

Terminal Evaluation Terms of reference



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Title: Terminal Evaluation Lead Consultant for Wind Hybrid Power Generation Market Development Initiative Project (International)

Project Name: Wind Hybrid Power Generation Market Development Initiative (WHyPGen)

Reports to: Programme Manager of Environment Unit

Duty Station: Home based

Expected Places of Travel (if applicable): Bali and Yogyakarta Provinces

Duration of Assignment: May 2016 – June 2016 (30 working days)

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS FROM HIRING UNIT

8 - Senior Specialist	CONFIRMATION OF CATEGORY OF LOCAL CONSULTANT , please select :
	(1) Junior Consultant
	(2) Support Consultant
	(3) Support Specialist
	(4) Senior Specialist
	(5) Expert/ Advisor
	CATEGORY OF INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT , please select :
	(6) Junior Specialist
(7) Specialist	
(8) Senior Specialist	
X	APPROVED e-requisition

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION FROM CONSULTANT

X	CV
X	Copy of education certificate
X	Completed financial proposal
X	Completed technical proposal

Need for presence of IC consultant in office:

☒ intermittent (deliverables-based)

☐ full time/office based (needs justification from the Requesting Unit)

Provision of Support Services:

Office space: Yes ☒ No

Equipment (laptop, etc.): Yes ☒ No

Secretarial Services Yes ☒ No

If yes has been checked, indicate here who will be responsible for providing the support services:

Signature of the Budget Owner: Verania Andria <verania.andria@undp.org>

I. BACKGROUND

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 Wind Hybrid Power Generation Market Development Initiative Project (PIMS 4223).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Wind Hybrid Power Generation Market Development Initiative Project			
GEF Project ID:	3953		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4223 Atlas ID 76672	GEF financing:	2,156,200	
Country:	Indonesia	IA/EA own:	150,000	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:	20,834,600	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	16,500,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	37,484,600	
Executing Agency:		Total Project Cost:	39,640,800	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		2 August 2012
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:

Wind Hybrid Power Generation Market Development Initiative (WHyPGen) project is a 4 years nationally implemented project with USD 2,156,000 funding support from Global Environment Facility (GEF) through UNDP since 2012. The Center for Energy Conservation Technology (B2TKE) at the Agency for Technology Assessment and Application (BPPT) is the project implementing partner. The WHyPGen project aims to promote the adoption of Wind Hybrid Power Generation (WHyPGen) technology through the facilitation of commercial on-grid WHyPGen systems for on-grid power supply within the Indonesian market, and when and where possible pass on the replication to the electricity markets in other countries such as those in the ASEAN region. It focuses on promotion, development and facilitation for the commercialization of cost-effective grid-connected wind hybrid power generation. The project is comprised of several barrier removal activities which would substantially reduce any risk in the adoption of WHyPGen technology.

Ministry of Energy & Mineral Resources estimates a total potential of 448 MW of wind power generation in areas with best wind conditions such as in the south coastal areas of South Sulawesi and Nusa Tenggara. Previous studies by the US National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) shows excellent potential for wind power generation in the country at areas near 9o to 10o S latitude. Wind speeds in these areas range from 6.3 – 10.1 m/s and a stand-alone wind power density of 300 – 1,000 W/m² at 30 m altitude. The ASEAN Center for Energy estimates this at 480 MW for 3 – 5 m/s wind speeds. Despite of high wind power potential, the electricity generation in Indonesia is highly depending on fossil fuel.

