



# **Consultancy for Mid-term Evaluation of the Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP)**

8 September 2009

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 The Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project**

The Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP) is a joint initiative by 11 Pacific Island Countries (PICs), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the United Nations Development programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The global environment and development goal of PIGGAREP is the reduction of the growth rate of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission from fossil fuel use in the PICs through the removal of the barriers to the widespread and cost effective use of feasible renewable energy technologies. The specific objective of the project is the promotion of the productive use of renewable energy to reduce GHG emission by removing the major barriers to the widespread and cost-effective use of commercially viable renewable energy technologies. PIGGAREP consists of various activities whose outputs will contribute to the removal of the major barriers to the widespread utilization of renewable energy technologies. The project is expected to bring about in the PICs: i) increased number of successful commercial renewable energy applications; ii) expanded market for renewable energy applications; iii) enhanced institutional capacity to design, implement and monitor renewable energy projects; iv) availability and accessibility of financing to existing and new renewable energy projects; v) strengthened legal and regulatory structures in the energy and environmental sectors; and, vi) increased awareness and knowledge on renewable energy and renewable energy technologies among key stakeholders.

### **1.2 UNDP/GEF The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy**

The UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and

disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators or specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term evaluations, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods should conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

PIGGAREP is a five year project, which began implementation in July 2007 and is planned to be operationally closed by July 2012. As the project now is approaching two and a half years of implementation as per standard UNDP/GEF requirements a mid-term evaluation of this GEF Full Size Project (FSP) has to be undertaken.

## **2. Objective**

The objective of the assignment is to undertake the mid-term evaluation of the PIGGAREP as per UNDP/GEF requirements and procedures.

## **3. Request for Quotations (RFQ)**

Quotations are kindly requested from parties that are willing and able to undertake the services as specified in the detailed Terms of Reference (TOR) in Annex A.

## **4. Instructions to the Bidders**

- (a) The Quotation must cover all the objectives, outputs and activities as specified in the TOR (Annex A);
- (b) Only United States Dollars (US\$) must be used in the Quotation;
- (c) The Quotation must include:
  - i) An overall technical approach that will be taken to carry out the assignment and the guiding principles thereof. Outline the proposed approach based on the TOR;
  - ii) Information on the qualifications of the bidder including updated CV of the individual(s) who will contribute to the consultancy, and, as part thereof, a summary of recent work in the areas to be covered in

this consultancy including clients and information about the work produced for them;

- iii) Information on availability during the period November to December 2009, which is the planned period for the consultancy;
- iv) Total person days proposed for the work on the consultancy and daily rate in US\$ for each person;
- v) Costs for travel, Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) for the number of people required to participate in the field visits and other possible operating costs for the consultant(s); and,
- vi) A preliminary work plan/timeline based on activities and reporting requirements as specified in the TOR including proposed dates for each of the deliverables (draft as well as final versions).

- (d) The Quotation must be in the English language;
- (e) The abovementioned documents, information and requirements are mandatory and as such are required to form a complete tender. A quotation will be rejected unless it is substantially responsive to the abovementioned requirements;
- (f) The consultancy will include one mission to the Pacific. Timing will depend on the exact dates of the 2009 PIGGAREP Multipartite Review (MPR) Meeting, which is planned to take place 23-27 November 2009 in Nadi, Fiji. The MPR meeting will provide the Successful Contractor an opportunity to meet and have bilateral discussions with representatives from all the 11 participating PICs. Thus preliminary the mission to the Pacific will include visits to Fiji as well as Samoa - where SPREP and UNDP Samoa Multi-country Office (MCO) are based - as part of the same round-trip;
- (g) The final working plan will be determined through negotiation between the successful bidder and the UNDP Samoa MCO;
- (h) Travel expenses (using economy airfares) will be provided from the contractor's home base and back and as part thereof, the Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be provided according to standard United Nations (UN) rates<sup>1</sup> and UNDP procedures;
- (i) For more information about PIGGAREP including copies of the UNDP Project Document and the GEF FSP Brief (which is an integral part of the Project Document), Inception Phase Report and Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) please visit the PIGGAREP homepage:

