DETAILED Terminal Evaluation NATIONAL CONSULTANT Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and Global Environment Facility (GEF) M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported, 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 *Project “*Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings” (PIMS #3001)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |   |
| GEF Project ID: | 2241 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 58178 | GEF financing:  | 912,411 | 679,165 |
| Country: | Mauritius | IA/EA own: |       |       |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | 558,187 | 536,121 |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change - Mitigation | Other: | 4,680,000 |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | Promoting energy efficiency in residential and commercial buildings | Total co-financing: | 1,552,256 |       |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities | Total Project Cost: | 7,702,854 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Public Infrastructure, Central Electricity Board, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development  | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 31/10/2007 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: 31/12/2014 | Actual:      |

Objective and Scope

In October 2007, the Ministry of Energy Public Utilities (MEPU) launched a US$ 912,411 technical assistance project, funded by the GEF and supported by the UNDP, called ‘Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings’. 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. In setting out to do so, the project activities were designed to ensure that energy is used cost-effectively and rationally throughout the island. The project tackles market barriers in all three areas of a building’s energy use: building fabric, equipment, and people (behaviour). The target is an accumulated total of 42,000 tonnes of CO2eq (direct) and 245,000 tonnes CO2eq (indirect) over 10 years.

The project is intended to overcome barriers to energy efficiency in buildings in Mauritius and reinforce the development of a market approach to improving residential and non-residential building energy efficiency in both existing stock and future buildings.

The project has five broad outcomes (or components):

1. Building regulations and codes for energy saving are developed, enacted and sustainably enforced;

2. Demand and supply for energy saving services and technology stimulated

3. Building engineers, architects, compliance officers, policy makers, financial sector, suppliers and public are convinced of the importance and market opportunities for building energy-saving

4. Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation

5. Project management

The original outcomes and outputs are summarised below:

*Outcome 1:*

*Building regulations and codes for energy saving are developed, enacted and sustainably enforced*

* Energy Efficiency Unit (EEU) is established
* Building regulations and codes developed and enacted, taxation and labelling mechanisms assessed
* Compliance enforcement capabilities of municipal building code enforcement agencies reinforced.

*Outcome 2:*

*Demand and supply for energy saving services and technology stimulated*

* National standard for energy audits and programme of certification of energy auditors established
* Number of investment grade energy audits and feasibility studies through audit scheme increased
* Standard designs developed for low and middle income housing, schools, and other building needs developed and in use
* Appliance selection and installation guidelines for key products available at sale points.

*Outcome 3:*

*Building engineers, architects, compliance officers, policy makers, financial sector, suppliers and public are convinced of importance and market opportunities for building energy saving*

* Information on local costs and benefits of DSM and building energy efficiency well known by service suppliers and policy makers
* Awareness of building energy saving opportunities improved.

*Outcome 4:*

*Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation*

* Monitoring and evaluation work plan implemented
* Lessons learned collected, prepared and disseminated

A Project Management Unit (PMU) was set up at the Ministry for monitoring project progress and for follow up of delivery of the project outputs and finances. The PMU comprises the National Project Director and the Project Manager from the MEPU, the Environment Programme Officer from the UNDP Country Office, as well as a few other technical staff from the MEPU and UNDP CO.

It is worth noting that a Mid-Term Review was conducted in November 2011.

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.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported,GEF-financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is 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. 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 is 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 Mauritius. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* UNDP

• Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities

• Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development

• Ministry of Local Government,

• Ministry of Finance and Economic Development,

• Town and Country Planning Board,

• Central Statistical Office,

• Mauritius Research Council,

• University of Mauritius,

• National Housing Development Corporation,

• Central Electricity Board,

• Development Bank of Mauritius,

• Mauritius Association of Architects,

• Institution of Engineers,

• Private companies – building contractors, equipment suppliers, consultants, architects

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIRs, project budget revisions, mid-term 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. 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.

II. Functions and key results expected:

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The National Consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation / language support, etc.

A. The review team is expected to prepare an Evaluation Report based on the outline listed in Annex II while specifically including the following aspects:

1. Adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon.

2. Extent of progress achieved against the overall Project Objective disaggregated by each of the individual Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (including sub-activities); as against the Impact Indicators identified and listed in the project document. Extent of the incremental value added with project implementation.

3. Performance in terms of in-time achievement of individual project activities as well as overall project in terms of adherence to planned timelines.

4. Relevance and adequacy of mid-course changes in implementation strategy with PSC approval, if any and the consequent variations in achievements, if any.