In order to remove the barriers to the sustainable investment of wind power generation, the WHyPGen project (2012-2016) implement six Component Activities:

1. WHyPGen technology Application Assessment
2. WHyPGen Technology Demonstration
3. Financing WHyPGen Initiatives
4. Policy and Institutional Support for WHyPGen initiatives
5. WHyPGen Promotion
6. WHyPGen Market Development and Industry support

In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on Terminal Evaluation (TE), a Lead International Consultant will be recruited to conduct Terminal Evaluation for SPARC project. The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

II. SCOPE OF WORK, ACTIVITIES, AND DELIVERABLES

Scope of Work

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

- a) **Evaluation criteria and ratings:** An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluator 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 can be seen in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. Implementing Agency (IA) & Executing Agency (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:	

- b) **Provide evidence based information** that is credible, reliable and useful. 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 focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.
- c) **Project Finance/Co-finance:** The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator will receive assistance from the Country Office 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								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

- d) **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.
- e) **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.¹
- f) **Conclusion, recommendations & lessons:** the evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.
- g) **Implementation Arrangements:** The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Indonesia. 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.
- h) **Visit WHyPGen project locations** in Nusa Penida (Bali Provinces) and Baron Technology Park (Yogyakarta Provinces).
- i) **Application of a collaborative and participatory approach**² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Expected Deliverables

Deliverables/ Outputs	Target Due Dates	Review and Approval Required
Inception Report	18 May 2016 (4 days)	

¹ 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](#)

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

TE evaluator clarifies objectives, methods and timeframe of Terminal Evaluation		UNDP Country Office Indonesia, Programme Manager and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor
Presentation of initial findings Based on field mission, meetings and interviews	06 June 2016 (10 days)	
Final Report* Based on revised Draft report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have been addressed.	30 June 2016 (16 days)	

*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.

III. WORKING ARRANGEMENTS
<p>Institutional Arrangement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The principal responsibility for managing this TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is <i>UNDP Indonesia</i>. The commissioning unit will contract the consultant(s) and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE evaluator. The WHyPGen Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant administrative and financial support to provide documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits as required for the completion of the work. The expected frequency of the reporting is as stated in the Expected Deliverables mentioned-above. <p>Duration of the Work</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The duration of work is 30 days from May to June 2016. The expected starting date is 13th May 2016 with expectation of completion on 30th June 2016. The unforeseen delay will be further discussed by UNDP as basis for possible extension. The feedback from UNDP and government partners to the submitted report can be expected within 10 working days from the date of submission. <p>Duty Station</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The contractor’s duty station will be home-based with possibility of travel to Jakarta, Bali and Yogyakarta province during field visit to project sites. The consultant is working on the output-based, thus no necessity to report or present regularly. <p>Travel Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The return travel cost from country of origin to Jakarta is to be included in the financial proposal. Travel cost (ticket and daily allowance) to project sites in Bali and Yogyakarta will be covered by the project separately from the contract, based on agreed plan and following UNDP’s standard. The duration of field mission to project sites will be 10 days.

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS
<p><u>Academic Qualifications:</u></p> <p>A Master’s degree in engineering, environmental science, social science, economics</p> <p><u>Years of experience:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 15 years; Experience working in renewable energy projects and in Asia Pacific countries would be an advantage but not mandatory; Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations would be an advantage but not mandatory;

III. Competencies and special skills requirement:

- Competence in renewable energy projects management/application.
- Demonstrate understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrate analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

V. EVALUATION METHOD AND CRITERIA

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

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

* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

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

Criteria	Weight	Maximum Point
<u>Technical</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria A: qualification requirements as per TOR: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Master's degree in engineering, environmental science, social science, economics. 2. Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 15 years; 3. Experience working in renewable energy projects in Asia Pacific countries 4. Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies and experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations, an advantage but not mandatory 5. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; 	40%	10 10 10 5 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria B: Brief Description of Approach to Assignment <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understands the task and applies a methodology appropriate for the task? 2. Important aspects of the task addressed clearly and in sufficient detail? 3. Is planning logical, realistic for efficient project implementation? 	60%	25 20 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria C: Further Assessment by Interview (if any) 	N/A	

