TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE UNDP/GEF PROJECT:

PIMS 4324 - Project Title: Technology Transfer and Market Development for Small Hydropower in Tajikistan

Contents

Project Title:	Technology Transfer and Market Development for Small Hydropower in Tajikistan" - PIMS 4324
Functional Titles:	International Consultant / Team Leader National Consultant
Duration:	estimated 20 working days over the period of: September – October 2014.
Terms of Payment:	Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Mid-Term Evaluation Report
Travel costs:	The costs of in-country mission(s) of the consultant are to be included in the lump sum.

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full-size projects supported by the GEF should undergo a mid-term evaluation in the course of project implementation.

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

i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and
iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

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

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the "GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy" (see http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html).

This Mid-Term Evaluation is initiated by UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan and Bratislava Regional Centre as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the level of regulatory bodies of the Ministry of Energy and Water Resources of the Republic of Tajikistan, and UNDP/GEF) with a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and with a strategy for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Summary: The UNDP/GEF's project of "Technology transfer and market development for SHP in Tajikistan" is a four-year project implemented directly by UNDP's Energy and Environment Programme.

The responsible national partner for the execution of the project is the Ministry of Energy and Water Resources of the Republic of Tajikistan. The project has a GEF budget of USD 2,000,000 and UNDP's co-financing commitments of USD 1,330,000, and the potential co-financing commitments from the Government, private sector and other UNDP projects (including in-kind contribution) is USD 5,120,000. The Project Document was signed between the Ministry of Energy and Industry (currently the Ministry of Energy and Water Resources) of the Republic of Tajikistan and UNDP Country Office on 19 March 2012.

The aim of the project is to initiate UNDP Tajikistan's strategy – the scaling up of pilot activities for the acceleration of progress towards the achievement of MDGs with a particular focus on improving access to renewable energy in rural regions for the purpose of poverty reduction and triggering economic development. Its conceptualization falls within the frame of the Poverty Reduction Strategy III and National Development Strategy, which have been recognized to have no focus on promoting use of abundant renewable potential for poverty reduction, development and building environmental resilience.
The project is expected to significantly accelerate the development of small-scale hydropower (SHP) generation in Tajikistan by removing barriers through enabling legal and regulatory framework, capacity building and developing sustainable delivery models, thus substantially avoiding the use of conventional biomass and fossil fuels for power and other energy needs. The project aims to do this by introducing a regulatory framework to supply the grid with electricity generated SHP through sustainable delivery models and financing mechanisms and assist the Government in attracting funding for SHP investments.

The inception phase began in April 2012 and included an inception workshop several months later on September 28, 2012. The inception report documents the review of the project strategy and those changes made during the inception phase.

From the point of view of the design and implementation of the project, the key stakeholders are:

- Ministry of Energy and Water Resources of the Republic of Tajikistan (MoEWR)
- "Barki Tojik", the national electricity utility company
- Agency for Hydrometeorology under the Committee for Environmental Protection
- Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT)
- Local production facilities and service providers (CJSC "Energoremont" and SUE "Tajiktekstilmash")
- Academy of Science of the Republic of Tajikistan
- TajikGidroenergoProekt Research Institute
- Tajik Technical University
- Kurgantyube institute of energy
- Local government authorities at jamoat (sub-district,) district and regional levels
- Jamoat Resource Centers
- Micro Finance Institutions
- Non-governmental organizations
- UNDP Country Office
- UNDP/GEF Regional Center for Europe and CIS (Bratislava)
- The GEF Secretariat, who is not involved in project implementation, but to whom the Evaluation Report to be prepared under this Terms of Reference will be submitted.

Three project outcomes are defined in the Project Document:

1.	Adapted and enhanced legislative and regulatory framework for small-scale hydropower development in the country.
2.	Enhanced technical and planning know-how and developed market chain for SHP.
3.	Demonstrated technical and economic viability of SHP technology in supporting socio-economic development.
4.	National Scaling-up Programme of Renewable Energy-based Integrated Rural Development in supporting socio-economic development.