5. Degree of effectiveness of the Energy Efficiency Management Office while identifying gaps, if any with lessons learned and alternative scenarios, if any

6. Extent to which energy efficiency has been mainstreamed in the local context. Identify gaps, if any, and provide alternative scenarios

7. Extent of effectiveness of the project and energy efficiency gains achieved as a consequence of the project and the extent to which the envisaged benefits (have been achieved

8. Estimation of the greenhouse gas emission reduction benefits, direct and indirect, arising from the project. Greenhouse gas mitigation estimates for the project must be derived using the official GEF methodology for energy efficiency projects: <http://www.stapgef.org/revised-methodology-for-calculating-greenhouse-gas-benefits-of-gef-energy-efficiency-projects-version-1-0/>

9. Evaluate the impact of the project activities on the various government institutions

10. Extent of effectiveness of awareness generation activities by way of quality of promotional packages / awareness material, number of Awareness Programmes, Trainings undertaken and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like , brochure, etc. should also be considered

11. Pattern, in which funds have been leveraged, budgeted, spent and accounted for in the project.

B. The team should also focus their assessments on project impacts as listed:

a) Perceptions on the “Situation at the end of the Project” as it seems to the review team at the terminal review stage

b) Nature and scale of the policy impact made by the project, if any, on relevant line departments of the Government or other policy making bodies

c) Extent of effectiveness of capacity building initiatives undertaken under the aegis of the project

d) Assessment of Greenhouse Gases Emission reduction achieved during the life of the project and an estimate of likely emission reductions possible in the future

e) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the institutional arrangement deployed in the project with alternative scenarios, if any

f) Details of co-funding, if any, leveraged by the project and its impact on the project achievements (a “Financial Planning Co-financing” format is enclosed in Annex II for reporting);

g) The effectiveness of monitoring and overseeing systems such as Project Steering Committee and suggestion on improvements if any

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([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: |       |

Project finance / co-finance

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

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)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mauritius*.* 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.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 1 month according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing (person day involvement per consultant) | Completion Date |
| Preparation and desk work |  2 days | 5 November 2014 |
| To be available for the Evaluation Mission of the international consultant |  5 days | 17-21 November2014 |
| Draft Evaluation Report & draft GEF CC-M Tracking Tool |  2 days | 21 November 2014 |
| Final Report & final GEF CC-M Tracking Tool |  1 days | 30 November 2014 |

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 OFP |
| **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.

The International consultant will be allocated 15 person days and the National Consultant 10 person days input.

Team Composition

The International consultant should have

* At least an Honours Degree in Science or Engineering
* A minimum of 5 years of relevant experience in Energy Efficiency or related field;
* Must have undertaken at least 2 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.
* Be fully IT literate

Competencies

* Excellent communication (spoken and written) skills in English and French
* 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

The National consultant should have

* At least an Honours Degree in Science or Engineering
* A minimum of 3 years of relevant experience in Energy Efficiency or related field;
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage;
* Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
* Be fully IT literate

Competencies

* Excellent communication (spoken and written) skills in English and French
* 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

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)

Payment modalities and specifications

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

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply on http://jobs.undp.org. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **Hierarchy of Objectives** | **Key Performance Indicators**  | **Means of verification** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Critical Assumptions/Risks** |
| **Project GOAL:**To reduce GHG emissions sustainablythrough a transformation of the buildingenergy efficiency market for existing and new buildings | Amount of CO2 emissions avoided | * Annual Reports from PMU
* Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation Reports
 | Zero tonne of CO2 emissions avoided | **End-of-project target:**42,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions avoided due to 30 verified investments in energy efficiency measures in buildings**Mid-project target:**9,000 tonnes of CO2 avoided due to5 verified investments in energy efficiencymeasures in buildings | * Effective enforcement of regulations and standards is sustainably maintained after the end of the project
* Project support is consistent throughout the project by government and donors, and afterwards by government
* Electricity prices remain stable or continue to rise and act as an incentive for investment in energy saving
* Suitable methodology is formulated for the calculation of “Amount of CO2 emissions avoided”
 |
| **Output 1.1:***Energy Efficiency Unit (EEU) established and functioning* | * Number of core

technical staffs recruited by the EEU * Percentage of totl assigned tasks completed by the EEU
 | * Budgets allocated in

 Government Plans* Progress Reports from

 PMU* Mid-Term and

 Terminal Evaluation  Reports | No Energy Efficiency Unit dealing with energy efficiency is established  | **End-of-project target:*** The EEU is fully staffed and functional and its existence is assured beyond the end of the project
* EEU has successfully involved stakeholders from different Government Ministries and Agencies, and an Energy Efficiency Management Committee has been set up for overseeing the activities of this Unit