VI. 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'](#)

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Indicators (as in PIR; see Box 2 with <i>baseline situation, end-of-project targets</i> and <i>mid-term status</i>)	Alternative list of indicators	Baseline (mid 2011)	EoP target (mid 2016)
Project objective	Project objective		
1. Installed capacity of WHyPGen facilities (0, <u>9.4 MW</u> , 0.735 MW) 2. Total electricity generation from installed WHyPGen facilities (1.35; <u>19.27 GWh/yr</u> , 0) 3. Total WHyPGen capacity planned (0, <u>100 MW</u> , 452.2 MW)	1. Installed wind power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of projects (based on Indicators 11 and 12) Capacity (MW) Electricity generation (GWh/yr) Direct emission reduction (ktCO₂/yr) 	Installed/under construction: - 1 - 0.734 MW - 1.6 - 3.0	Installed/under construction - 2 - 50.7 MW - 111.1 - 82.0
	2. Short-term planned wind power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of projects (see Indicator 13) Capacity (MW) Electricity generation (GWh/yr) Post-project emission reduction (ktCO₂/yr) 	Negotiation - 0	Negotiation - 3 - 162.5 MW - 355.9 - 256.9
	3. Longer-term planned wind power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of feasible projects Capacity (MW) Electricity generation Indirect emission reduction 	- 0	- 4 - 220.5 MW - 373.4 - 270.8
4. Provinces covered by the new & updated wind maps (0, <u>9</u> , 13) 5. Number of assessed locations with wind power potentials (0, <u>25</u> , 19) 6. Number of identified locations with wind resources that are feasible for wind-power based power generation (0, <u>15</u> , 16)	4. Provinces covered by the new & updated wind maps 5. Number of assessed locations with wind power potentials 6. Number of identified locations with feasible wind resources	0 0 0	13 25 20
7. Number of evaluated wind energy system (0, <u>11</u> , 8) 8. Number of completed wind power generation project feasibility studies (0, <u>10</u> , 10)	7. Number of evaluated wind energy system 8. Number of completed wind power feasibility studies	0 0	11 10
9. Number of local equipment manufacturers that can potentially produce wind energy components (0, <u>14</u> , 15); 10. Number of local equipment manufacturers that are ready to produce wind energy components (0, <u>7</u> , 10)	9. Number of assessed local equipment manufacturers that can: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> potentially produce and are ready to produce 10. Number of companies engaged in a wind power generation business (developers, equipment suppliers)	0 0 0	15 10 15
11. Number of planned WhyPgen replication projects (0, <u>10</u> , 7) 12. Number of WhypGen projects implemented (0, <u>6</u> , 1)	11. Number of projects in operation	0 1 0	1 1 3

Indicators (as in PIR; see Box 2 with <i>baseline situation</i> , <i>end-of-project targets</i> and <i>mid-term status</i>)	Alternative list of indicators	Baseline (mid 2011)	EoP target (mid 2016)
	12. Number of projects under construction/rehabilitation ³ 13. Number of projects under negotiation (PPA, finance)		
13. % contribution of WHyPgen in electricity supply in Indonesia (0, <u>0.0062</u> , 0)	Propose to delete this outcome and the indicator, because it is more at impact (project objective) than at outcome level. Moreover, with only few wind farms getting on-grid, the % will still be very low; the indicator is not giving any useful insight.		
14. Number of local services providers and power project developers trained on the development of business plans and utilization of financial models for preparing bankable proposals by year 3 (0, <u>6</u> , 2)	14. Number of institutions trained (banks and other financial) on RE development	0	3
15. Number of local services providers and power project developers trained on the development of business plans and utilization of financial models for preparing bankable proposals (0, <u>28</u> , 10)	15. Number of companies trained (project developers and investors, service providers, government entities) on business plan and bankable proposal development; indicating number of trainings	0 0	25 6
16. Number of banks/FIs that provide affordable financing schemes for WhyPGen projects (0, <u>3</u> , 1)			
<i>Outcome 3.2 Local banks/ financing institutions providing loans for wind power generation (including WhyPGen)</i>			
17. Number of financing schemes designed and approved for wind energy projects as well as for WhyPGen component manufacturing (0, <u>3</u> , 0)	16. Number of local banks offering a financing schemes (loans, guarantees, other) for wind power (indicating the size of the scheme) (<i>see also Recommendation 4c</i>)	0	1 (\$ 3 million)
18. Number of wind energy projects implemented with financial support through the approved financing scheme (0, <u>2</u> , 0)	17. Number of wind projects implemented with project-linked financing schemes (and volume of finance)	0	1 (\$ 16 million)
19. Volume of financing (in USD million) provided to implemented wind energy projects through the approved financing schemes (0, <u>16 million</u> , 0)	18. Completed study on sources of funding and issues and options in financing commercial wind power with recommendations for one or more financing schemes (<i>new indicator, see Recommendation 4b</i>)	0	1
20. Number of formulated policies (fiscal, market, regulatory, institutional) that are supportive of wind power generation (0, <u>6</u> , 2)	19. Completed review of existing policies and regulations (tax incentives, regulations, tariffs) and applicability for wind energy development (big, medium, small) (<i>new indicator; see explanation given in Recommendation 4d</i>)	0	2
21. Number of approved and enforced policies (fiscal, market, regulatory, institutional) that are supportive of wind power generation (0, <u>3</u> , 0)	20. Status of and number of policy regulations on feed-in tariff and facilitating market access ○ Proposed ○ Approved	0 0	1 2