[http://www.sprep.org/climate\\_change/piggarep.htm](http://www.sprep.org/climate_change/piggarep.htm)

---

<sup>1</sup> As per 1 August 2009 the Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rate for Apia, Samoa and Nadi, Fiji is US\$209.00 and US\$175.00 respectively

- (j) If the Quotation is received prior to the formal submission date corrections/modifications can be made up to that date;
- (k) The Quotation must be submitted in electronic format only (MS Word 2003 or PDF-format) by e-mail to all the three e-mail addresses specified in Section 9 below. If the electronic submission exceeds 2 MB in total, it must be broken into several e-mails each with an attachment of less than 2 MB in size and with e-mail text indicating the position of the attachment relative to the overall submission; and,
- (l) Successful as well as unsuccessful bidders will be informed by e-mail as soon as possible after the submission date. Unsuccessful bidders will not be debriefed.

## **5. Evaluation Criteria**

The following evaluation criteria will be applied when selecting the successful Contractor:<sup>2</sup>

- (a) Conformity to the TOR;
- (b) Qualifications and experience (please refer below);
- (c) Quality and soundness of the preliminary proposed overall technical approach and work plan;
- (d) Total number of working days to carry out the required tasks; and
- (e) Total quoted price.

## **6. Qualifications and Experience**

The successful Contractor is expected to have all or most of the following qualifications and experience:

- (a) Professional and academic qualifications in the areas of energy and environment or other relevant fields;
- (b) Proven track record of very extensive experience in project and program monitoring and evaluation (M&E) preferably in the context of GEF, in general, and UNDP/GEF, in particular;
- (c) Knowledge of renewable energy and climate change projects and national context of renewable energy project and program implementation in PICs (or alternatively familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of the PICs);
- (d) Experience in Pacific island Countries is considered an asset; and,

---

<sup>2</sup> The UNDP Samoa Multi-country Office (MCO), UNDP Pacific Centre (PC) and SPREP will participate in the evaluation committee. The final decision with regard to the successful Contractor will rest with the Resident Representative (RR), UNDP Samoa MCO

(e) Excellent working knowledge of English both spoken and written.

## **7. Contract**

The contract will be issued and managed by UNDP Samoa MCO.

## **8. Submission Date**

Deadline for the submission of offers is Thursday 8 October 2009 Samoa time.

## **9. Contact Information**

Mr. Peniamina Leavai, Climate Change Programme Officer, UNDP Samoa Multi-country Office (MCO), email: [peni.leavai@undp.org](mailto:peni.leavai@undp.org)

Mr. Thomas Lynge Jensen, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Climate Change Mitigation in the Pacific, UNDF Pacific Centre (PC), email: [thomas.jensen@undp.org](mailto:thomas.jensen@undp.org)

Mr. Solomone Fifita, PIGGAREP Project Manager, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), email: [solomonef@sprep.org](mailto:solomonef@sprep.org)

## **Annex A –**

### **Terms of Reference for PIGGAREP Mid-term Evaluation**

#### **1. Introduction**

##### **1.1 The Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project**

The Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP) is a joint initiative by 11 Pacific Island Countries (PICs), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the United Nations Development programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The global environment and development goal of PIGGAREP is the reduction of the growth rate of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission from fossil fuel use in the PICs through the removal of the barriers to the widespread and cost effective use of feasible renewable energy technologies. The specific objective of the project is the promotion of the productive use of renewable energy to reduce GHG emission by removing the major barriers to the widespread and cost-effective use of commercially viable renewable energy technologies. PIGGAREP consists of various activities whose outputs will contribute to the removal of the major barriers to the widespread utilization of renewable energy technologies. The project is expected to bring about in the PICs: i) increased number of successful commercial renewable energy applications; ii) expanded market for renewable energy applications; iii) enhanced institutional capacity to design, implement and monitor renewable energy projects; iv) availability and accessibility of financing to existing and new renewable energy projects; v) strengthened legal and regulatory structures in the energy and environmental sectors; and, vi) increased awareness and knowledge on renewable energy and renewable energy technologies among key stakeholders.

