



Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through GPN ExpRes

Date: 08.12.2021

Assignment title: Terminal Evaluation for UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects

Unit: Portfolio CESA, Economic Growth and Environmental Sustainability

Assignment Type: TE International Consultant (Project Evaluator)

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Languages Required: Portuguese and English

Category: Climate change and environment

Location: Home-based and São Tomé and Príncipe

Starting Date: as soon as possible after contract signature

Duration of Initial Contract: 35 working days

Expected Duration of Assignment: December 2021 – February 2022 (35 working days)

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 ***Promotion of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient grid-based hydroelectric electricity through an integrated approach in Sao Tome and Principe (PIMS 4602)*** implemented through UNDP CO Sao Tome e Principe. The project was initiated in 2016 and is now at its final year of implementation, after a 15-month no-cost extension request from the Government of Sao Tome and Principe was approved by the Executive Coordinator of the UNDP-Global Environmental Finance in November 2020. 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)

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The world is currently facing the COVID-19 pandemic, which is affecting people everywhere and impacting global and local economic activity and transport systems, as well as causing unprecedented disruptions to daily life that undercut the societal fabric of opportunities for human interaction¹.

This project sought to introduce an integrated energy and ecosystems-based approach to grid/isolated-grid-based mini/small hydro-electricity generation in Sao Tome and Principe. It aimed to achieve this

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

target by introducing a conducive regulatory framework and by establishing a financial support mechanism that will attract investors and facilitate private sector participation in increasing the share of hydropower electricity generation and renewable energies in the country.

In addition, in order to ensure the availability of hydro resources for electricity generation (and irrigation for job creation), the project had an integrated watershed management approach that aimed at integrating innovative participative methods of natural resource management with community livelihoods improvement in a sustainable way and within a landscape approach. This was to be achieved through watershed level land use planning and implementation of community forests, and income generating activities through non-wood forest products and ecosystem-based services for rural communities. This landscape approach was designed to be sustained by a financial mechanism between the private hydroelectricity producers and the upstream communities, based on the maintenance of environmental services (water supply regulation).

Expected outcomes and associated outputs were:

Outcome 1: Streamlined and comprehensive policy and legal/regulatory framework for private sector investment in on-grid/isolated-grid mini/small hydro electricity generation and for integrated watershed management.

Output 1.1.: Appropriate policy and legal/regulatory framework established and operational, for (A) energy sector and for (B) integrated watershed management.

Output 1.2.: Technical report on grid capacity requirements to enable feed-in for grid-connected mini-hydro systems followed by development of an updated grid code.

Output 1.3: Established procedures and standardized PPAs for the introduction of a transparent procurement process in the selection/award of hydro sites by private developers.

Output 1.4: Setting up of a one-stop shop for issuance of construction licenses and permits to hydropower developers.

Output 1.5: Standardized environmental methodology developed for evaluating hydropower projects, and economic and financial evaluation methodology for calculating small hydropower tariffs to be paid to IPPs.

Output 1.6: Capacity developed within EMAE, local banks and key national actors such as Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructure, Natural Resources and Environment to appraise mini/small-hydro projects for development.

Output 1.7: Increased national and local capacity to coordinate institutions for inter-sectoral SLM approach and to implement integrated resources management at the watershed level.

Outcome 2: Promotion of investment in mini/small-hydro through appropriate catalytic financial incentives for project investors.

Output 2.1: Financial Support Mechanism (FSM) established and capitalized to support private investment in grid/isolated-grid- connected mini/small-hydro.

Output 2.2: MOU signed with Central Bank of Sao Tome and Principe setting out the objective, funding mechanism and administration rules regarding its participation as fiduciary agent of the FSM.

Output 2.3: Financial and other incentives to be provided to project developers.

Output 2.4: Reports on financial closure with identified investors.

Output 2.5: Report on completion of construction of at least 4 MW of on-grid/isolated-grid hydropower commissioned at various sites by end of project.

Outcome 3: Integrated land use, sustainable forest management and natural resource management provide social benefits and sustain environmental services at the watershed level.