Associated with these outcomes there are a number of Outputs (please see Annex 1 for the Revised Logical Framework of the project). Progress towards them is reported in 2012-2013 Annual Project Implementation Review (to be available for the evaluation team).

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is initiated and commissioned jointly by UNDP Tajikistan Country Office and by the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit (Bratislava). Mid-term evaluations (MTEs) are intended to identify potential project design issues, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation (MTE) provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. To this end, the MTE will serve to:

1. Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
2. Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project and GEF objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
3. Enhance organizational and development learning;
4. Enable informed decision-making;
5. Create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

The evaluation team will assess the project concept and design. The evaluation team should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluation team will revise and re-assess the relevance of indicators and targets, review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The MTE will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the MTE is to assess the Project Management Unit's use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The MTE will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. MTE should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation team should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation team will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

Project progress will be measured based on Project Logical Framework (see Annex 1), which provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation will assess the aspects as listed in evaluation report outline attached in Annex 2.

4. DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

The Evaluation Team will look at the following aspects:

1. Project concept/design, relevance and strategy

1.1 Project relevance, country ownership/drivenness (R): the extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time as well as the extent the activities contribute towards attainment of global environmental benefits:

a. Is the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country?
b. Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans?
c. How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results?
d. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective way towards results.
e. Do the outcomes developed during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)? If no, please come up with suggestions and recommendations.

1.2 Preparation and readiness:

a. Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
b. Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
c. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
d. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified?
e. Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

1.3 Stakeholder involvement (R):

a. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project design?
b. Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design of project activities?

1.4 Underlying factors/assumptions:

a. Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.
b. Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made.
c. Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

1.5 Management arrangements (R):

a. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
b. Are the project roles in line with UNDP and GEF programming guidelines?
c. Can the management arrangement model suggested by the project be considered as an optimum model? If no, please come up with suggestions and recommendations.

1.6 Project budget and duration (R):

a. Assess if the project budget and duration were planned in a cost-effective way?

1.7 Design of project M&E system (R):

a. Examine whether or not the project has a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives.
b. Examine whether or not the M&E plan includes a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities.
c. Examine whether or not the timeframe for various M&E activities and standards for outputs are specified.

1.8 Sustainability:

a. Assess if project sustainability strategy was developed during the project design?
b. Assess the relevance of project sustainability strategy

2. Project implementation

2.1 Project's adaptive management (R):

a. Monitoring systems
    - Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
        - Do they provide the necessary information?
        - Do they involve key partners?
        - Are they efficient?
        - Are additional tools required?
    - Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it.
    - What impact did the retrofitting of impact indicators have on project management, if such?

- Assess whether or not M&E system facilitates timely tracking of progress towards project's objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually; tracking tools are finalized properly, the information provided by the M&E system is used to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs.

b. Risk Management
   - Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why.
   - Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

c. Work Planning
   - Assess the use of routinely updated workplans.
   - Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
   - Are work planning processes result-based[1]? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning.

d. Financial management
   - Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. (Cost-effectiveness: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.). Any irregularities must be noted.
   - Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
   - Did promised co-financing materialize (please fill out the co-financing form provided in Annex 2)?

e. Reporting
   - Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management.
   - Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

f. Delays
   - Assess if there were delays in project implementation and what were the reasons.
   - Did the delay affect the achievement of project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

2.2 Stakeholder participation, partnership strategy (R):

a. Assess whether or not and how local stakeholders participate in project decision-making.
b. Does the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation of project activities?
c. Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.
d. Identify opportunities for stronger partnerships.

2.3 Sustainability:

a. Assess the extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end; commitment of the government to support the initiative beyond the project.
b. The evaluators may look at factors such as mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies.

[1] RBM Support documents are available at http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm

The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- *Financial resources:* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
- *Socio-political:* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk 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 the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance:* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental:* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:

- *Likely* (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- *Moderately Likely* (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- *Moderately Unlikely* (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- *Unlikely* (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

3. Project results (outputs, outcomes and objectives)

3.1 Progress towards achievement of intended outputs, outcomes/measurement of change:
Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for SHP development (legal and regulatory frameworks, local capacities for managing and operating the SHPs, producing SHP equipment and results, etc.) to the baseline ones.