**Mid-project target:*** Drafting and enactment of an Energy Efficiency Bill
* EEU has been established
 | * Project support is consistent throughout the project by government and private donors, and afterwards by government
* The core technical staffs have been recruited as from Mid-project
* Appropriate trainings are provided to the EEU Staffs for them to be able to manage the operations of this Unit
 |
| **Output 1.2:***Building regulations and codes developed and enacted* | * % compliance level in new building constructions > 500 m2
 | * Regulations and Codes Developed
* Minutes of Meetings
* Copies of Presentations
* Progress Reports
* Legislations
 | No Building Regulations and Codes are developed  | **End-of-project target:*** Building Regulations and Codes have been enacted and sustainably enforced and are receiving support from all Government Stakeholders

**Mid-project target:*** Final Drafts of

 Building  Regulations  and Codes are  available and have  been disseminated  to local key  stakeholders  | * Final draft Codes and Regulations developed are acceptable to the Government and other public & private stakeholders
* Ongoing and consistent support from government, donors and other concerned stakeholders, throughout and after the end of the project
* Appropriate and comprehensive training are provided to stakeholders for the implementation of the enforced regulations and codes
 |
| **Output 1.3:***Compliance enforcement capabilities of municipal building code enforcement**agencies reinforced*. | * Number of building permits issued after enforcement of the codes and regulations
* % compliance level in new building constructions > 500 m2
 | * Reports from Building Permit Issuing Authorities (i.e., Municipal Councils

 and District Councils),  PMU, and EEU* Minutes of Meetings
* Government Budget

 Reports * Copies of presentations, training programmes, and training materials
 | Building Permit Issuing Authorities have no knowledge of the new building regulations & codes | **End-of-project target:*** Compliance levels with building standards > 80% in new building constructions
* Ongoing budgets allocated to sustaining compliance enforcement

**Mid-project target:*** Building Permit Issuing Authorities of Mauritius and Rodrigues attended training workshops for reinforcing their compliance enforcement capabilities
 | * One or two days of training sessions may not be sufficient for an effective reinforcement of the compliance enforcement capabilities of the building permit issuing authorities
* Training courses may not be tailored as per the specific needs of each of the different target groups of the building permit issuing authorities
* The code and regulations may not be enforced by the government; or, it can take a long time to come in force
 |
| **Output 2.1:** *National standard for energy audits and programme of certification of energy auditors established*.  | * Number of trained Energy Auditors
* Number of Certified Energy Auditors
 | * List of trained and Certified Energy Auditors
* Programmes, applications, copies of presentations and training materials of Energy Audit Training Courses
* Minutes of Meetings
* Energy audit scheme documentation
 | No standards for energy audits and certification programme for energy auditors have been developed  | **End-of-project target:*** Energy Audit Training Course and Certification Programme for Energy Auditors are operating on a fully commercial basis
* At least 20 local experts have completed the energy audit certification course, and at least 10 are certified for undertaking investment grade energy audits

**Mid-project target:*** Report available on the review of existing international standards for energy audits
* Training course materials and an energy audit software tool developed
* At least 20 local experts have been trained for undertaking energy audits as per the audit scheme
 | * Ongoing and consistent support from government, donors and other concerned stakeholders, throughout and after the end of the project
* Appropriate and comprehensive training are provided to stakeholders for the implementation of the energy audit scheme
* Existing market demand for energy audits
 |
| **Output 2.2 :***Number of investment grade energy audits and feasibility studies through audit**scheme increased* | * Number of investment grade energy audits and feasibility studies undertaken
 | * Records of project funds
* Copies of Energy Audit Reports
* Letters from Donors for further financial support
* Progress Reports
* Minutes of Meetings
* Terminal Evaluation Report
 | Zero investment grade energy audits undertaken | **End-of-project target:*** Full utilization of the available GEF project funds for part-financing of 50 energy audits
* A minimum of 30 out of the 50 supported energy audits should lead to concrete investment projects for the implementation of the recommended audit measures