##### **1.2 UNDP/GEF The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy**

The UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators; or specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term evaluations, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods should conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a

means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. PIGGAREP is a five year project, which began implementation in July 2007 and is planned to be operationally closed by July 2012. As the project now is approaching two and a half years of implementation as per standard UNDP/GEF requirements a mid-term evaluation of this GEF Full Size Project (FSP) has to be undertaken.

## **2. Objective**

The objective of the assignment is to undertake the mid-term evaluation of the PIGGAREP as per UNDP/GEF requirements and procedures.

## **3. Outputs**

- a) Inception Note;
- b) De-briefing Note; and,
- c) Mid-term Evaluation Report.

## **4. Activities**

The scope of work for the consultancy will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following activities:

### **REGARDING INCEPTION NOTE:**

- a) Study and review relevant background materials; and,
- b) Write-up an inception note including: a) the successful Contractor's understanding of the consultancy and associated tasks; b) the proposed detailed technical approach; c) the proposed detailed work plan/timeline; d) identification of issues crucial to the viability of the consultancy; and e) detailed comments on this TOR including anticipated risks and problem areas. Subsequently, if required and approved by UNDP Samoa Multi-county Office (MCO) and UNDP/GEF, the TOR can be adjusted in response to the Inception Note.

### **REGARDING DE-BRIEFING NOTE:**

- a) Prepare debriefing notes, based on preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations from the mission to Fiji and Samoa; and,
- b) Discuss preliminary draft debriefing notes with appropriate personnel from SPREP, UNDP Samoa MCO and UNDP/GEF. Prepare minutes of the meetings and submit for comment and approval of the participating parties.

## **REGARDING MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT:**

In general:

- a) Undertake a systematic and impartial assessment of PIGGAREP;
- b) Determine the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the involved partners;
- c) Assess the entire UNDP/GEF-funded project and its components as well as the co-financed components of the project;
- d) Assess the project implementation taking into account the status of the project activities and outputs and the resource disbursements made up to end of October 2009;
- e) Assess capacity at the country level including options to meet the capacity needs and requirements of the countries to deliver on their PIGGAREP results;
- f) Undertake the mid-term evaluation at two levels: i) component level; and ii) project level;
- g) Consult findings and recommendations available in relevant evaluation reports (which will be made available to the Successful Contractor) including the following: i) STAP Technical Review – PIGGAREP Project Brief, 7 April 2005, prepared by Trexler Climate + Energy Services; ii) Output Evaluation for the Pacific Island Renewable Energy Project (PIREP), 7 April 2005, prepared by Trexler Climate + Energy Services; iii) Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF/SPREP Project RAS/02/G35, Prepared by Advisory Services on Climate, ENergy and Development ISSues (ASCENDIS), Final Version, October 2006; iv) Evaluation of the Role and Contribution of UNDP in Environment and Energy, UNDP, August 2008; and v) GEF Evaluation Office Summary on the Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF/SPREP Project RAS/02/G35, August 2009;

With regard to component level:

- h) Assess whether there is effective relationship and communication between/among components so that data, information, lessons learned, best practices and outputs are shared efficiently, including cross-cutting issues;
- i) Assess whether the performance measurement indicators and targets used in the project monitoring system are specific, measurable, achievable, reasonable and time-bounded to achieve desired project outcomes;
- j) Assess whether the use of consultants has been successful in achieving component outputs;
- k) Assess appropriateness and relevance of: i) work plans (project life, yearly and quarterly); ii) compliance with work and financial plans vis-à-vis actual budget allocations; iii) timeliness of disbursements, procurement, coordination among project team members and committees; and iv) UNDP country office support;



- l) Highlight any issue or factor that has impeded or accelerated the implementation of the project or any of its components, including actions taken and resolutions made;

With regard to project level:

