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United Nations Development Programme/Government of Mauritius

***Terms of Reference for the Mid Term Evaluation of the UNDP-GEF***

***“Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy***

***Conservation in Buildings” Project***

**TITLE:** Consultancy Services – Mid Term Evaluation

**SECTOR:** Energy Sector

# LOCATION: Republic of Mauritius

**DUTY STATION**: Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities

**ASSIGNMENT:** Mid Term Evaluator

**DURATION:** 13 working days over 1.5 months

(1 mission - overall duration of 5 working days in Mauritius)

**STARTING DATE:** June 2011

**1.0 BACKGROUND**

Over the past few years, electricity demand in Mauritius has grown at an average annual rate of 5%. According to the power utility forecasts, electricity generation capacity will have to be increased by approximately 60% over the next 10 years mainly due to air conditioning and mechanical ventilation loads from commercial and residential buildings. The main sources of electricity generation for the Republic of Mauritius remain fossil fuels, namely coal and heavy fuel oil. In line with the stated policy of Government of Mauritius, the UNDP-GEF project entitled “Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings” is being implemented since January 2008, with the first project manager assuming duty in June 2008. The project was established following an application to the GEF, approved in 2007, for the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities, by the UNDP and resulted in an MSP grant of 902K USD. The Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities holds the government mandate to regulate matters concerned with Energy.

The overall project goal is to reduce GHG emissions sustainably through a re-engineering of the building energy efficiency market for existing and new buildings. The project is intended to recommend measures to overcome barriers to energy efficiency in buildings in the Republic of Mauritius and reinforce the development of a market approach with a view to improving residential and non-residential energy efficiency in both existing and future buildings. Consequently, the project activities will ensure that energy is used in a cost effective manner and rationally throughout the islands. The project tackles market barriers in all three areas of energy use in buildings: building fabric, equipment, and people (behaviour). The project has benefited from a GEF grant of USD 912K and a number of assignments have been undertaken since 2008. The Energy Efficiency Bill has been completed and voted in parliament, the Building control Bill is in preparation, as is the Energy Audit Management scheme. In addition, the project also helped in the development of the Grid Code for Small Scale Renewables in Mauritius, and so resulted in the population being able to sell electricity to the grid as well.

In line with the requirement of the project document, the project must be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations, namely the Mid-term and the Terminal Evaluations. The objective of this assignment is to undertake an independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the project. This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration:

1. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>)
2. UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>).

**2.0 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES**

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is initiated by UNDP Country Office in Mauritius in line with the UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines in order to assess the overall project progress, make sure the project is on track to deliver the agreed outcomes, and produce recommendations on any adjustments needed.

The main objectives of the MTE are to:

* Determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes;
* Focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
* Highlight issues requiring decisions and actions;
* Present lessons learnt and best practices about project design, implementation and management, and state how they can be applied to future and other on-going projects;
* Examine the performance of the project since the beginning of its implementation as measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project;
* Address underlying causes and issues contributing to targets not adequately achieved;
* Identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design;
* Recommend for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing the project outputs and outcomes to date;
* Assess if there is evidence that sustainability of benefits is being built into the project (institutional and financial capacity)
* Provide detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period and to assess early signs of the project success or failure, and prompt any necessary adjustments;

Findings of the MTE will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the remainder of the project’s term.

**3.0 SCOPE OF THE MID TERM EVALUATION**

The evaluation will focus on a range of aspects as elaborated at Annex 1. In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with **(R)** should be rated with the 6 point GEF/UNDP rating scale shown at Annex 3, by using the following divisions: *Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory(S), Moderately Satisfactory(MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory(MU), Unsatisfactory(U), Highly Unsatisfactory(HU)*. All ratings given should be properly substantiated:

**PROJECT FORMULATION**

* ***Conceptualization/Design (R):***

1. Assess the efficiency of project planning
2. Assess whether the approach used in design and selection of project interventions addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area.
3. Assess the logical framework and determine whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objectives were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual, institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project.
4. Assess the adequacy of indicators for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement.
5. Assess to what extent lessons and experiences from other relevant projects were incorporated into the design.