**Mid-project target:*** Final draft of energy audit scheme documentation and report on contingent support mechanism for financing energy audits, are available for implementation
 | * Sufficient project funds are available for the part-financing of the 50 energy audits. If additional funding is needed, government and/or donors are willing to provide the necessary funds.
* The owners of the designated buildings are able to acquire the remaining funds needed for the 50 audits
* Ongoing growth or sustaining of energy (electricity) prices; and, plenty of market opportunities have been developed for investing in energy auditing and in the implementation of the audit measures
 |
| **Output 2.3 :***Standard designs for low and middle-income housing, schools, and other buildings needs developed and in use* | % of the total number of targeted new residential and non-residential buildings constructed as per the standard designs  | * Progress Reports from PMU
* Terminal Evaluation report
* Designs and Plans
* Minutes of Meetings
 | Designs of new buildings do not incorporate energy efficiency and energy saving measures  | **End-of-project target:*** 100% of the new low income housing constructed through the National Housing Development Corporation incorporate energy efficiency and energy saving measures as a result of this project
* Standard Designs have become de facto norm for off the shelf construction of the other targeted residential and non-residential buildings

**Mid-project target:**•Final draft of  standard designs  available for the targeted residential and non-residential buildings of <500 m2 | * Government may not opt for mandatory standard designs
* Standard designs may not be suitable for a mild tropical climate such as that of Mauritius and may therefore not be acceptable to the local stakeholders of the public and private sectors
 |
| **Output 2.4***Appliance selection and installation guidelines for key products available at**points of sale* | Number of Guidelines | * Records from PMU
* Copies of Guidelines
 | No Guidelines available | **End-of-project target:*** Guidelines are available at all points of sale for at least 5 of the targeted household electric appliances
* Copies of guidelines for building energy efficient products, fabrics and appliances are widely disseminated through networks of suppliers of products and services

**Mid-project target:**•Final draft report available on the review of international energy performance standards and energy labelling of household electric appliances | * Ongoing and consistent support from government, donors and other concerned stakeholders, throughout and after the end of the project
* Inception of this project component may be delayed awaiting the other outputs to be delivered
 |
| **Output 3.1***Costs and benefits of building energy efficiency measures well known by service**suppliers and policy makers*. | Number of commercial actors in building energy saving sector | * Project Progress Reports
* Survey reports
* Final reports on costs and benefits of building energy efficiency measures
* Minutes of meetings
 | * Limited information available on local costs and benefits of building energy efficiency measures
* Very limited number of commercial actors in building energy saving sector
 | **End-of-project target:*** Number of

CommercialActors in building energy saving sector increased by a factor of 10 since start of the project**Mid-project target:*** Number of

Commercial actors in building energy saving sector increased by a factor of 5 since start of the project | * Inception of this project component may be delayed awaiting the other outputs to be delivered
* Market opportunities for building energy efficiency and energy saving may not be attractive enough for the commercial actors
* A suitable methodology is devised for the survey of the number of commercial actors at the inception, mid-way and at the end of the project
 |
| **Output 3.2***Awareness of building energy saving opportunities improved*; | Energy saving awareness score | * Results of Survey
* Website and/or Web pages developed
* Field Site visits
 | Limited awareness raising activities on energy saving and energy efficiency implemented by the Government and related Organisations  | **End-of-project target:*** Average “energy saving awareness score” tripled as compared to baseline

**Mid-project target:*** Average “energy saving awareness score” doubled as compared to baseline
 | * Inception of this project component may be delayed awaiting the other outputs to be delivered
* Ongoing and consistent support from government, donors and other concerned stakeholders, throughout and after the end of the project
 |
| **Output 4.1***Monitoring and Evaluation work plan implemented* | * Number of deliverables submitted by the Project Consultants
* Project outcomes and outputs achieved
 | * Baseline and end-of-project study
* Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation Reports
* Project Progress Reports
 | Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations not yet done | **End-of-project target:*** Terminal Evaluation of the project done by an independent International Evaluator
* Methodological tool (logframe) of measuring project performance and impacts has been formulated
* Measured indicators of project outputs and impacts

**Mid-project target:*** Mid-Term Evaluation of the project done by an independent International Evaluator
 | * Ongoing and consistent support from government, donors and other concerned stakeholders, throughout and after the end of the project
 |
| **Output 4.2***Lessons learned collected, prepared and disseminated*. | Number of technical reports, publications, leaflets/pamphlets, and so on, that have been published or hosted to websites | * Project technical reports
* Project publications and leaflets
 | No soft and/or hard copies of technical reports and publications available for structured learning and dissemination activities | **End-of –project Target:*** At least 2 – 3 project technical reports and/or publications that are made available online on a website and/or in hard copies
* Lessons learned documented provide a basis for Energy Efficiency Policy making inside and outside Mauritius

**Mid-project target:*** Dissemination of draft deliverables to local stakeholders for their comments and views
 | * Ongoing and consistent support from government, donors and other concerned stakeholders, throughout and after the end of the project
 |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

* Project Document and Project Appraisal Document;
* Project implementation reports (PIRs);
* Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
* Audits reports
* Annual Review Reports
* Mid Term Evaluation Report
* 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.