- m) Assess project performance in terms of progress towards achievement of results (internal and within project's control) including to what extent: i) the project is making satisfactory progress in achieving project outputs vis-à-vis the targets and related delivery of inputs and activities; ii) the direct partners and project consultants are able to provide necessary inputs or achieve results; iii) given the level of achievement of outputs and related inputs and activities to date the project is likely to achieve its Immediate Purpose and Development Objectives; and iv) there are critical issues relating to achievement of project results that have been pending and need immediate attention in the remaining period of implementation;
- n) Assess factors affecting successful implementation and achievement of results (beyond the Project's immediate control or project-design factors that influence outcomes and results) including to what extent: i) project implementation and achievement of results is proceeding well and according to plan and if not what are the outstanding issues, obstacles, bottlenecks, etc. that are affecting the successful implementation and achievement of project results; ii) the broader policy environment remain conducive to achieving expected project results, including existing and planned legislations, rules, regulations, policy guidelines and government priorities; iii) the project logical framework and design still are relevant in the light of the project experience to date; iv) critical assumptions/risks in project design are still relevant under present circumstances and based hereon validate these assumptions as presently viewed by the project management and in addition determine whether there are new assumptions/risks that should be raised; v) the project is well-placed and integrated within the national government development strategies, such as National Energy Policy Frameworks, community development, poverty reduction, etc., and related national, regional and global development programs to which the project implementation should align; vi) the PIGGAREP's purpose and objectives remain valid and relevant and if not what items or components in the project design needs to be reviewed and updated; and vii) the institutional and implementation arrangements still are relevant and helpful in the achievement of the Project's objectives and if not what are the institutional concerns that hinder the Project's implementation and progress;
- o) Assess project management (adaptive management framework) including: i) if the project management arrangements are adequate and appropriate; ii) how effectively the project is managed at all levels including if such it results-based and innovative; iii) if the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system, operate as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making; iv) if technical assistance and support from project partners and stakeholders are appropriate, adequate and timely; v) whether the risks originally identified in the

- project document and, currently in the APR/PIRs, are the most critical and validate if the assessments and risk ratings placed are reasonable; vi) describe additional risks identified during the evaluation, if any, and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted; vii) assess the use of the project logical framework and work plans as management tools and in meeting with UNDP-GEF requirements in planning and reporting; viii) assess the use of electronic information and communication technologies in the implementation and management of the project; ix) on the financial management side, assess the cost effectiveness of the interventions and note any irregularities; and x) assess how the APR/PIR process have helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results;
- p) Assess strategic partnerships (project positioning and leveraging) including: i) if project partners are strategically and optimally positioned and effectively leveraged to achieve maximum effect of the renewable energy program objectives for the participating PICs; ii) how project partners, stakeholders and co-financing institutions are involved in PIGGAREP's adaptive management framework; iii) identify opportunities for stronger collaboration and substantive partnerships to enhance the project's achievement of results and outcomes; and; iv) to what extent the project information and progress of activities are disseminated to project partners and stakeholders and recommend possible ways to improve the collaboration and partnership mechanisms.

## 5. Methodology

With the aim of having an objective and independent evaluation, the Successful Contractor is expected to conduct the project evaluation according to international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). The *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System* is available here: [http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/22383/11502729611/UNEG\\_Standards\\_for\\_Evaluation\\_Annex\\_III.pdf/UNEG%2BStandards%2Bfor%2BEvaluation\\_Annex%2BIII.pdf](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/22383/11502729611/UNEG_Standards_for_Evaluation_Annex_III.pdf/UNEG%2BStandards%2Bfor%2BEvaluation_Annex%2BIII.pdf)

Furthermore it is expected that in general the methodology that is to be applied will include the following tools as required:

- a) Documentation review/desk study;
- b) Mission;
- c) Interviews; and
- d) Questionnaires.

The proposed overall technical approach including specific mix of methodological tools to be applied as part of the evaluation is to be included as part of the Quotation and the detailed technical approach will be prepared by the successful Contractor and included as part of the draft Inception Note. Subsequently these will be discussed and agreed to between the successful Contractor and UNDP.