Output 3.1: Each specific IWMP includes a water & carbon monitoring scheme which provides information on carbon stocks and on the water flows upstream of the hydroelectricity production.

Output 3.2: Integrated managed lands in watershed include a CF managed effectively for sustainable resource conservation.

Output 3.3: New methods and techniques of agroecology (conservation farming practices) reduce lands degradation in watershed.

Output 3.4: Watershed lands function to provide resources, alternative incomes and sustainable environmental services.

Output 3.5: Community trusts for re-investment of energy proceeds into community lands conservation are established and implemented.

Outcome 4: Outreach programme and dissemination of project experience/best practices/lessons learned for replication throughout the region/among SIDS countries.

Output 4.1: National Plan to implement outreach/promotional activities targeting domestic (and international) investors.

Output 4.2: Capacity development of MPWINRE /EMAE and MAPRD to monitor and document project experience.

Output 4.3: Published materials (including video) and informational meetings with stakeholders on project experience/best practices and lessons learned.

Timeframe

This project was approved for a duration of 5 years by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), commencing August 2016 and terminating in December 2020. A 15-month no-cost extension was granted, and the new project closing date is March 31st, 2022.

Management Arrangements

The project is being executed on NIM modality by on NIM modality by the Directorate General of Natural Ressources DGRNE of the Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructures, Natural Resources and Environment (MOPIRNA). Please refer to Section 4 of the Project Document for details on the Management Arrangements of the Project.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the “Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-Financed Projects”. Results of this Terminal Evaluation will be used by key stakeholders (such as GEF, UNDP, local government, etc.) to be replicated by other projects or by other countries, improving their implementation in future programs. 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.

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, lesson 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 tracking tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and the terminal tracking tools that must be completed before the TE begins.

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 STP Country Office, 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 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 (See Annex H).

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 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 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 report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses of 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 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 Results Framework provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in 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 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 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 Promotion of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient grid-based hydroelectric electricity through an integrated approach in Sao Tome and Principe

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ²
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 35 *working days* over a time period of 8 *weeks* starting on December 30th, 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
Dec 10 – Dec 29, 2021	Selection of TE Consultant
December 30, 2021	Preparation period for TE Consultant (handover of documentation)
January 05, 2022	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report

² 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)

January 12, 2022	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
Jan 13 – Jan 26, 2022	TE mission: Virtual stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc.
January 27, 2022	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
January 28 – Feb 02, 2022	Preparation of draft TE report
February 03, 2022	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
February 11, 2022	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
February 14 - 18, 2022	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
February 22, 2022	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

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: <i>December 17, 2021</i>	TE Consultant submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: January 07, 2022	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: January 17, 2022	TE Consultant submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
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: February 04, 2022	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.³

8. 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 Sao Tome and Office. The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators.

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

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE consultant to provide all relevant documents, to include an itinerary of the confirmed stakeholder interviews.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

The Terminal evaluation shall be carried out by a team of international (1) and local (1) consultants.

The International Consultant will be considered as the team leader and will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The International Consultant will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating UNDP-GEF financed projects.

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 an International Consultant for the role of evaluator will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Sciences, Climate Change, Renewable energy, Natural resources management, 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
- Proven experience evaluating GEF projects;
- Experience working in Africa, especially in SIDS countries;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Climate Change ; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English and Portuguese.

10. 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.

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%⁴:

- 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 PROCESS⁵

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁶ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))⁷;
- 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 travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), 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 following email address ONLY: BidsSTP@undp.org indicating the following reference “International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *“Promotion of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient grid-based hydroelectric electricity through an integrated approach in STP”*, by December 02nd 2021 at 5pm GMT. 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

⁴ 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

⁵ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁶ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psu/Support%20documents%20on%20C%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁷ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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.


