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# 1. INTRODUCTION

* 1. **UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP has four objectives:

1. to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
2. to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
3. to promote accountability for resource use;
4. 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 as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with applicable policies for UNDP/GEF projects, all GEF-funded projects implemented by UNDP are subject to monitoring and evaluation.

The current Terms of Reference of this evaluation outline what is expected from the Evaluator and briefly reflect key aspects of the project and its background. For any description on methodology, procedures and content of the evaluation report reference is made to the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects (Annex 1).

## Brief project description

* + 1. **Context**

The success of the Brazilian sugarcane-ethanol program is now well established, both in terms of being commercially competitive today without subsidy and in terms of achieving significant ongoing reductions in greenhouse gas emissions relative to petroleum fuel use. The project described here seeks to help launch a similar commercial and environmental success story with sugarcane-biomass electricity generation in Brazil. The proposed project is globally significant because over 80 countries grow sugarcane, and Brazil is viewed internationally as a leader in technological innovation and competitiveness in the sugarcane processing industries. Thus, success in Brazil would likely catalyze similar efforts in other countries. As biomass-based electricity production is already familiar in the Brazilian sugarcane processing industries, where generated electricity meets onsite process requirements, the hurdles to commercial success in electricity are much less daunting than at the same stage of development of the sugarcane-ethanol program.

The overall objective of the proposed project is to catalyze the establishment of a commercial market for sugarcane-based electricity supply to the Brazilian grid, to displace fossil-fuel electricity that would otherwise need to be generated to meet growing electricity demands in Brazil. The GEF has helped lay the foundation for a cane-power industry in Brazil by sponsoring an earlier project (Biomass power Generation – GEF ID 338) that was largely a technology development and capacity building effort. The SUGARCANE RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY (SUCRE) project will build on this earlier effort to catalyze the transformation of the sugarcane industry in Brazil into one for which supply to the grid of renewable electricity from sugarcane biomass becomes a significant and core aspect of their business, alongside sugar and ethanol production.

To maximize the potential for electricity generation from sugarcane, the project will facilitate the expanded use of bagasse and launch the widespread use of sugarcane “trash”, the tops and leaves of the sugarcane plant that historically have been burned on the cane field as a waste product. As previously determined, the quantity of trash that is available on a typical cane field is equal to the amount of bagasse produced. Thus, considering trash and bagasse, the biomass resource from sugarcane is effectively double the resource commonly associated with sugarcane. This offers the opportunity for large amounts of renewable electricity to be exported from sugarcane mills to the grid, since all of the additional biomass harvested will be solely utilized for additional electricity generation.

* + 1. **Project outcomes**

The objective of the SUCRE project is to create the conditions for sugar mills to increase the export of electricity generated by sugar cane trash and bagasse to the grid.

The outcomes of the SUCRE project are designed to overcome the barriers to commercially-practiced collection and utilization of sugarcane trash for electricity generation and sales to the grid, as follows:

1. Technology for sugarcane trash collection and conversion to exported electricity at sugarcane mills is commercially launched.
2. Economic and financial viability of sugarcane trash collection and utilization for export of electricity from sugarcane mills is commercially demonstrated.
3. Environmental integrity of the use of biomass for energy is assured.
4. Dissemination, capacity building, replication strategy across the sugar cane sector is under implementation.
5. Institutional, legal, regulatory framework is in place to promote the sustainable use of biomass for electricity generation and sales to the grid.

# 2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The project was approved in 2010 and implementation was expected to start early 2011. However, the executing agency for the project, originally a research center for the sugarcane sector, changed its legal status and became a private organization. This has impacted negatively in the implementation of the project and project activities with GEF financing were never initiated.

Given the issues mentioned above, UNDP has decided to call for an Evaluation of Implementation Arrangements of the SUCRE project and engage in the preparation of a Substantive Revision to be agreed among the Parties, as part of the adaptive management of the Project.

In this sense, it is expected that the evaluators assess the original PRODOC, its logical framework and implementation arrangements and prepare a Substantive Revision in order the project can be implemented by another executing agency.

The evaluation will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP. A key principle of the evaluation is that it must provide clearly documented evidence and analysis, and unbiased assessment.

The main stakeholders of this evaluation are: (i) The Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation of the Government of Brazil (MCTI); (ii) The Sugarcane Technology Center (CTC), as the original executing agency of this project; (iii) The sugarcane mills providing co-financing and hosting project activities; (iv) Equipment manufacturers providing co-financing and technical support to the project; and (iv) UNICA.

# 3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will cover the appropriateness of project design and implementation arrangements and propose any necessary changes to the PRODOC to ensure the project is relevant, effective, and efficient and presents the envisaged results and sustainability. These criteria should be further defined through a series of questions covering all aspect of the project interventions, broken out in two main sections:

1. Project design: Logical framework, Assumptions and Risks, Implementation Arrangements, Budget (co-finance) and Timing; and
2. Project Implementation: Alternate executing agency and confirmation of stakeholders’ participation.