### **Ad a) Documentation review/desk study**

Review of relevant project documents and reports will be based on the following sources of information: review of documents related to the Project and structured interviews with knowledgeable parties. Through such the Successful Contactor is expected to become well versed as to the project objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, activities and status of accomplishments.

Prior to the mission to the Pacific, the Successful Contractor will receive relevant documentation including: i) PIGGAREP Project Document and Project Brief; ii) Inception Report; iii) Annual work plans including budgets; iv) Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) for 2007/2008 and 2008/2009; v) Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) and quarterly Financial Reports (FRs) for the period July 2007 to September 2009; vi) audit for 2007 and 2008; and v) TORs for consultants assignments and copy of key deliverables:

### **Ad b) Mission**

The consultancy will include one mission to the Pacific, which is to coincide with the 2009 PIGGAREP Multipartite Review (MPR) Meeting that is planed to take place 23-27 November 2009 in Nadi, Fiji. The MPR meeting will provide the Successful Contractor an opportunity to meet and have bilateral discussions with representatives from all the 11 participating PICs.

Thus preliminary the mission to the Pacific will include visits to Fiji as well as Samoa - where SPREP and UNDP Samoa MCO are based - as part of the same round-trip. Face-to-face feed-back from relevant national level project stakeholders such as government departments, power utilities, etc from these two countries are to be organised.

## **6. Reporting Requirements**

### **6.1. Deliverables**

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
1. Draft Inception Report	To be proposed by the bidder and reflected in the preliminary work plan that is to be submitted as part of the Quotation. Final date for this deliverable will be determined through negotiation between the successful bidder and UNDP MCO Samoa and reflected in the final working plan
2. Final Inception Report	See above
3. Draft Debriefing Note	See above
4. Final Debriefing Note	See above
5. Draft Mid-term Evaluation Report	See above
6. Final Mid-term Evaluation Report	See above

Concerning reporting requirements it should be noted that:

- a) All draft documents should be in Microsoft Word 2003 and all final documents in Adobe Acrobat format;
- b) All documents must have no restriction in access; and,

- c) The consultancy is planned to be undertaken in the period November to December 2009 and as such the consultancy including all deliverables is to be finalized by end of December 2009 the very latest.

## 6.2 Structure of Mid-term Evaluation Report

The outline of the Mid-term Evaluation report could be structured along the following lines:

- a) Executive summary;
- b) Introduction;
- c) The project and its development context;
- d) Findings and conclusions including project implementation achievements challenges, and difficulties to date
- e) Lessons learned;
- f) Recommendations for modifications and the future course of action;
- g) Annexes including: i) TOR; ii) mission itinerary; iii) list of persons interviewed; iv) list of documents reviewed; v) questionnaire used and summary of results; vi) Co-financing and Leveraged Resources (based on table that will be provided to the Successful Contractor) and vi) comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions. If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the Successful Contractor and the key project partners these must be explained in an annex attached to the final report).

Concerning length of the report normally it should not exceed 50 pages in total.

## 7. Inputs

Entity	Input
UNDP Samoa MCO	a) Organize the consultancy including being contractual UNDP/GEF entity; b) liaise with the successful Contractor to set up stakeholder interviews; c) Assist with logistics concerning mission including meetings; d) Ensure the timely provision of payments as per contract with successful Contractor; e) Provide relevant background information and documentation to the successful Contractor; f) Provide comments on all draft deliverables; and g) As appropriate participate in meetings
UNDP/GEF	a) Provide guidance on relevant UNDP/GEF procedures, policies and practices; b) Provide relevant background information including copies of relevant documentary sources; c) Provide input on draft documents; and d) As appropriate participate in meetings
SPREP	a) Provide relevant background information and documentation to the successful Contractor; b) Assist with logistics concerning mission including meetings; c) Comment on selected draft deliverables; and d) As appropriate participate in meetings
PICs	Primary source of key inputs on the progress, issues, results, impacts, etc of the PIGGAREP at the national level