Criteria	Weight	Max. point
Technical Competence	70%	100
Educational qualifications: Master in Energy, Environmental Science, Engineer or any related field	10	
Review of previous Reports submitted with recent experience in results-based management evaluation methodologies and applying SMART indicators	10	
Experience in carrying out GEF UNDP Terminal Evaluations related to climate change and /or renewable energy	20	
Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years	15	
Experience working in Africa, especially in SIDS countries	10	
Fluency in written and spoken English and Portuguese.	5	
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30%	100
Total Score	Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30%	

13. TOR ANNEXES

- 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
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

14. APPROVAL

This TOR is approved by : *(indicate name of Approving Manager)*

Signature 
 Name and Designation Maria Teresa Mendizabal
 Date of Signing 09-Dec-2021

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:</p> <p>Outcome No. 4: By 2016, the Government and districts, as well as the population, adopt techniques and behaviour that promote a sustainable environment and ensure better prevention and management of risks and natural disasters.</p>					
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</p> <p>Indicator 1: Number of mini/small hydropower projects for electricity generation.</p>					
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page):</p> <p>Promote the use of renewable energy and alternative sustainable habitats.</p> <p>Mainstream environment and energy.</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme: To promote investment in renewable energy technologies.</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Total avoided GHG emissions from utilisation of mini/small hydropower stations for electricity generation.</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Avoided GHG emissions from utilisation of mini/small hydropower stations for electricity generation (tons CO₂) and \$/t CO₂.</p>					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective					
To assist the Government in addressing the barriers to significantly increase grid/isolated-grid-connected mini/small hydropower capacity and to sustainably manage the watershed.	<p>1. Framework in place to enable the private sector to invest in grid/isolated-grid-based mini/small hydropower generation.</p> <p>2. Hydro-electricity generation</p> <p>Reduction of tons of CO₂ over the 5-year</p>	<p>GHG emissions in the electricity generation sector has increased from 79,080 tons in 1998 to 101,480 tons in 2005. This increase is getting bigger due to a sustained increase in diesel fuel use for electricity generation.</p> <p>The present contribution of hydropower in the</p>	<p>Hydro-electricity generation of 51,921 MWh, resulting in direct reduction of 137,200 tons of CO₂ over the 5-year FSP project life cycle. Subsequent generation of 15,871 MWh/year and reduction of 874,200 tons of CO₂ over the remaining lifetime of the plants.</p>	<p>Project's annual reports, GHG monitoring and verification reports.</p> <p>Project Terminal Evaluation report.</p>	<p>Continued commitment of project partners, including Government agencies and investors/developers.</p>

	<p>FSP project life cycle. Subsequent generation MWh/year and reduction of CO₂ over the remaining lifetime of the plants.</p> <p>3. Three (3) Integrated Watershed Management Plans (IWMPs) are adopted, and 23,000 ha are under SLFM practices.</p>	<p>electricity generation mix of the country was a mere 8 % in 2013.</p> <p>No investment taking place in the grid/non-grid-connected mini hydropower sector.</p> <p>No IWMPs are yet developed in the country.</p> <p>No lands restoration techniques implemented in STP.</p> <p>A loss of approx. 1,515 tCO₂ every year in the 6,000 ha of forest in the project sites.</p> <p>No large-scale reforestation driven by the GoSTP (private initiative exists, for a commercial purpose).</p>	<p>Estimated cumulative indirect GHG emission reduction of 4.8 million tons of CO₂ by 2035 on the basis of a conservative policy scenario and a GEF causality factor of 80%.</p> <p>At least 3 IWMPs for project sites have been successfully developed, adopted (endorsed) by communities and under implementation.</p> <p>10,000 ha of lands under good management practices.</p> <p>At least an enhancement of 144,000 tCO₂ during the 20 years lifetime.</p> <p>At least 35,000 tCO₂ sequestered during the 20 years lifetime.</p> <p>Additional income-generating opportunities for the local economy through the creation of some 200 jobs for the operation and maintenance of the hydro power stations and 6,995 inhabitants from 58 communities in</p>	<p>Project's yearly reports.</p> <p>Project site visits and evaluation for verification</p>	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			sustainable forests and land management.		
Outcomes					
Outcome 1: Streamlined and comprehensive policy and legal/regulatory framework for private sector investment in on-grid/isolated-grid mini/small hydro electricity generation and for integrated watershed management.	Frameworks finalized and available for consultation by potential investors and by watershed stakeholders.	None available at the present time.	To be completed within 12 months of project initiation and approved by Government early in Year 2.	Published documents. Government decrees/laws.	Commitment of the various Government institutions.
Output 1.1: Appropriate policy and legal/regulatory framework established and operational, for (A) energy sector and for (B) integrated watershed management.	Appropriate policy and framework arrangements are in place and operational: (A) For energy: Policy document outlining legal/regulatory framework that will guide private sector investment in hydropower drafted and operationalised. (B) For SLFM: Forestry Management Master Plan updated and validated, legal texts for CF designed and validated, Integrated water resource management law promoted, IWMP framework designed, specific	None available at the present time.	To be completed within 12 months of project initiation and approved by Government early in Year 2.	Published documents.	Commitment of the various Government institutions.