# 4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The evaluators are expected to deliver the following products:

* Oral presentation of the initial assessment of the Implementation Arrangements and the recommendations for a substantive revision, after interviewing the main stakeholders, to MCTI and UNDP CO in order to allow for clarification and validation.
* A draft final report that will serve as the basis for a Project Substantive Revision containing proposals for (a) appropriate project implementation arrangements (b) suggestions on modifications to project outcomes, outputs, and/or activities, based on the current level of progress for biomass generation with sugarcane in Brazil, (c) budget modifications, including co-financing sources, and (d) a logical framework revision. The relevance of the project in the current scenario must be assessed. Items (a, b, c) are under the responsibility of the national consultant, while item (d) is under the responsibility of the international consultant. Both consultants are expected to assess the relevance of the project.
* A final report, including changes/suggestions requested by UNDP on draft version, with the items above.
* Based on the final report, a Project Substantive Revision shall be prepared by the international consultant.

# 5. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

The evaluation methodology will include documentation review, interviews and field visits. The Evaluators shall discuss with the UNDP-Brazil country Office and the MCTI on the methodological approach to be undertaken.

A list of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators is attached in Annex 2.

# 6. EVALUATION AND PROFESSIONAL ABILITIES REQUIRED

The present evaluation will be undertaken by two external consultants and must be performed in close cooperation with UNDP, MCTI and CTC team, which will assist and support with documents and all information needed for the evaluation process.

**6.1. National Consultant for Technical Aspects and Implementation Arrangements**

In general terms the consultant should ensure the assessment is carried out in an objective way to provide an external perspective to the technical aspects and implementation arrangements of the project, from his experience.

Specifically he will:

* Assess the different instances of the project implementation, carefully reviewing the ability as how the project can be carried out according to specific responsibilities;
* Evaluate how different instances can be related among themselves and propose a clear definition of roles and responsibilities.
* Propose managerial, financial and administrative aspects of the project so that they are aligned with the financial rules and regulations of UNDP, and/or the public/private procurement rules when it applies;
* Evaluate the cost effectiveness of the methodologies to be used by the project.
* Assess the design of the project, its relevance and progress towards the objectives set.
* Assess the required inputs for the achievement of impacts, especially in relation to the main goals of the project.
* Assess the financial sustainability and institutional capacity of the stakeholders to carry out the activities of the project.
* Make implementation arrangements recommendations to enable execution by a different executing agency.
* Evaluate the different aspects of the project such as sustainability, ownership, efficiency, and design with reference to technical aspects.

**6.2. International Consultant on Preparation of a Substantive Revision**

In general terms the consultant should ensure the assessment is carried out in an objective way to provide an external perspective to required changes in project design to be reflected in a Substantive Revision, from his experience.

Specifically he will:

* Assess the design of the project and necessary changes to be reflected in the Substantive Revision.
* Undertake the necessary changes in the project logical framework, rewriting the description of outcomes, outputs, and/or activities, as necessary.
* Update project context, justification, strategy, sustainability and other text required by the donor for the preparation of the Substantive Revision.

# 7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

## 7.1. Management Arrangements

The *UNDP-Brazil* has overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements of this evaluation as well as day-to-day support to the evaluators (travel, accommodation, office space, and communications) and timely provision of per diems and contractual payments. The *UNDP-Brazil* will also organize the site missions (travel arrangements, meetings with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, interviews, field trips). The evaluators will be briefed by the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) and the Regional Coordination Unit (UNDP-GEF RCU) upon the commencement of the assignment, and will also provide a terminal briefing. Other briefing sessions may be scheduled, if deemed necessary.

Payment modalities and specifications: The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. To the national consultant, payment will be 50% at the submission of the Draft Report to the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU, and the other 50% once the Final Report has been completed and cleared by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. To the international consultant, payment will be 50% at the submission of the Draft Report to the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF CU, and the other 50% once the Substantive Revision has been completed and cleared by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU.

The quality of the evaluators’ work will be assessed by the UNDP-CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations and requirements, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installment.

This Terms of Reference follows the UNDP policies and procedures, and will be agreed upon by the MCTI, UNDP Country Office and the CTC. The final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, therefore, the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU will have to formally clear the report (as per the Approval Form in Annex 4).

## Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan, and the estimated contract period will be in **June-July 2013**:

Preparation before field work: (5 days including travel time)

* Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project.
* Familiarization with overall challenges faced on project implementation and PRODOC format.

Mission to pilot areas: (5 days)

* Meeting with UNDP CO and UNDP- GEF RCU.
* Meetings with key stakeholders in country.
* Collection and review of all available materials with focused attention to project implementation and stakeholders’ participation.
* Visit to Project sites: the itinerary will be set in cooperation with CTC.
* Review of major findings with UNDP CO, MCTI and CTC in a meeting to be held in Brasília.

Draft report (10 days): To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

* Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, MCTI and CTC (telephone).
* Drafting of report in the proposed format.
* Completing of the Draft Report and presenting it for comments and suggestions (email).

Final Report (5 days)

* Completing of the final report based on previous comments and suggestions.
* Presentation of final evaluation report to UNDP CO, MCTI and CTC.

Substantive Revision (5 days)

* Preparation and presentation of the substantive revision based on the final report.

## 8. ANNEXES

## Annex 1: UNDP Guidance on Evaluation of GEF Financed Projects (Version for external evaluators).

## Annex 2: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators.

## Annex 3: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form.

## Annex 4: Evaluation Report Clearance Form.

## Annex 1: UNDP Guidance on Evaluation of GEF Financed Projects (Version for external evaluators)

## Annex 2: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

* Approved PIF;
* Signed PRODOC.

## Annex 3: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Annex 4: Evaluation Report Clearance Form to be completed by CO and included in the final document**

Reviewed and Cleared by

***UNDP GEF***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***UNDP Country Office***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-1)