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**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

**Terms of Reference**

**for TERMINAL Evaluation:**

**Project Title**: “Small Hydro Power Development”

**Functional Title:** International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

**Duration:** Estimated 20 working days during November-December 2015, including field mission to Kyrgyzstan

**Terms of Payment:** Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report

**Duty station:** Home based with a week mission to Bishkek(5 working days)

**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of “Small Hydro Power Development” Project (PIMS #3134).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | ” Small Hydro Power Development” | | | | |
| GEF Project ID:  UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS): | | #3931  #3134 |  | at endorsement (Million US$) | at completion (Million US$) |
| Atlas award ID:  Atlas project ID: | | 00059088  00073756 | GEF financing: | 0.950 | *0.827 (TBC)* |
| Country: | | Kyrgyzstan | IA/EA own: | 0.100 | 0.100 |
| Region: | | ECIS | Government:  In-kind support | 0.800 | 0.800 |
| Focal Area: | | Climate change | Other: | 20.480 | *23.862 (TBC)* |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | To promote on-grid renewable energy -CC-SP3-RE | Total co-financing: | 21.380 | *24.762 (TBC)* |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Energy and Industry of the Kyrgyz Republic | Total Project Cost: | 22.330 | *25.589 (TBC)* |
| Other Partners involved: | | The Ministry of Energy and Industry of the Kyrgyz Republic and the State Agency for  Environment Protection and Forestry under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 29 January 2010 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:   31 December 2013 | Actual:   31 December 2015 |

Objective and Scope

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects, in the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf> and guidelines for conducting evaluations: www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905; as well as the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm.

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.

The project is designed to produce five components:

Component 1: To formulate a streamlined and comprehensive market-oriented energy policy and legal/regulatory framework for small hydropower development in the country. The expected outputs under this component are:

* Adoption and implementation of new policies streamlining land tenure and water use rights for small hydro power developers;
* Revision of the Law on Renewable Energy to define/redefine role of the Ministry of Energy and its Directorate for Small and Medium-scale Power Projects in the Kyrgyz Republic (DSMP).
* Procedures for the introduction of competition in the award of sites/concessions for development.
* Standard PPA to facilitate DSMP negotiations with IPPs.
* One-stop shop for issuance of construction licenses and permits to developers.

Component 2: To develop capacity within DSMP to effectively address institutional issues and to evaluate the economic and financial viability of small hydropower projects, especially within the context of a least cost planning approach and to build capacity within the Ministry’s RE Unit to monitor and enforce regulations related to SHP. The expected outputs are:

* Suitable methodology for the economic/financial evaluation of small hydropower plants.
* Standard financial evaluation methodology for calculating SHP tariffs to be paid to IPPs and the tariffs to be charged to consumers, taking account the operating and investment recovery costs of project developers.
* Incentives to be provided to project developers such as reduction/elimination of import duties/taxes on equipment, income tax holiday for a specific duration, simplification of foreign exchange regulations, making it a requirement for distribution companies to purchase all electricity generated by SHP, establishing a portfolio to be eventually occupied by SHP in the electricity generation mix (a sort of SHP generation target), grant of longer-term generation licenses valid for 40-50 years (rather than 25-30 years), simplifying EIA procedures for SHP, building or participating in building access roads to SHP sites ear-marked for development. All these will be operationalized by the Ministry of Energy in consultation with other Government Departments.
* In addition, the project will explore possibilities for introduction of such risk mitigation instruments as hydropower energy production guarantee (in case power production targets are not met by developers) or insurance package to safeguard developer in case of non-payment for electricity already supplied. These instruments will be proposed following detailed assessment of risk profile of the pilot projects and discussions among the Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Finance, investors and finance/insurance entities, with the latter entrusted with responsibility to operationalize and manage the scheme. No GEF funds are to be used to capitalize or cover the additional costs of the guarantees.
* Develop and validate power sector baseline study and GHG emission factor for Kyrgyzstan power grid to facilitate and reduce costs of SHP project development under CDM mechanism. Prepare PDD, conduct validation, and facilitate national approval, registration and signature of the Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement (ERPA) for the first CDM project activity in Kyrgyzstan, i.e. the bundle of SHP projects for a total of 200 MW. The list of SHP projects for inclusion in CDM package is currently being discussed with the Directorate and potential investors; it will not include the pilot SHP projects (20 MW) to be supported via the proposed GEF grant in order to avoid any potential double counting of the resulting GHG emission reductions.
* Capacity developed within the Ministry’s RE Unit to monitor and enforce regulations related to SHP.