	environmental safeguards framework validated.				
Output 1.2: Technical report on grid capacity requirements to enable feed-in for grid-connected mini-hydro systems followed by development of an updated grid code.	Present grid code updated to ensure safe and secure switching in and out of hydropower stations, without disruption in quality of electricity supplied.	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 12 months of project initiation and approved by Government early in Year 2.	Published documents.	Commitment of the various Government institutions and project developers.
Output 1.3: Established procedures and standardized PPAs for the introduction of a transparent procurement process in the selection/award of hydro sites by private developers	Standardised bidding documents for sites and PPAs drafted, and approved by Government authorities.	Not available at the present time.	<p>To be completed within 11 months of project initiation and approved by the Government by the end of year 1.</p> <p>Competitive bidding for sites/concession areas completed by the end of year 1.</p> <p>PPAs for at least 4 MW of mini-hydro capacity signed by the end of the second year after project start.</p>	<p>Published documents.</p> <p>Documents awarding sites to private developers available.</p> <p>Signed PPAs available.</p>	Continued investor interest.
Output 1.4: Setting up of a one-stop shop for issuance of construction licenses and permits to hydropower developers.	One-stop shop is established and operational. Information brochure and website are available.	Under the business-as-usual scenario, the average time to secure all required construction licenses and permits can take up to several years. None at the present time.	All construction licenses and permits are issued within 4-6 months of submission of documents.	Signed documents.	Continued investor interest.

Output 1.5: Standardised environmental methodology developed for evaluating hydropower projects, and economic and financial evaluation methodology for calculating small hydropower tariffs to be paid to IPPs.	Standardised methodologies developed and operationalized for environmental and ecofin analyses, and for determining feed-in tariffs.	None at the present time.	To be completed within 10 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of Government entities and staff.
Output 1.6: Capacity developed within EMAE, local banks and key national actors such as Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructure, Natural Resources and Environment to appraise mini/small-hydro projects for development.	Proposed installed capacities/number of projects appraised for development.	None available at the present time.	4 MW of projects evaluated by Government staff by the end of year 1. Six Government staff trained during first 12 months of project.	Training modules/number of staff trained. Project report.	Concerned institutions willing to release staff for training.
Output 1.7: Increased national and local capacity to coordinate institutions for inter-sectoral SLM approach and to implement integrated resources management at the watershed level.	Number of staff belonging to DG Agriculture and Forestry, and key representatives of the five chamber districts and the Regional Delegation of Principe trained on SLFM. Protocol for institutional cooperation between above institutions agreed and in place. A coordinated inter-sectoral database for SLFM at the watershed level is in	None available at the present time. None available at the present time. None available at the present time.	At least 50% of the staff is trained. To be completed within 10 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter. To be completed within 18 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Training modules/number of staff trained. Protocol. Periodic project report.	Commitment of the various Government institutions.