³ This indicator would cover also the support given by the WHyPGen project to refurbish the wind hybrid power facility at Nusa Penida (*see Recommendation 4a*)

Indicators (as in PIR; see Box 2 with <i>baseline situation</i> , <u>end-of-project targets</u> and <u>mid-term status</u>)	Alternative list of indicators	Baseline (mid 2011)	EoP target (mid 2016)
22. Number of local companies actively engaged in the wind power generation (including WHyPGen) business (0, <u>14</u> , <u>15</u>) ⁴			
23. Number of completed promotional materials on wind energy in general and WhyPGen in particular (0, <u>15</u> , <u>15</u>) 24. An operational and widely used central database system on wind energy by yr2 (0, <u>year2</u> , 2014); 25. Number of engineering schools that offer courses on wind energy technologies in their engineering curricula (0, <u>3</u> , <u>5</u>) ⁵ 26. Average number of coordination activities of IWA (Indonesia Wind Association) each year starting yr 2 (0, <u>4</u> , <u>0</u>)	21. Number of promotional materials completed 22. Functioning website, users (counter) and central infobase with wind data with expected number of visitors 23. Number and type of promotional events organised with WHyPgen project support (with IWA and others) (<i>see Recommendation 4f</i>) 24. Guide for investors in wind energy (<i>see Recommendation 4e</i>) 25. Clearinghouse established operationalized by MEMR and (number of users, such as developers, investors, service/equipment providers that make use of the facility) (<i>see Recommendation 4g</i>)	0 0 0 0 0	15 1 (9000) Events: - Annual forum (3) - Workshops 1 1 (10)
27. A fully established and operational wind energy clearinghouse by yr 2 (0, <u>year2</u> , 2014-15) ⁶ 28. Number of project developers, investors, technical service and local equipment manufacturers that make use of the clearing house each year (0, <u>8</u> , <u>0</u>)	26. Completed report containing an assessment of (technical) capacity building and training needs and plan for project-supported activities per market cluster (<i>see Recommendation 4h</i>) 27. Number of (technical) trainings and staff trained (engineers and operators ⁷ ; service/consultancy providers) on wind energy topics 28. Number of engineering schools that offer wind power subjects in their engineering curricula	0 0 3 0	1 5 100 5 3

⁴ This indicator (22) has been shifted to Component 1 as Indicator 10 in the alternative list

⁵ Proposed to be moved to Component 6 to show the linkage with training activities of this Component

⁶ We propose to merge Indicators 27 and 28 and move to Component 5 (as Indicator 25 in the alternative list) together with other promotional and info dissemination activities, with Component 6 focussing on technical training and support.