The evaluation should, inter alia, look into:

- Adequacy of the level and proposed modes of enforcement of the regulatory, policy and programmatic documents developed within the project for creating of SHP enabling environment;
- Verification of the GHG emissions reduction and the impact the SHPs may have on the GHG emissions reduction;
- Verification of the Government commitment towards contributing to the development of SHPs through the adopted and financed SHP projects within the project implementation period;
- Validation of the adequacy and viability of the approaches applied within the project;

To determine the level of achievement of project outcomes and objectives following three criteria should be assessed:

- *Relevance*: Are the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- *Effectiveness*: Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there are any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such a project.
- *Efficiency*: Is the project cost effective? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

Outcomes should be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency:

- *Highly Satisfactory (HS):* The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Satisfactory (S):* The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Moderately Satisfactory (MS):* The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)*: The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Unsatisfactory (U):* The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):* The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

In addition to a descriptive assessment, **criteria should be rated** using the rating scales as in GEF Evaluation guidelines (**http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Policies-TEguidelines7-31.pdf**). The guidelines use the 6-point satisfaction and 5-point sustainability scales are defined in Table 1.2 and Table 1.3 of Annex 4 respectively. Thus, the Project objective and outcomes are to be rated in accordance with their respective measurable indicators, as well as for each of its components, using a 6-point scale that is defined in Table 1.2. Other aspects of the Project's objective (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact) and sustainability of its outcomes are rated, respectively, according to satisfaction and sustainability scales. Also the Overall Rating of the project should be indicated.

5. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, follow minimum GEF requirements as indicated in Annex 2.

The Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The Report will include a table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing in this project, according the table attached in Annex 3 of this TOR

The Report will be supplemented by Rate Tables, attached in Annex 4 of this TOR.

The length of the mid-term evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

6. EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards. They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The evaluation will take place mainly in the field. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, UNDP CO, Steering Committee, project team, and key stakeholders.

The evaluation team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual Reports, outcome/component level reports, project files, strategic and legal documents. The list of documentation to be reviewed is included in Annex 5 of this Terms of Reference.

The evaluation team is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. S/He is also expected to visit the project sites.

In preparation for the evaluation mission, the project manager, with assistance from UNDP country office, will arrange for the completion of the tracking tool (in currently valid GEF tracking tool template). The Tracking tool will be completed/endorsed by the relevant implementing agency or qualified national research /scientific institution, and not by the international consultant or UNDP staff. The tracking tool will be submitted to the international evaluation consultant, who will need to provide his/her comments on it. Upon incorporation of the comments from the international evaluation consultant to the tracking tool, it will be finalized and attached as mandatory annex to the MTE report.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation reviewed;
- Interviews;
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Although the Evaluation Team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

The Evaluation Team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

7. DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

International Consultant

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and MTE outline (maximum 4-day homework);
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTE report (1 day);
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor (maximum 3 days);
- Field visit to the pilot project site and interviews (2 days);
- Debriefing with UNDP (1 day);
- Development and submission of the first MTE report draft (maximum of 4 days). Submission is due on the 16-th day of the assignment. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the final MTE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (maximum 5 days);
- Supervision of the work of the national consultant (during entire evaluation period).

Required Qualifications:

- Master's degree in Renewable Energy Sources Management, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Economics, Physics or other related areas;
- 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency projects, preferably with components on small hydropower plants development;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating renewable energy related projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project);
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based management policies and procedures;
- Recognized expertise in the renewable energy and energy efficiency and excellent understanding of climate change issues;
- Familiarity with renewable energy and energy efficiency in CIS would be an asset;
- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
- Fluent in English both written and spoken;
- Fluency in Russian will be considered an asset;
- Computer literacy.

National Consultant

Duties and Responsibilities

- Collection of background materials upon request by Evaluation Team Leader/International Consultant;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodologies, work plans and evaluation report outlines;
- Desk review of materials;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders; provide both oral and written translation from/to English/Russian/Tajik, whenever necessary;
- Field visit and assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in developing the first draft of the MTE report;
- Assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in finalization of the Mid-Term Evaluation report.