	place.				
Outcome 2: Promotion of investment in mini/small-hydro through appropriate catalytic financial incentives for project investors.	Document outlining incentives drafted, approved and available to investors.	No comprehensive document available at the present time.	To be completed within 12 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of Government entities.
Output 2.1: Financial Support Mechanism (FSM) established and capitalized to support private investment in grid/isolated-grid-connected mini/small-hydro.	Financial Support Mechanism (FSM) within the Central Bank of Sao Tome and Principe established and operationalised.	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 12 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project report.	Cooperation of Government entities and staff.
Output 2.2: MOU signed with Central Bank of Sao Tome and Principe setting out the objective, funding mechanism and administration rules regarding its participation as fiduciary agent of the FSM.	MOU drafted, finalised and signed with the Central Bank of Sao Tome and Principe.	None available.	To be completed within 12 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of Government entities and staff.
Output 2.3: Financial and other incentives to be provided to project developers.	Incentives to be provided by Government to project developers approved and operationalised.	No comprehensive document available at the present time.	To be completed within 12 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of Government entities.
Output 2.4: Reports on financial closure with identified investors.	Documents on financial closure for at least 4 MW of hydro drafted and finalised with investors.	Not presently available.	Completed within 12 months of project start.	Project reports.	Continued investor interest.

Output 2.5: Report on completion of construction of at least 4 MW of on-grid/isolated-grid hydropower commissioned at various sites by end of project.	At least 4 MW of hydropower stations constructed and operational, either supplying the grid or isolated mini-grids.	No construction is being undertaken at the present time.	At least 4 MW of mini/small hydropower stations constructed by the end of project. 15,871 GWh of electricity generated annually at project end.	Site visits and project reports.	Supportive institutional, legal and regulatory framework.
Outcome 3: Integrated land use, sustainable forest management and natural resource management provide social benefits and sustain environmental services at the watershed level.	Number of ha under SALM practices. Carbon stock enhanced in the forests. CO2 sequestration with trees plantation / forest rehabilitation.	No lands restoration techniques implemented in STP. A loss of approx. 1,515 tCO2 every year in the 6,000 ha of forest in the project sites. No large-scale reforestation driven by the GoSTP (private initiative exists, for a commercial purpose).	10,000 ha of lands under good management practices. At least an enhancement of 144,000 tCO2 during the 20 years lifetime. At least 35,000 tCO2 sequestered during the 20 years lifetime.	Project's yearly reports. Project site visits and evaluation for verification Monitoring scheme.	Political support to the integrated approach at the watershed level remains very high, supporting national level reforms (removal of barriers) and development of private investments.
Output 3.1: Each specific IWMP includes a water & carbon monitoring scheme which provides information on carbon stocks and on the water flows upstream of the hydroelectricity production.	Carbon & Water flows indicators in selected watershed: enhancement of carbon stocks (tCO2/ha), reduced water deficiency, reduced erosion, increased sediment retention, increased dry season stream flows	No comprehensive monitoring scheme exists at the present time.	At least 3 monitoring schemes providing sets of monthly data in each of the watershed.	Project Monitoring System (output 1.7).	Cooperation of Government entities, the communities and private sector.
Output 3.2: Integrated managed lands in watershed include a CF	Number of hectares of secondary forest covered by	0 hectares of secondary forest are covered by a	At least 6,000 ha of Community Forests established and covered	Project reports. Project Monitoring System.	Adoption of CF legal framework.

managed effectively for sustainable resource conservation.	participative management plans.	management plan in the country.	by a management plan among the project sites.		
Output 3.3: New methods and techniques of agroecology (conservation farming practices) reduce lands degradation in watershed.	a. Number of farmers trained on good practices. b. Increased of yield for main crops under SALM.	No training on SALM at the date of PPG (PAPAFPA project will initiate training in the next months).	At least 4,000 farmers are trained. At least 20% of yield increase for main crops under SALM.	Training reports. Survey reports.	Communities will change behaviour and commit to new practices if provided with alternatives and support to implementation.
Output 3.4: Watershed lands function to provide resources, alternative incomes and sustainable environmental services.	Number of ha reforested /forest rehabilitated. Number of Ecological Perimeters established. Percentage of the increase of households' incomes.	No large scale reforestation activities driven by the GoSTP. No Ecological Perimeters including IGA (the concept is new)	At least 7,000 ha are reforested / rehabilitated. At least 50 ha of EP under sustainable management. 20% increase in households' incomes.	Project reports. Baseline and follow-up surveys of rural livelihoods, EP production and IGA.	Communities will change behaviour and commit to new practices if provided with alternatives and support to implementation.
Output 3.5: Community trusts for re-investment of energy proceeds into community lands conservation are established and implemented.	Amount of money (USD) collected every year in the Community Trust.	No benefit sharing scheme established and operationalized in the country.	At least 100,000 USD collected every year from the 3 rd year of project.	Project reports. FSM and Community Trust reporting documentation.	Investments of IPPs within the 2 years after project initiation. Cooperation of Government entities and private sector.
Outcome 4: Outreach programme and dissemination of project experience/best practices/lessons learned for replication throughout the region/among SIDS countries.	Outreach programme formulated. Project experience compiled, analysed and disseminated.	Lack of sufficient information to pursue programme.	Increased awareness among stakeholders in place to promote and develop the market for on-grid/isolated-grid mini/small-hydro.	Project final report and web site.	Growth of programme will be sustained.