* ***Stakeholder participation (R):***

1. Assess the adequacy of involvement of the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation, and their participation in the project’s design.
2. Assess whether the project adequately consulted and made use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design of project activities.

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

* ***Implementation Approach (R):***

1. Assess the use of the project’s logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it.
2. Assess other elements that reflect adaptive management (e.g., comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed) and any changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
3. Assess use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
4. Assess the general institutional arrangements and operational relationships between institutions involved and others, and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
5. Assess the technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.
6. Assess stakeholder participation during the implementation of the project

* ***Monitoring and Evaluation (R):***

1. Assess to what extent there has been supervision of activities during project implementation
2. Assess progress against predetermined indicators as per the logical framework.
3. Assess the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plans.
4. Examine if the monitoring framework is in place and is being adequately implemented and hence generating critical information needed to manage the project

* ***Stakeholder participation (R):***

1. Assess to what extent local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement, if necessary.
2. Assess whether the project consulted and made use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities.
3. Assess the adequacy of the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

**RESULTS**

* ***Attainment of Outcomes/Achievement of Objectives (R):***

1. Assess whetherthe project has made the expected progress towards achievement of intended outputs and outcomes/measurement of change.
2. Assess the level of achievement of project outcomes and objectives based on the following three criteria:

* *Relevance*: Are the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
* *Effectiveness*: Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there are any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such a project. Will the achievement of outputs and outcomes lead to the attainment long-term objective/impacts of the project?
* *Efficiency*: Is the project cost effective? Is the project the least cost appropriate option? Is the project implementation delayed and if it is, then does that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects. Evaluator should also consider that list cost option may not necessarily be the most appropriate (cost versus results)

1. Assess the whole project for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. This includes assessing to which extent organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanism used by UNDP supports the project/programme

**ANALYSIS OF USE OF COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE (R)**

For the UNDP Country office specifically, it is important to highlight the overall contribution of the project to the Energy focal area where the UNDP in Mauritius is said to have a comparative advantage by virtue of its on the ground presence and good relations with stakeholders

**4.0 DELIVERABLES**

The Consultant will produce the following deliverables to UNDP/GEF, UNDP Country Office in Mauritius and the Project Management Unit (Ministry of Energy & Public Utilities):

1. Inception report 3-4 days after start comprising a detailed work plan, including any questionnaires, specific questions and adjusted time schedule to deliver on the assignment. A presentation of the findings to key stakeholders;
2. Draft Evaluation Report within 1 week after visit
3. Final Detailed Evaluation report within 1 week after comments on the draft report in accordance with the structure of the sample report outline provided at Annex 2; The Report will also contain annexes prepared by the consultant including TOR, itinerary, List of persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, questionnaires and summary of results, co-financing and leveraged resources, etc..
4. A presentation of the findings to key stakeholders at the end of the Mission;
5. An executive summary including findings and recommendations, and an ***overall rating*** of the project based on GEF Rating Scales provided at Annex 3;

The report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented electronically in MS Word format. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment;

The selected consultant will have to complete the sample statement of ethics provided at Annex 2, and to submit same as an annex to the evaluation report.

The views of all stakeholders will be sought on the draft evaluation report and any contradictory views shall be included as an annex to the final report.

**5.0 RESOURCES AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT**

In order to obtain the necessary information, the evaluators are expected to consult the stakeholders as well as appropriate documents to be provided by the latter. The main stakeholders concerned by the project are as follows:

* UNDP Country Office
* Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities
* Central Electricity Board
* Ministries on the Steering Committee
* GEF Operational Focal Point

During the evaluation, the consultant will be expected to meet with the stakeholders as well as the Steering Committee. The consultant will be paid on lump sum basis including cost of international travel and Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA), upon satisfactory delivery. The Consultant will be provided with office space at the Ministry. Office space is also available at the UNDP. The consultant is expected to bring his own laptop, photography equipment etc. Reports will be printed by the UNDP.