National Consultant will assist International Consultant with the oral and written translation between English and Russian/Tajik as required. The National Consultant will work closely with the International Consultant and coordinate all activities with the responsible staff of the project, Ministry of Energy and Water Resources, Programme Unit of the UNDP Country Office. Travels are also planned in the due course to the project sites throughout the country.

Required Qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in social sciences or other related filed. Postgraduate degree(s) will be an advantage;
- Minimum 3 years of relevant experience, preferably in the field of renewable energy development;
- Previous experience with the development projects implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Participation in the similar evaluations in the past is a strong advantage;
- Proven analytical skills;
- Good interpersonal, communication, facilitation and presentation skills;
- Fluency in English, Russian and Tajik both written and spoken is essential;
- Computer literacy.

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Tajikistan. UNDP CO will contract the evaluation team. The responsible staff of the project and UNDP will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Team to provide the project documentation, set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government counterparts, etc.

The evaluation will be conducted within the period of **September - October 2014.**

The activity and tentative timeframe are broken down as follows:

Activity	Timing	Estimated duration
Desk review	September 2014	2 days
Briefings for evaluators by UNDP CO and UNDP EEP	Till 29 September 2014	1 day
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings, presentation of main findings	end September – early October	10 days
Drafting of the evaluation report	Within 10 working days after the mission	3 days
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms	Till 25th October 2014	2 days
Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)	Till 30th November 2012	2 days
		20 days

The report (draft and final version) shall be submitted to the UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan.

Prior to approval of the final report, UNDP contact person will circulate the draft for comments to government counterparts and project management: responsible staff of the project, UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan, Ministry of Energy and Water Resources of the Republic of Tajikistan, UNDP/GEF RTA.

UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions **within 10 working days after receiving the draft**.

The finalised Evaluation Report shall be submitted latest on **10 November 2014.**

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

9. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online on www.undp.tj by **30th May 2014, 12:00 CET**

The application should contain current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

Shortlisted candidates will be invited to present a price offer indicating the total cost in USD of the assignment (including the daily fee, per diem and travel costs) preferably according the template attached in Annex 6)

UNDP applies fair and transparent selection process that would 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.

UNDP is a non-smoking work environment.

Due to large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform the unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.

Annex 1. Revised Logical Framework and Project Performance Indicators

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD: Outcome 6: Improved environmental protection, sustainable natural resources management, and increased access to alternative renewable energy.
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: **Key Indicator (1):** Number of alternative renewable technologies demonstrated.
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Mainstreaming Environment and Energy
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: To promote on-grid renewable energy - CC-SP3-RE
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Total avoided GHG emissions from hydropower generation.
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Avoided GHG emissions from hydropower generation (tons CO_2/kWh); and \$/t CO_2.

Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Goal: Reduction of GHG emissions from energy use by rural and remote communities	Avoided GHG emissions from rural communities' energy use by end of project (EOP), ktCO2 Avoided GHG emissions from rural communities' energy use by end of project influence period, 10 years (EOPIP), ktCO2	0 0	45 ktCO2 244 ktCO2	Project Annual reports; GHG emissions monitoring and verification reports, final evaluation	No change in positive Government policies concerning SHP development and utilization
Objective: Significantly accelerate the development of small-scale hydropower (SHP) by removing barriers through enabling legal and regulatory framework, capacity building and developing sustainable delivery	• No. of new small hydropower projects under implementation by EOP • Minimum No. of fully operational SHPs by EOP • Cumulative electricity generation from	• 1 • 0[2] • 0 • 0	• 10[3] • 5 • 2,430 • 6,500	Individual SHP project reports, Performance reports of operational SHPs; Project's annual reports, GHG monitoring and verification reports. Project final evaluation report.	Continued commitment of project partners, including Government agencies and investors/developers