Component 3: To develop capacity within DSMP/country to assess hydrological resources, design, evaluate and implement projects, and provide maintenance and repair services. The expected outputs are:

* Programme for updating the 30-year old hydrological data.
* Guidelines and technical standards for small hydropower development.
* Capacity within DSMP to design, evaluate and implement projects.
* Local capacity for maintenance and repair services.

Component 4: To prepare full feasibility and technical design studies for the 5 small hydropower sites listed in Table 1 below (this is a preliminary list that may be subject to change on the basis of initial studies by Cotec and Seloga as per their respective framework agreements with the Government), followed by construction of the power stations. The expected outputs are:

* Reports on feasibility and design studies.
* Reports on financial closure with identified investors.
* Report on completion of construction of the 5 hydropower stations.

Component 5: To formulate an outreach programme and document/disseminate project experience/best practices/lessons learned for replication throughout the country. The expected outputs are:

* Plan to implement outreach/promotional activities targeting domestic and foreign investors.
* Capacity development of DSMP to monitor and document project experience.
* Published materials on project experience/best practices and lessons learned/website.

**The Project has five primary outcomes summarized below:**

Component 1: Amendments to the Kyrgyz Republic laws streamlining land tenure and water use rights to small hydropower developers are made. Government Resolutions №501 as of July 15, 2015 and №507 as of July 20, 2015 are adopted. “Concept of development of small hydropower in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2015-2017”, “Standard PPA agreement for SHP investors”, “Rules on technological connection to the power grid and assessment methodology for calculation of fee on technological connection”, “Regulation on land tenure procedure” and “Regulation on water use agreements” are developed.

Component 2: The methodology of financial mechanism for calculating small hydropower tariffs adopted by the State Agency for Fuel and Energy Complex Regulation. Changes to the law "On renewable energy sources” developed in 2012 on financial and other incentives and guarantees to purchase small hydropower plant generated electricity adopted by the Parliament. EIA for small hydropower plant on the river Chandalash (6.8 mW) was developed and delivered to the investor.

Component 3: SHP database with more than 60 economically perspective sites is developed. GIS-maps including finalized SHP database with economically perspective sites are updated.

Component 4: Feasibility studies for Karakol SHP (1,6 mW) and LLC Ibragimov SHP (0,6 MW) on the river Beles are conducted. Technical design studies for the reconstruction of hydraulic structures at Kalinin SHP (1,4 mW), Ken-Suu SHP (70 kW) and Tor-Kul SHP (70 kW) are conducted.

Component 5: Republican conference “On the development of small hydropower plants” with more than 100 participants including Deputy Prime Minister, ministers, government officials, donors (foundations and banks), local investors and NGO is organized. Agency on Renewable Energy Sources development and Energy efficiency and a Small Hydropower Plants Association are created. Two guidebooks on designing and equipping SHPs are published and distributed to leading universities and libraries. Website on the latest developments in renewable energy (www.greenenergy.kg) is launched and handed over to the relevant NGO.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have been 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 (*see* [*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. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Key stakeholders:

* Ministry of Energy and Industry of the KR;
* State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry& GEF Focal Point;
* State Agency for Fuel and Energy Complex Regulation
* Directorate for Small and Medium-scale Power Projects in the Kyrgyz Republic
* UNDP Country Office;
* UNDP “Environment for Sustainable Development” Programme;
* UNDP/UNEP “Poverty & Environment Initiative” Project
* Project team;
* UNFCCC FP
* UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, Istanbul Regional Hub;
* Karakol Energy
* Chandalash Energy
* Kalininskaya SHP
* Ibragimova LLC
* Inkraft CJSC

**Other stakeholders:**

* «Energy» The Kyrgyz Scientific and Technical Center
* Renewable Energy Association
* Small Hydropower Plants Association
* BIOM

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF CCM 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.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

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

Project finance / cofinance

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 0.950 | 0.827  (TBC) |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.827  (TBC) |
| IA/EA own | 0.100 | 0.100 |  |  |  |  | 0.100 | 0.100 |
| * In-kind support |  |  | 0,800 | 0.800 |  |  | 0.800 | 0.800 |
| * Other |  |  |  |  | 20.480 | 23.862  (TBC) | 20.480 | 23.862 (TBC) |
| Totals | 1.050 |  | 0.800 | 0 | 20.480 |  | 22.330 | 25.589  (TBC) |

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 Kyrgyzstan*.* 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 20 days according to the following indicative plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing (indicative) | Completion Date (indicative) |
| **Preparation (desk review)** | *3* days (November, 2015) | *November 2015* |
| **Evaluation Mission (in-country field visits, interviews)** | *5* days (November, 2015) | *November 2015* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *6* days (November, 2015) | *November 2015* |
| **Final Report** | *6* days (November, 2015) | *November 2015* |

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 1 week before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and Project |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | Last day of the field mission (Friday) | Project Team, UNDP CO and key stakeholders, members of Project Board |
| **Draft Final Report** | Draft evaluation report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within a week time after the field mission | Project team, CO, reviewed by RTA, GEF OFP |
| **Final Report\*** | Final report addressing and integrating feedback and comments | Within a week time after receiving comments on the 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.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international evaluator.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international Consultant will bear responsibility over submission of a final report. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

**International evaluator** must present the following qualifications:

* Master degree or equivalent in natural sciences;
* Minimum 10-years of professional experience in the field of renewable energy;
* At least three years of proven track record of application of results-based monitoring approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on in environment/ climate change/Small Hydro Power (relevant experience in the CIS region and within UN system would be an asset);
* Familiarity with priorities and basic principles of renewable energy and relevant international best-practices;
* Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures;
* Excellent English communication skills,
* Good Russian communication skills.

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

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *100%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[3]](#footnote-3) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[4]](#footnote-4));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page);
4. **Financial Proposal** Contracts based on Lump-Sum, that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem and etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Currency of Offer: United States Dollars (US$)

All application materials should be submitted to the e-mail address (procurement@pmu.undp.kg) with indicating the following reference “Terminal Evaluation Consultant for UNDP-GEF Project on Small Hydro Power Development in Kyrgyzstan” This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by ***13 November 2015, 12.00 pm of GMT+6.*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Statement of Medical Fitness for Work.**

Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 62 years of age are required, at their own cost, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from an UN - approved doctor prior to taking up their assignment.

Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.

**Inoculations/Vaccinations.**

Individual Consultants/Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal.

**Security Clearance.**

The Consultant should undertake the Basic Security in the Field (BSIF) training and Advanced Security in the Field (ASIF) tests prior to travelling. These requirements apply for all Consultants, attracted individually or through the Employer.