Output 4.1: National Plan to implement outreach/promotional activities targeting domestic (and international) investors.	Plan available and operationalized.	No such plan available.	Completed within 18 months of project initiation.	Project documentation.	Expected expansion of programme.
Output 4.2: Capacity development of MPWINRE /EMAE and MAPRD to monitor and document project experience.	Capacity development material prepared. Data on project experience compiled.	No capacity development programme. None at the present time.	6 Government staff trained by the end of project. Completed within 6 months of project end.	Project reports.	Designation of staff by relevant Ministries.
Output 4.3: Published materials (including video) and informational meetings with stakeholders on project experience/best practices and lessons learned.	Project experience and best practices compiled, published and available on website.	Lack of information on best practices and lessons learned.	Completed within 6 months of project end.	Project documentation and web site.	Continued interest of stakeholders.

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

#	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
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 members
- 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 rating⁸)

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 (*)

⁸ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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)
 - TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
 - 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

NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level?			
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators• The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Document• GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies• PIF	Desk review
Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically?	The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Document• CPD• PIF	Desk review
Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Document• UNDP CPD	Desk review
Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement.• Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting• Quarterly Reports• Annual Reports (PIR)• Stakeholder Consultation Reports	
Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area	A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Document• Annual Reports (PIR)• Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Desk Review• Stakeholder Interviews
Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Document• PIF	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Desk Review• Stakeholder Interviews
Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?	The SES checklist was completed appropriately, and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Document• SES Annex	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Desk Review of Documents
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?	The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Annual Reports (PIR)• Monitoring Reports• Beneficiary testimony• Site visit/field reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Desk Review of documents• Interviews with project staff,

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document tracking tool 	stakeholders and beneficiaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site visits
Is the installed solar PV capacity adequate to enable the realization of the intended cumulative reduction in emissions?	The installed PV capacity is sufficient to achieve the desired emission reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports (PIR) Monitoring Reports Site visit/field reports Tracking tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries Site visits
Is the installed Hydro capacity adequate to enable the realization of the intended cumulative reduction in emissions?	The installed Hydro capacity is sufficient to achieve the desired emission reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports (PIR) Monitoring Reports Site visit/field reports Tracking tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries Site visits
Has the project achieved any direct Emissions Reductions based on the energy interventions.	The project has achieved emission reductions and monitoring is ongoing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports (PIR) Monitoring Reports Beneficiary testimony Site visit/field reports Tracking tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff stakeholders
Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making?	Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering Committee Meeting Minutes Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?	A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ATLAS Risk Log M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?	The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 	Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project’s objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyze the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft legislation Policy Documents Action/Implementation Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Stakeholder consultation
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans Annual Reports (PIR) Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

	term or other external evaluation		
To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement Evaluation Documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds <p>The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HACT Assessment(s) Capacity Assessments 	Desk Review
Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document M&E Plan AWPs FACE forms Site visit reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement/Recruitment reports FACE forms CDRs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Interviews with project staff

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice 		
Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Audit Reports 	Desk Review
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	Desk Review
Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	Desk Review
Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log MOU(s) 	Desk Review
Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	Desk Review
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions	The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports (PIR) Monitoring Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Stakeholder Consultation
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

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:

- Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
- Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- 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:
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: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)* 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

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of Promotion of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient grid-based hydroelectric electricity through an integrated approach in Sao Tome and Principe (PIMS 4602)

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):

[illegible]