**5.0 TIME FRAME**

The evaluation will take place in ***June/July 2011*** and it requires a ***5-day*** country mission in Mauritius as well as a desk review (prior to the country mission) and drafting and finalization of the report (following the country mission). The consultant will be paid on lump sum basis including cost of international travel and Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA), upon satisfactory delivery. The draft final report should be submitted to UNDP Mauritius and Project Management Unit, for necessary comments from stakeholders, ***within one week*** after completion of the mission to Mauritius. The consultant will finalize the report within ***one week*** upon receiving comments and feedback from the stakeholders. The whole assignment shall be completed within a period of ***1.5 months***. Total person days input of ***13 days*** is expected.

**6.0 COMPETENCIES**

* Excellent communication (spoken and written) skills
* Excellent writing, analytical and research skills
* Showing strong attention to details
* Excellent interpersonal skills
* Ability to work in a multicultural and international environment
* Ability to work under pressure and to meet tight deadlines

**7.0 QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE**

* At least a Honours Degree in Science or Engineering;
* International Consultant with a minimum of 5 years of relevant experience in Energy Efficiency or related field;
* Must have undertaken at least 3 Mid-Term and/or Final Evaluations, including ***one*** in the field of Energy Efficiency, preferably for a similar UNDP/GEF project;
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Highly knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage;
* Familiarity with Mauritius or any Small Island Development States (SIDS);
* Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
* Have good written and oral communication skills in English and French.
* Be fully IT literate

**8.0 LANGUAGE:**

The language of the assignment shall be English. All deliverables shall be in English language. Therefore, excellent English communication skills (oral, written, and presentation) are essential. Knowledge of French will be an advantage.

**9.0 MODE OF APPLICATION**

All applications shall be submitted through the UNDP jobs website at: <http://jobs.undp.org>

**10.0 CLOSING DATE: (10 Working Days after date of advertisement)**

**ANNEXES :**

Annex 1 : Mid-Term Evaluation Report Sample Outline

Annex 2 : GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Principles – Ethics Draft Text

Annex 3 : Ratings Guidelines for GEF Project Progress

**Note :**

A soft copy of the Project Document can be downloaded from the GEF Website.

Project Title : Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings

PIMS No. 3001, Proposal ID: 00048159, Project ID: 00058178

**ANNEX 1**

**MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT SAMPLE OUTLINE**

**Note: The consultant is expected to follow this outline in preparing the report**

**Table of contents**

**Acronyms**

**1. Executive summary including an overall rating of the project** (using the 6 point GEF/UNDP rating scale).

* Brief description of project;
* Context and purpose of the evaluation;
* Main conclusions, rating of progress towards objectives as well as rating of progress on implementation, recommendations and lessons learnt;

**2. Introduction**

* Purpose of the evaluation;
* Key issues addressed;
* Methodology of the evaluation ***(refer to example provided below at \*\* for specific guidance***);
* Structure of the evaluation.

**3. The project(s) and its development context**

* Project start and its duration;
* Problems that the project seek to address;
* Immediate and development objectives of the project;
* Main stakeholders;
* Results expected.

**4. Findings and Conclusions**

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (R) should be rated in conformity with the GEF/UNDP guidelines for final evaluations using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Highly Unsatisfactory.

***4.1 Project Formulation***

* *Conceptualization/Design****(R)****.* This should assess whether the approach used in design and selection of project interventions addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objectives were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
* *Country-ownership/Driveness.* Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
* *Stakeholder participation* ***(R)***Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
* *Replication approach.* Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
* *Linkages* between the project and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage. This element should also address the question of to what extent the project addresses UNDP priorities; gender, south-south cooperation, poverty-environment linkages (sustainable livelihoods) and disaster prevention and recovery.

***4.2 Project Implementation***

* *Implementation Approach* ***(R)****.* This should include assessments of the following aspects:

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M & E activities if required.

(ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.

(iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.