⁷ The case of Nusa Penida (see Box 7) may highlight the need for qualified engineers and wind (hybrid) system operators

Indicators (as in PIR; see Box 2 with <i>baseline situation</i> , <u>end-of-project targets</u> and <u>mid-term status</u>)	Alternative list of indicators	Baseline (mid 2011)	EoP target (mid 2016)
	29. Number of vocational training institutes that including wind power operation and maintenance 30. Study on grid-related issues (ability of grids to absorb intermittent production, grid stability, dispatching rules, charges, etc.) (<i>see Recommendation 4j</i>)	0	1
29. Cumulative number of local equipment manufacturers trained under capacity development programs (0, <u>15</u> , 0) 30. Number of wind energy projects (including WhyPGen) that are designed and engineered by local technical service providers (0, <u>4</u> , 0) 31. Number of wind power (incl. WhyPGen) projects facilitated through WESMA (0, <u>2</u> , 0)			
32. % of all trainees of the capacity development programmes that are actively engaged in the Indonesia wind market (0, <u>60</u> , 0) ⁸			
33. Number of areas with completed electricity demand analysis and forecasts (0, <u>25</u> , 0) 34. Number of power project developers and technical service providers that make use of the electricity demand analyses and forecasts (0, <u>8</u> , 0)			
	Management and cross-cutting		
	31. Number of reviews and evaluations (mid-term and final)	0	2
	32. Strategic plan 2014-2016 (<i>see Recommendation 3a</i>)	0	1
	33. End-of-project report on wind development status, issues and options (<i>see Recommendations 3b</i>)	0	1

⁸ This Indicator will be difficult to measure. First, it would need a survey of all participants in the project-supported training activities (for which budget may not be available), but, more important, it misses a practical definition of what is meant by ‘actively engaged’. We propose to delete it.

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. Project Document
2. Inception Report
3. Annual Work and Financial Plans
4. Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) for 2012 and Quarterly Reports
5. Minutes of project board meetings
6. Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff and PMU staff (if any)
7. Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
8. Quarterly Reports
9. Past Audit Report

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTION

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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project contribute to the national programs of renewable energy and electricity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution/support to the national policy or progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant stakeholders Related documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Document review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project well-placed and integrated within the national government development strategies, such as promotion of low carbon technologies, decentralized power generation using relatively clean energy resource such as natural gas resources etc., and related global development programs to which the project implementation should align? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does overall implementation of the project activities contribute to the achievement of the targeted outputs and outcomes of WHyPGen? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Refer to Project Planning Matrix (log frame)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPD, PMU UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Document Review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Project making satisfactory progress in achieving project outputs vis-à-vis the targets and related delivery of inputs and activities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Refer to Project Planning Matrix (log frame)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPD, PMU UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Document Review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the level of achievement of outputs and related inputs and activities, is the Project achieves its Purpose and Development Objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Refer to Project Planning Matrix (log frame)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPD, PMU UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Document Review
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project implementation and achievement of results proceeding well and according to plan, or are there any outstanding issues, obstacles, bottlenecks, etc. on the implementation of demonstration projects, government or private sector or the captive power industry as a whole affecting the successful implementation and achievement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPD, PMU UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

of project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the broader policy environment remain conducive to achieving expected project results, including existing and planned legislations, rules, regulations, policy guidelines and government priorities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPD, PMU UNDP Relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project well-placed and integrated within the national government development strategies, such as promotion of low carbon technologies, decentralized power generation using relatively clean energy resource such as natural gas resources etc., and related global development programs to which the project implementation should align? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the committed co-financing for the project being used? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the identified risks being mitigated by the project? Validate new risks and the rating, and how is the effect to the project implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution 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	Sustainability ratings: 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	Relevance ratings 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)
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 Form⁹

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: _____

⁹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹⁰

- 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 Manual¹¹)
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 rated¹²)
- 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:

¹⁰The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹¹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹² Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3

Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4.

Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5.

Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

[illegible]