EVALUATION PROCESS

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:**

The offer giving the best value for money should be selected.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Title:**  ***Small Hydro Power Development*** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Objective** |  |  |  |  |  |
| To assist the Government in addressing the barriers to significantly increase grid-connected small hydropower capacity. | 285,140 MWh of electricity generated by project completion and 250,000 tons of CO2 avoided. | GHG in the electricity generation sector scheduled to increase from 1.75 million tons/year to almost 3 million tons/year by the year 2020.  Negligible investments taking place in the grid-connected small hydropower sector. | Investment in at least 5 small hydropower sites by end of project.  Reduction of 250,000 tons of CO2 over the 4-year MSP project life cycle. | Project’s annual reports, GHG monitoring and verification reports.  Project final evaluation report. | Continued commitment of project partners, including Government agencies and investors/developers. |
| **Outcomes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** Streamlined and comprehensive market-oriented energy policy and legal/regulatory framework for small hydropower development. | Framework finalized and available for consultation by potential investors. | None available at the present time. | To be completed within 6 months of project initiation and approved by Government by the end of year 1. | Published documents. Government decrees/laws. | Commitment of the various Government institutions. |
| **Output 1.1:** Report streamlining land tenure, water use rights and review of Law on Renewable Energy to define/redefine role of DSMP. | Report confirming that policy and framework arrangements are in place. | Overlapping responsibilities of various Government institutions make the decision process very complicated. | To be completed within 6 months of project initiation and approved by the Government by the end of year 1. | Published documents. | Commitment of the various Government institutions. |
| **Output 1.2:** Procedures for the introduction of competition in the award of sites/concessions for development. | Guidelines available. | Not available at the present time. | To be completed within 6 months of project initiation and approved by the Government by the end of year 1.  Competitive bidding for sites/concession areas completed by the end of 1.5 years after project start. | Published documents.  Signed agreements. | Commitment of the various Government institutions and project developers. |
| **Output 1.3:** Standard PPA to facilitate DSMP negotiations with IPPs. | Document available. | Not available at the present time. | To be completed within 6 months of project initiation and approved by the Government by the end of year 1.  All PPAs for 20 MW of capacity signed by the end of 1.5 years after project start. | Published documents.  Signed agreements. | Continued investor interest. |
| **Output 1.4:** One-stop shop for issuance of construction licenses and permits to developers. | One-stop shop is operational.  Information brochure and website are available. | Under the business-as-usual scenario, the average time to secure all required construction licenses and permits are 13 months. | All construction licenses and permits are issued within 4-6 months. | Signed documents. | Continued investor interest. |
| **Outcome 2:** Capacity available within DSMP to evaluate the economic and financial viability of small hydropower projects and within the Ministry’s RE Unit to monitor and enforce regulations related to SHP. | Number of DSMP/Ministry staff who participated in and successfully completed capacity development programme. | None available at the present time. | 5 projects evaluated by Government staff by the end of year 1.  Six Government staff trained during first 6 months of project. | Training modules/number of staff trained.  Project report. | Concerned institutions willing to release staff for training. |
| **Output 2.1:** Suitable methodology for the economic/financial evaluation of small hydropower plants. | Methodologies applied by DSMP | Not available at the present time. | To be completed within 6 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter. | Project report. | Cooperation of Government entities and staff. |
| **Output 2.2:** Standard financial evaluation methodology for calculating small hydropower tariffs to be paid to IPPs/to be charged to consumers. | Methodologies applied by DSMP | No such evaluation methodology available. | To be completed within 6 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter. | Project documentation. | Cooperation of Government entities and staff. |
| **Output 2.3:** Financial and other incentives to be provided to project developers. | Document available. | Not comprehensive document available at the present time. | To be completed within 6 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter. | Project documentation. | Cooperation of Government entities. |
| **Output 2.4:** Guarantee and risk mitigation instruments that facilitate IPP investment. | Instruments developed. | No such instruments available at the present time. | Instruments designed in year 1 and applied to IPP investments by year 2. | Project reports. | Lending institutions ready to come on board. |
| **Output 2.5**: PIN and PDD to pursue options under CDM. | CDM projects registered. | None available to date. | To be completed by the end of year 2. | Project documentation. | Cooperation of Government entities. |
| **Output 2.6:** Capacity developed within the Ministry’s RE Unit to monitor and enforce regulations related to SHP. | Number of Ministry staff successfully trained. | None available at the present time. | Five to Six Government staff trained during first 6 months of project. | Number of staff trained.  Project report. | Cooperation of Ministry and staff. |
| **Outcome 3:** Capacity available to assess hydrological resources, design, evaluate and implement projects, and provide maintenance and repair services. | Teams trained in various categories of activities.  Technical assessment of projects.  Guidelines for maintenance, repair and modular SHP design. | No such activity being implemented. | 5 projects technically assessed in year 1.  Manual for operations & maintenance developed in year 1, O&M procedures applied in at least 5 sites by end of project.  40 people trained in the various categories by the end of the project. | Project reports. |  |
| **Output 3.1:** Programme for updating the 30-year old hydrological data. | Instrumentation to measure river flow installed.  Software developed for interpretation of data. | Hydrological data presently available date back to the 1970s. | Update of 5 sites (in addition to the 5 targeted for development) completed by the end of project. | Project documentation. | Cooperation of concerned Government institutions. |
| **Output 3.2:** Guidelines and technical standards for small hydropower development. | Published guidelines. | Not presently available. | Completed within first 6 months of project. Applied in 5 project development sites. | Project reports. | Participation of Government institutions in drafting guidelines. |
| **Output 3.3:** Capacity developed within DSMP to design, evaluate and implement projects. | Capacity development material available. | Not presently available. | Six DSMP staff trained during first 6 months of project. | Project documentation. | Participation of Government entities in training programme. |
| **Output 3.4:** Local capacity for maintenance and repair services. | Availability of qualified and certified companies for maintenance and repair services. | None available now. | 30 people trained by the end of the project. | Project reports. | Availability of people with basic technical education. |
| **Outcome 4:** Full feasibility and technical design studies for 5 small hydropower sites followed by construction of power stations. | Feasibility reports. | Not presently available. | Construction of 5 small hydropower stations completed by the end of the project. | Site visits to power stations.  Project reports. | Commitment and participation of Government institutions and project developers. |
| **Output 4.1:** Reports on feasibility and design studies. | Reports available. | Non-existent at the present time. | Completed within 9 months of project start. | Project documentation. | All data made available to consultants. |
| **Output 4.2:** Reports on financial closure with identified investors. | Reports available. | Not presently available. | Completed within 12 months of project start. | Project reports. | Complete socio-economic survey of targeted population is undertaken. |
| **Output 4.3:** Report on completion of construction of the 5 hydropower stations. | Completion report. | No construction is being undertaken. | Five small hydropower stations constructed by the end of project.  130.5 GWh of electricity generated annually at project end. | Site visits and project reports. | Supportive institutional, legal and regulatory framework. |
| **Outcome 5:** Outreach programme and dissemination of project experience/best practices/lessons learned for replication throughout the country. | Outreach programme formulated. Project experience compiled, analyzed and disseminated. | Lack of sufficient information to pursue programme. | 8-10 projects initiated in other areas of Kyrgyzstan within 3 years of MSP completion. | Project final report and web site. | Growth of programme will be sustained. |
| **Output 5.1:** Plan to implement outreach/promotional activities targeting domestic and foreign investors. | Plan available. | No such plan available. | Completed within 6 months of project initiation. | Project documentation. |  |
| **Output 5.2:** Capacity development of DSMP to monitor and document project experience. | Capacity development material prepared. | No capacity development programme. | 10 Government staff of trained by the end of project. | Project reports. | Appointment of staff by Government. |
| **Output 5.3:** Published materials on project experience/best practices and lessons learned. | Project experience and best practices compiled, published and available on website. | Lack of information on best practices and lessons learned. | Completed within 3 months of project end. | Project documentation and web site. |  |

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

**General documentation**

* UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);
* UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;
* GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations.

**Project documentation**

* Project document;
* Annual Work Plans;
* Annual Project Reports;
* Project Implementation Reviews;
* GEF Operational Quarterly Reports;
* Midterm Evaluation Report (MTE);
* Management response to MTE;
* Inception report;
* Project Board Meeting minutes;

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **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, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

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 shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. 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 risks  1. 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[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**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[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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 * Co-financing table |

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. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Moderately Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Guidelines for conducting Terminal evaluations: http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)