(v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

* *Monitoring and evaluation* ***(R)****.* Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.
* *Stakeholder participation* ***(R)****.* This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

(i) The production and dissemination of information and lessons generated by the project.

(ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.

(iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.

(iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

* *Financial Planning:* Including an assessment of:

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

(iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

(iv) Co-financing

* *Procurement Management:*  Including an assessment of:

(i) Technical and human resource capacity for procurement management

(ii) Linkage between work programming, procurement planning, budgeting, and disbursement planning

(iii) Effectiveness of procurement management, as indicated by results of audits (internal and/or external), and reports of review and supervision missions by IAs.

* *Sustainability.* Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

***4.3. Results***

* *Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives* ***(R)****:* Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

* *Sustainability:* Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
* *Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff*

**5. Recommendations**

* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. Recommendations should be specific and clearly justified in relation to the achievement of the project objectives.
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Changes to project strategy, including the log frame indicators and targets

**6. Lessons learned**

* This should highlight the ‘best’ and ‘worst’ practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

**7. Evaluation report Annexes**

* Evaluation TORs
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

**\*\* EXAMPLE OF METHODOLOGY OUTLINE:**

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the MTE will include, but may not be limited to the following:

**A) Documentation review including, *inter alia*:**

* Project Document and Project Appraisal Document;
* Project implementation reports (PIR’s);
* Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
* Audits reports
* Annual Review Reports
* M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
* Financial and Administration guidelines;

The following documents will also be available:

* The project M&E framework
* Knowledge products from service providers
* Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
* Minutes of the Project Board Meetings, task teams and other project management meetings;
* Maps
* The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and,
* The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

**B) Interviews with:**

* UNDP-GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
* Staff of the Project Coordination Unit;
* Executing agencies:
* Members of the Project Board
* Task Team members (if appropriate).
* Project stakeholders, particularly members of the various project level steering committees and project beneficiaries;
* Participating members of the Pilot projects
* Relevant staff in participating government departments.

**C) Field Visits:**

The following project sites should be visited:

In addition, **but separate from project staff and their institutions**, the evaluators will need to specifically meet with selected communities (intended beneficiaries of the project during the field visits).

**ANNEX 2**

**ETHICS DRAFT TEXT**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------

***The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Principles***

In accordance with the monitoring and evaluation policy of the GEF and UNDP, this evaluation is guided by, and has applied, the following principles:

**Independence:** The Evaluator is independent and has not been engaged in the Project activities, nor was he responsible in the past for the design, implementation or supervision of the project.

**Impartiality:** The Evaluator endeavoured to provide a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the project. The evaluation process has been impartial in all stages and taken into account all the views received from stakeholders.

**Transparency:** The Evaluator conveyed in as open a manner as possible the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of the findings. This evaluation report aims to provide transparent information on its sources, methodologies and approach.

**Disclosure:** This report serves as a mechanism through which the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation are disseminated to policymakers, operational staff, beneficiaries, the general public and other stakeholders.

**Ethical:** The Evaluator has respected the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and the sources of specific information and opinions in this report are not disclosed except where necessary and then only after confirmation with the person consulted.

**Competencies and Capacities:** The credentials of the Evaluator in terms of his expertise, seniority and experience as required by the terms of reference (Annex X) are provided in Annex XX; and methodology for the assessment of results and performance is described below (section XXX).

**Credibility:** This evaluation has been based on data and observations which are considered reliable and dependable with reference to the quality of instruments and procedures and analysis used to collect and interpret information.

**Utility:** The Evaluator strived to be as well-informed as possible and this ensuing report is considered as relevant, timely and as concise as possible. In an attempt to be of maximum benefit to stakeholders, the report presents in a complete and balanced way the evidence, findings and issues, conclusions and recommendations.

**ANNEX 3**

**RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR GEF PROJECT PROGRESS**

1. **Progress toward achieving project objectives**

Rating of Project Progress

towards Meeting Objective: Taking into account the cumulative level of progress compared to the target level across all of the objective indicators, please rate the progress of the project towards meeting its objective, according to the following scale.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

1. **Progress in project implementation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. |