[2] Many SHP constructed in the past are malfunctioning; none connected to the grid and few investments in SHP take place, except for by isolated donor-funded projects
[3] The projects are in various stages of development (assessment , feasibility, construction, operation)

models, thus substantially avoiding the use of conventional biomass and fossil fuels for power and other energy needs.	newly installed SHPs by EOP, MWh/yr • Cumulative electricity generation from newly installed SHPs by EOPIP, MWh/yr •				
Outcomes					
Outcome 1: Adapted and enhanced legislative and regulatory framework for small-scale hydropower development in the country.	• Adopted regulation operationalizing RES Law	No regulations in support of RES Law	Rules and regulations adopted by end of Year 1	Published documents. Government decrees/laws. Project progress reports	Commitment of the various Government institutions to adopt and capacities to enforce required bylaws are in place; Low turn-over of trained government staff
Output 1.1: Formulated, approved and enforced implementing rules and regulations (IRRs) of the new Law for RES that will facilitate actions geared towards the enhancement of the market environment for SHP	• Simplified procedures and principles for the licensing and construction of SHP facilities • • National RE/EE Fund •	• RES Law includes a number of provisions to facilitate investment in grid-connected RE projects, but they are not operationalized	• Procedures adopted by end of Year 1 • • • National RE/EE Fund set-up and is operational by end of Year 2 •	• Published IRRs • Project report documenting the status of IRRs enforcement • Project report on the status of operations of RE and EE Fund • Same as above • Same as above	Commitment of the various Government institutions to adopt and capacities to enforce required bylaws are in place
Output 1.2: Central and local government institutions with enhanced capacities to develop and coordinate SHP projects.	• # staff members from relevant central and local government institutions trained in developing and coordinating SHP	• 0	• 30 staff members trained by the end of Year 2	• Training reports •	Low turn-over of trained central and municipal staff is ensured

	projects				
Outcome 2: Enhanced technical and planning know-how and developed market chain for SHP in Tajikistan	• % of the total SHP installed cost provided by locally made goods and services	• 5-10%	• 50% by the end of Year 4	• Project report on SHP market chain development	Potential market chain actors are interested in SHP projects Demand for SHP is on the rise as a result of establishing favorable policy framework
Output 2.1: Guidebook on technical and policy aspects of SHP project development (to be used in all trainings to be delivered by the project)	• Guidebook on SHP project development	• 0	• Guidebook on SHP project development prepared and disseminated by the end of Year 1	• Published capacity needs assessment • Training reports • Same as above • Same as above • Same as above	• Commitment of partners to release staff for training program is in place • Commitment of universities and technical school to introduce new curricula is in place
Output 2.2: Local workshops and manufacturers with enhanced capacities to install, construct, manufacture and repair SHP system equipment and components	• Technology transfer and capacity development plan prepared for selected local manufacturers •	• 0 • 0	• 2 technology transfer and capacity development plan prepared by the end of Year 1	• Project report on SHP market chain development	• Interest of potential SHP market chain actors in provided capacity building and technology transfer is insured
Output 2.3: Vocational training program for technicians involved in	• # of technicians annually undertaking	• 0	• 20 technicians annually undertaking	• Training report	• Interest of local education institutions

SHP design/construction and O&M	vocational training on SHP		vocational training on SHP starting from Year 2		
Output 2.4: Local manufacturers capable of producing combined electric and biomass-fired heating and cooking devices for rural households	• # of local craft workshops capable of manufacturing and assemblage of simple, efficient and low-cost electric heating and cooking devices	• 0	• At least 1 local craft workshops by the end of Year 3[4]	• Project report	•
Outcome 3: Improved confidence on the technical and economic viability of integrated SHP-based rural development model	• No. of SHP demos/pilots incorporating aspects of productive uses and livelihood support for host communities •	• 0 • •	• At least 5 community-owned SHP projects operate on a sustainable basis and at least 5 additional are under construction by the end of Year 4 •	Reports on pilot SHPs operations	Availability of local people with sufficient technical education and managerial experience Participation of local level government
Output 3.1: Technical studies, political commitments and institutional framework secured for pilot SHP projects	• Feasibility studies • No. of integrated district development plans (IDDPs)	• • 0 • 0	• • FS for 2 sites by end of Year 1, 3 sites - by end of Year 2, 5 sites - by end of Year 3 • IDDP for 2 districts by end of Year 2, 3 districts - by end of Year 3 • • At least 5 further SHP projects identified and	Report on implementation of pilot SHP projects Integrated District Development Plans	Same as above

[4] Depending on the results of market and feasibility analysis the workshop may or may not be created. The Chinese goods are highly competitive in the local markets.

