of progress toward project indicator targets relative to expected level at current point of implementation | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement? | * Level of documentation of and preparation for project risks, assumptions and impact drivers | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * What are the key risks and barriers that remain to achieve the project objective and generate environmental benefits? | * Presence, assessment of, and preparation for expected risks, assumptions and impact drivers | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Are the key assumptions and impact drivers relevant to the achievement of environmental benefits likely to be met? | * Actions undertaken to address key assumptions and target impact drivers | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| Evaluation Criteria: Results - Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
| * Have the planned outputs been produced? Have they contributed to the project outcomes and objectives? | * Level of project implementation progress relative to expected level at current stage of implementation * Existence of logical linkages between project outputs and outcomes/impacts | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Are the anticipated outcomes likely to be achieved? Are the outcomes likely to contribute to the achievement of the project objective? | * Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Are impact level results likely to be achieved? | * Environmental indicators * Level of progress through the project’s Theory of Change | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| Evaluation Criteria: Sustainability - To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| * To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends? | * Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits * Level of expected financial resources available to support   maintenance of project benefits   * Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits | * Project documents Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained? | * Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained? | * Level of technical capacity of relevant stakeholders relative to level required to sustain project benefits | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * To what extent are the project results dependent on socio-political factors? | * Existence of socio-political risks to project benefits | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? | * Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| * Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts? | * Existence of environmental risks to project benefits | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Field visit interviews * Desk review |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment - How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
| * How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | * Level of progress of gender action plan and gender indicators in results framework | * Project documents * Project staff * Project stakeholders | * Desk review, interviews, field visits |
| Cross-cutting and UNDP Mainstreaming Issues | | | |
| * How were effects on local populations considered in project design and implementation? | * Positive or negative effects of the project on local populations. | * Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports | * Desk review, interviews, field visits |

**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 and TE Ratings Table**

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

ToR Table 13 TE Rating Scales

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

|  |
| --- |
| **ToR Annex G: Report Celarance Form**  **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(*Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for Sustainable Water Management in Turkmenistan (PIMS# 4947) **Reviewed and Cleared By:**  **Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template**

**To the comments received on** *(date)* **from the Terminal Evaluation of** *(*Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for Sustainable Water Management in Turkmenistan (PIMS# 4947) 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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |