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1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Small Wind Energy Development and Promotion in Rural Areas (SWEDPRA) in DPR Korea (PIMS #751).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

1. Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | PIMS #751 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | #.00076431 | GEF financing:  | 0.725 | 0.725 |
| Country: | DPR Korea | IA/EA own: | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| Region: | East Asia and Pacific | Government: |       |       |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change  | Other: |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | CCM-3: Renewable Energy (GEF 5) | Total co-financing: |       |       |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 0.875 | 0.875 |
| Other Partners involved: | UNOPS | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | October 2005 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:April 2013 | Actual:April 2013 |

1. Objective and Scope

The DPR Korea energy sector is characterized by a heavy reliance on coal and coke (over 60% of demand in 1990). Petroleum, all of which is imported, accounted for only 7% of supply in 1990, electricity another 7% and biomass provided an estimated 24%. Industrial demand accounts for nearly half of all consumption, residential about a third (half of this contributed by wood and biomass). The remaining sectors (agriculture, military, transport, commercial and non-energy) all contributed about 3 to 5% to demand. The DPR Korea in the 80s built a heavily industrialized, energy intensive economy, which because of reliance on coal and older technology are now energy-inefficient, . produce far below demand and contribute to atmospheric pollution and climate change.

Since 1990, the economy has suffered. Much of this can be related to energy supply and demand causes i.e. increased demand against lack of capital investment in energy, worn out technology and increased energy losses. . Vital infrastructure, such as that for electricity generation, transmission, and distribution and transport, has declined drastically as a result. The decline has been felt nowhere more than in the agricultural sector. Moreover, electricity shortages have caused an estimated 25% reduction of irrigation capability in 1996 compared to 1990 levels. Irrigation is essential for rice production in the temperate climate of DPR Korea. Rural households as well have experienced an estimated 50% drop in service. Rural clinics, hospitals and schools suffer these same shortages. This has brought about declining standards of living.

The goal of Small Wind Energy Development and Promotion in Rural Areas (SWEDPRA) is the reduction of the annual growth rate of GHG emissions from fossil fuel use, particularly coal. The objective of the project is removal of barriers to widespread application of small wind energy systems (SWES) in DPR Korea by assisting the nascent wind energy sector on the road to increased quality and standards and full-scale commercialization and improving the domestic market (particularly in the rural areas), as well as the potentially viable foreign market, for locally manufactured SWES.

The SWEDPRA project supports the Government Policy on Science and Technology which was adopted in1991. This policy promotes the research and development activities in the area of renewable energy such as solar and wind energy, to widen utilization of renewable sources of energy. In the year 1993, The Government issued the National Action Plan for Agenda 21 focusing on a transition to sustainable development. This document has featured development of renewable energy, in particular wind energy as one of the three priorities. Later in 2002, as part of the First National Communication Report (FNCR) to the UNFCCC, the DPR Korea has reiterated its commitment to developing and disseminating wind energy technologies.

In order to achieve the project objective, the following project key Components and Outcomes were identified: .

Component 1: Wind Energy (WE) Resource Assessment. Outcome 1: Regular conduct of assessment of the wind characteristics and energy potentials in the country.

Component 2: WE Technology Information and Awareness Enhancement. Outcome 2: The feasibility and benefits of wind energy technology applications are widely known to potential users in the country.

Component 3: Development of Domestic and Overseas Market for locally Made SWES. Outcome 3: Fully established and promoted market for locally made SWES units both domestically and abroad.

Component 4: SWES Design Improvement. Outcome 4: Locally made SWES units comply with internationally acceptable quality and performance standards.

Component 5: SWES Manufacturing Improvement. Outcome 5: Improved manufacturing of locally made SWES units towards internationally accepted production practices and standards.

Component 6: SWES Technology Application Demonstration. Outcome 6: Successful showcasing of the installation, operation and monitoring of optimally designed and manufactured SWES units.

Component 7: Energy Planning and Policy Formulation. Outcome 7: Energy planning and policy making becomes part of the country’s development planning system.

This is a medium sized project with project implementation duration of 50 months, and funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and UNDP. The project was initially signed in August 2005, and implemented for 18 months from October 2005 – March 2007 before its suspension. During this period, the project was executed by UNOPS. After restart of UNDP operations, SWEDPRA project was reviewed and signed in August 2010. Since then, the project is being implemented under UNDP Direct Execution (DEX) until its revised planned closing date of April 2013, which is about 32 months.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

1. Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed project has developed over time. The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. The international consultant will be the team leader and coordinate the evaluation process to ensure quality of the report and its timely submission. The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, translation etc. The evaluation team is expected to become well versed as to the project objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, activities and status of accomplishments. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator/s is/are expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Pyongyang, including the project sites (*TBI*)*.* Interviews will be held with the following individuals and organizations at a minimum, but not limited to:

* National Project Director (NPD)
* Project Technical Manager (PTM)
* Project Manager (PM)
* Project Administrative Assistant
* UNDP Programme Support Unit
* UNDP Financial Officer
* UNDP Procurement Officer
* Project Steering Committee Members
* Relevant project stakeholders, and personnel, but not limited to:
* National Coordination Committee on Environment (NCC-E)
* State Academy of Science (SAOS)
* State Commission of Science and Technology (SCST)
* Non-Conventional Energy Development Centre (NCEDC)
* Ministry of Land and Environment Protection.
* International Project Consultant(s), where applicable (possibly use Skype interview)
* Research institutions and Experts in the country, where applicable
* Relevant personnel at UNDP Country Office in DPR Korea and Program Analyst in-charge of the Project

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document (two versions), inception workshop report, annual work and financial plans, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR (2011 and 2012), project budget revisions, quarterly reports, Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings, Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any), Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc., midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment such as terms of reference for past consultants’ assignments and summary of the results; past audit reports (if any). A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

1. Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which 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 obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation |       |
| M&E Plan Implementation |       | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency  |       |
| Overall quality of M&E |       | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |       |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance  |       | Financial resources: |       |
| Effectiveness |       | Socio-political: |       |
| Efficiency  |       | Institutional framework and governance: |       |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |       | Environmental : |       |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |       |

1. Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

1. Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

1. Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

1. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in DPR Korea. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Throughout the period of evaluation, the evaluation team will liaise closely with the UNDP Resident Representative/Deputy Resident Representative/Programme Analyst/Senior M&E Adviser/Project Manager, the concerned agencies of the Government, any members of the international team of experts under the project and the counterpart staff assigned to the project. The team can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfil its task, the team, however, is not authorized to make any commitments to any part on behalf of UNDP/GEF or the Government.

***Logistics***

The team will conduct a mission visit to Pyongyang and selected project sites, to meet with relevant project stakeholders. This visit will also include meetings with the officials of UNDP, the Implementing Partner, stakeholders from other institutions and ministries related to the project.

After the initial briefing by UNDP Resident Coordinator/DRR/Programme Analyst/Project Manager, the review team will meet with the National Project Director, the officials of NCC-E, and GEF Operational Focal Point as required.

1. Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 21 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 2 days | *date* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 12 days | *date* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 5 days | *date* |
| **Final Report** | 2 day | *date* |

1. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

1. Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluator[[3]](#footnote-3). The individual experts in the team needs to have good technical knowledge of the wind energy, renewable energy and climate change projects and national context of wind energy project and program implementation in DPR Korea, possess good evaluation experience, and writing skills to carry out the assignment. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. International evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for quality and timely submission of the report. The allocation of tasks in the execution of this TOR shall be decided mutually between the International and National consultants. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The international consultant must present the following qualifications and professional background:

* Minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized professional experience in renewable energy and climate change projects Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
* Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
* Post-Graduate in Engineering, Management or Business;
* At least 3 years of technical experience in wind energy and process engineering or operations. Experience in specific to small wind energy systems (SWES) development and wind resource measurement in wind energy industry is advantageous;
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly, distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
* Familiar with developing countries context or regional situations relevant to that of DPR Korea;
* Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported renewable energy and climate change projects;
* Comprehensive knowledge of international renewable energy industry best practices;
* Very good report writing skills in English.

The evaluation team shall conduct debriefing for the UNDP Country Office, Project Manager, and NCC-E in Pyongyang towards the end of the evaluation mission. The international consultant shall lead presentation of the draft review findings and recommendations. Lead drafting and finalization of the terminal evaluation report. The evaluation team shall review the tracking tool. If it is not available, review the required information to complete the tracking tool as required for climate change mitigation projects.

1. Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

1. Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | At contract signing |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

1. Application process

**Mandatory documents to be included in the submission of technical and financial proposal:**

Interested individual consultants are required to submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications, which is mandatory.

***(a) Technical Proposal***

(i) Explaining why the individual consultant (IC) is most suitable for the work

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on the IC will approach and conduct the work

(iii) P11 form duly signed (attached below)

***(b) Financial proposal***

(i) Professional rate per day, total days, total professional cost, and travel costs (includes travel, lodging, and per diem) to Pyongyang from hometown and travel for field visits (TBI) for 5 days. Please include the information in the form “*OFFEROR’S LETTER TO UNDP CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT”* attached to this Procurement Notice.

***(c) Personal CV***

Including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 MOST RECENT references (with their full contact details, including e-mail, phone numbers)

**Special instructions for completing financial proposal**

1. ***Lump sum contracts***

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including professional rate, travel, per diem, and miscellaneous in the number of anticipated working days).

1. ***Travel***

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join Pyongyang and return travel to home country. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and IC, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

**Evaluation of the proposals**

IC proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

***Cumulative analysis:***

The award of the contract will be made to the Consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

1. Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight; [70%]

\* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| Technical |  |  |
| * Qualification of the Consultant
 | 20 | 20 |
| * Relevant work Experience
 | 25 | 25 |
| * Proposed Work Plan for undertaking the task
 | 20 | 20 |
| * Time Line for completion of the Task
 | 05 | 05 |
| Financial | 30 | 30 |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Also called consultant [↑](#footnote-ref-3)