	• No. of SHP projects in the pipe-line	• 0	construction started (without direct project support)		
Output 3.2: Operational SHP demos/pilots in selected communities , demonstrating the viability of the technology and O&M&M models	• • No. of operational demo/pilot SHP plants by EOP ○	• • 0 •	• 5 •	Report on implementation of pilot SHP projects	Same as above
Output 3.3: Pilot SHP operations sustained	• No. of PPAs signed for purchase of power from pilot SHP plants by EOP • No. of local business supported in pilot localities •	• 0 • 0 • 0 •	• At least 2 by the end of Year 3 • 5 by the end of Year 4 •	Report on implementation of pilot SHP projects	Same as above
Outcome 4: National Scaling-up Programme of Renewable Energy-based Integrated Rural Development	• Adopted and financed National Scaling-up Program	N/a	• Adopted and financed National Scaling-up Program by the end of Year 4	• Officially approved and published national scaling up plan	• Data on project impacts and results properly documented and made available to consultants

Output 4.1: Project results assessed, analyzed and compiled into comprehensive national report	• Project results and Lessons learnt report •	• N/a	• Project results and Lessons learnt report prepared by end of Year 4	• Project results and Lessons learnt report • Project report on GHG emission reduction monitoring	Data on project impacts and results properly documented and made available to consultants
Output 4.2: Conference on integrated renewable-energy based rural development organized	• Conference on integrated renewable-energy based rural development	• N/a	• Conference on integrated renewable-energy based rural development organized by the end of Year 4	• Conference report	Data on project impacts and results properly documented and made available to consultants
Output 4.3 Approved and funded proposal for national scaling up of the SHP demos/pilots	• Annual amount of governmental incentives allocated to support investment in new SHP plants under the scale-up plan by EOP, US$	• N/a	• 3,500,000 US$	• Officially approved and published national scaling up plan	Government commitment to promote SHP development and utilization is sustained

Annex 2. Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

(Designed for adaptation to specific project circumstances.)

Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context

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

Findings and Conclusions

- Project formulation
    - Implementation approach
    - Country ownership/Driveness
    - Stakeholder participation
    - Replication approach
    - Cost-effectiveness
    - UNDP comparative advantage
    - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
    - Indicators
    - Management arrangements

- Implementation
    - Financial Planning
    - Monitoring and evaluation
    - Execution and implementation modalities
    - Management by the UNDP country office
    - Coordination and operational issues

- Results
    - Attainment of objectives
    - Sustainability
    - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations

- 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

Lessons learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

- TOR (without annexes)
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing and Leveraged Resources (see Table 1 attached)
- Project results framework
- Mid-term tracking tool (reviewed by evaluator with his/her comments addressed and incorporated)
- Rating tables

Annex 3. Co-financing Table

Co financing (Type/ Source)	IA own Financing (mill US$)		Government (mill US$)		Other Sources* (mill US$)		Total Financing (mill US$)		Total Disbursement (mill US$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Loans										
Equity										
In-kind										
Non-grant Instruments *										
Other Types										
TOTAL										

- Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.

- "Proposed" co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.

- Describe "Non-grant Instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):
    - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash/purpose*.

- Explain "Other Sources of Co-financing":
    - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash*

Annex 4. Application of GEF minimum evaluation requirements. Rate tables.

Table 1.1 Application of GEF minimum evaluation requirements[5,6]

Minimum evaluation requirement	Dimension of evaluation	Basis of evaluation
Achievement of Project objective	▪ Outcomes	Level of satisfaction
	▪ Outputs	
Sustainability of Project outcomes	▪ Financial risks	Likelihood of risk
	▪ Socio-political risks	
	▪ Institutional framework/governance risks	
	▪ Environmental risks	
Monitoring & evaluation system	▪ Design of system	Level of satisfaction
	▪ Application of system	

Satisfaction scale: **H**ighly **S**atisfactory, **S**atisfactory, **M**oderately **S**atisfactory, **M**oderately **U**nsatisfactory, **U**nsatisfactory, **H**ighly **U**nsatisfactory

Sustainability scale: **L**ikely, **M**oderately **L**ikely, **M**oderately **U**nlikely, **U**nlikely, **H**ighly **U**nlikely

Table 1.2 Definitions of levels of satisfaction (GEF, 2008 *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations*)

Rating	Definition
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The project had **no shortcomings** in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
Satisfactory (S)	The project had **minor shortcomings** in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The project had **moderate shortcomings** in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The project had **significant shortcomings** in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The project had **major shortcomings** in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project had **severe shortcomings** in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

Sustainability of the Project's results requires rating according to the likelihood of outcomes being sustainable at the Project's termination, based on a 4-point scale that is defined in **Table 1.3**. Evaluations are based on testing progress and achievements against five major criteria

[5] *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*, 2006
[6] *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations,* 2008

(relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability, as appropriate), in accordance with GEF requirements.

Table 1.3 Definitions of levels of risk to sustainability of Project outcomes (*UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF-Financed Projects* GEF, 2012)

Rating	Definition
Likely (L)	**Negligible risks** to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future.
Moderately Likely (ML)	**Moderate risks**, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained.
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	**Substantial risk** that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.
Unlikely (U)	**Severe risk** that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained.
Highly Unlikely (HU)*	Expectation that **few if any** outputs or activities will continue after project closure.
Not Applicable (N/A)	
Unable to Assess (U/A)	

*Originally, only 4 levels of risk were used to rate sustainability (GEF, 2008) but this fifth level has been introduced recently (UNDP, 2012).

Table 1.4: Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY *	RATING **
Objective :				
OUTCOMES		**END-OF-PROJECT TARGET**	**STATUS OF DELIVERY**	**RATING**
Outcome 1:				
Outcome 2:				
Outcome 3:	-			
Outcome 4:				
Outcome 5:				

* *Status of delivery colouring codes:*
Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project
Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

** Rating:
Highly Satisfactory = HS
Satisfactory = S
Moderately Satisfactory = MS
Moderately Unsatisfactory = MU
Unsatisfactory = U
Highly Unsatisfactory = HU

Table 1.5: Project Rating

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE						RATING
	HU	U	MU	MS	S	HS	
PROJECT FORMULATION							
Conceptualization/Design							
Stakeholder participation							
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION							
Implementation Approach							
The use of the logical framework							
Adaptive management							
Use/establishment of information technologies							
Operational relationships between the institutions involved							
Technical capacities							
Monitoring and evaluation							
Stakeholder participation							
Production and dissemination of information							
Local resource users and NGOs participation							
Establishment of partnerships							
Involvement and support of governmental institutions							
PROJECT RESULTS							
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives							
Achievement of objective							
Outcome 1							
Outcome 2							
Outcome 3							
Outcome 4							
Outcome 5							
Outcome 6							
Outcome 7							
OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT							

Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators

The following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project:

Document	Description
Project document	Project Document
Project reports	Inception Report Annual work plans Steering committee meeting minutes Relevant tracking tools
Annual Project Report to GEF	PIR 2013
Other relevant materials:	Project key document outputs

Annex 6. Cost breakdown template

	Units*	Rate / USD	Total / USD
Work in home office			
Desk review			
Briefings by UNDP and PM			
Drafting of the evaluation report			
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms			
Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)			
Work on mission			
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings			
Sub-total fee			
Travel costs			
International travel to and from Tajikistan			
Local travel (to be arranged and covered by the project)	n/a	n/a	n/a
DSA (overnights)			
Sub-total travel costs			
TOTAL			

* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.

Annex 7. GEF terminology and project review criteria

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:
- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:
- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:
- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consist of three related, and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

<u>Information dissemination</u>
- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy**.**
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector**.**
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives**.**
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) **.**
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)**.**
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities**.**
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing[7].
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co-financing includes: grants, loans/concessional (compared to market rate), credits, equity investments, in-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Monitoring & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the

[7] Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.