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria**  | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local and national levels?  |
| * Is the project objectives conform to agreed

priorities in the UNDP Country ProgrammeDocument (CPD)? | * How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Republic of Mauritius?
 | * In line with the national priorities mentioned in the UNDP Country Programme

Document | * UNDP Country Programme Document
* Project document
 | * Documents analyses
* Interviews with UNDP and project team
 |
| * Is the project relevant to the GEF climate change mitigation area?
 | * How does the project support the GEF climate change mitigation area?
 | * Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF climate change mitigation area?
 | * Project documents
* GEF focal areas strategies and documents
 | * Documents analyses
* GEF website
* Interviews with UNDP and project team
 |
| * Is the project relevant to the Republic of Mauritius’s environment and sustainable development objectives?
 | * Is the project country-driven?
* What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?
* What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?
* Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?
 | * Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives
* Degree of coherence between the project and nationals priorities, policies and strategies
* Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities
* Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process
* Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria
 | * Project documents
* National policies and strategies
* Key project partners
 | * Documents analyses
* GEF website
* Interviews with UNDP and project team
 |
| * Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level?
 | * How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?
* Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?
* Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?
 | * Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders
* Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation
 | * Project partners and stakeholders
* Project documents
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |
| * Is the project internally coherent in its design?
 | * Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?
* Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve Project outcomes?
* Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women’s groups, etc). If so, indicate how
 | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic
* Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach
 | * Program and project documents
* Key project stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Key interviews
 |
| * How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?
 |  | * Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?
* How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?
* Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?
 | * Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally
 | * Documents from other donor supported activities
* Other donor representatives
* Project documents
 | * Documents analyses
* Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders
 |
| * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?
 |  | * Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives
 |  | * Data collected throughout evaluation
 | * Data analysis
 |
| **Evaluative Criteria**  |  | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
| * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?
 | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
 | * See indicators in project document results framework and log frame
 | * Project documents
* Project team and relevant stakeholders
* Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports
 | * Documents analysis
* Interviews with project team
* Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?
 |  | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?
* What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies
* developed? Were these sufficient?
* Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?
 | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design
* Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues
* Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed
 | * Project documents
* UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?
 |  | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?
* What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results?
 |  | * Data collected Throughout evaluation
 | * Data analysis
 |
| **Evaluative Criteria**  |  | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
| * Was project support provided in an efficient way?
 | * Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
* Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?
* Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
* Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
* Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)
* Did the leveraging of funds (cofinancing) happen as planned?
* Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?
* Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?
* How was results-based management used during project implementation?
 | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports
* Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided
* Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures
* Planned vs. actual funds leveraged
* Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other
* organizations
* Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost
* Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)
* Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency
* Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives
 | * Project documents And evaluations
* UNDP Project team
 | * Document analysis
* Key interviews
 |
| * How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?
 | * To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?
* Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?
* What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?
* Which methods were successful or not and why?
 | * Specific activities conducted to support the development

of cooperative arrangements between partners,* Examples of supported partnerships
* Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained
* Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized
 | * Project documents and evaluations
* Project partners and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
| **Evaluative Criteria**  | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| * Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?
 | * Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?
* Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?
* Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?
 | * Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts
* Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity
 | * Project documents and evaluations
* UNDP
* Beneficiaries
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?
 | * What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?
* How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc…)?
* What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?
 |  | * Data collected throughout evaluation
 | * Data analysis
 |
| * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?
 | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
 | * See indicators in project document results framework and log frame
 | * Project documents
* Project team and relevant stakeholders
* Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports
 | * Documents analysis
* Interviews with project team
* Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?
 | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?
* What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?
* Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project
 | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design
* Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues
* Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed
 | * Project documents
* UNDP, project team, and relevant
* stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?
 | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?
* What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results?
 |  | * Data collected throughout
* evaluation
 | * Data analysis
 |
| **Evaluative Criteria**  | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
| * Is the Project financially sustainable?
 | * Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?
* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends?
 | * The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.
 | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
| * Is the Project environmentally and socially sustainable?
 | * Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?
 |  | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
| * To what extent the stakeholders will sustain the project?
 | * Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?
* What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
* Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow?
* Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives?
 |  | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
| **Evaluative Criteria**  | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
| * Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts
 | * Clarify based on extent: a) verifiable improvement in energy intensity; and/or
* b) through specified indicators that progress is being made towards achievement of project objectives
* c) regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels
 | * The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention
 | * Project documents
* UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and 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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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 *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

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. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)