



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

United Nations Development Programme

Terms of Reference for the National Consultant for the Independent Interim Evaluation of the 'Accelerating the Transformational Shift to a Low Carbon Economy in the Republic of Mauritius' Project (PIMS 5681)

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: Local Consultant

Duty Station: Home based with site visits

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 23 July 2021

Duration of Contract: 40 working days (23 July 2021 through 31 October 2021)

1. Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Local Consultant for the first Interim Evaluation (IE) of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project titled *Accelerating the transformational shift to a low carbon economy in the Republic of Mauritius*' (PIMS 5681) implemented through the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development, which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on the 11 July 2017 (with the Funded Activity Effectiveness date); with the first disbursement received for the project in September 2017; and it is in its 3rd year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation which is a requirement set in Schedule 4. of the Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) for the project.

2. Project Background information

Project goal

The Green Climate Fund (GCF), through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), is providing financial support and expertise to assist the Government of Mauritius in achieving their targets set in the Long-Term Energy Strategy (2011-2025) (LTE) in terms of share of renewable energy in the electricity mix (the LTE (2011-2025) has been replaced by the Renewable Energy Roadmap 2030 for the Electricity Roadmap with a renewed target of achieving 35% of RE by 2025 and 40% of RE by 2030). It is implemented in a two-phase approach so as to reduce the implementation risks to the GCF and ensure that the second funding disbursement is contingent upon successful completion of the first phase.

Objectives

The objectives of the project are to:

- i. through Component 1, create a conducive environment for enhanced development and investment into the renewable energy sector in Republic of Mauritius through the institutional strengthening of the Mauritius Renewable Energy Agency (MARENA) and the Utility Regulatory Authority. The responsible party for the implementation of Component 1 is the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities (MEPU);
- ii. through Component 2, carry out a number of grid strengthening/upgrading activities including the installation of 18 MW Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) in order to boost the grid absorption capacity by around an additional 125 MW, following by the deployment of 25MW of rooftop solar PV small and medium scale installations in Phase II of the project. The responsible party for the implementation of Component 2 is the Central Electricity Board (CEB);
- iii. through Component 3, install a 300kW, solar PV powered mini-grid in the outer island of Agalega. The responsible party for the implementation of Component 3 is the Outer Island Development Corporation (OIDC);

Impacts,

As per the logical framework (ref. project document), the fund-level impact is to achieve reduced emissions through increased low-emission energy access and power generation. This is translated, at the outset of the project, with the attainment of the 35% target of renewable energy in the electricity mix by 2025 (40% by 2030) and an approximate reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of 4.27 million tCO₂e over the lifetime of the investments enabled, at a cost to the GCF of just USD 6.6/tCO₂e

Key outputs

The main outputs of each component are as follow:

- i. Component 1 – institutionally strengthened MARENA with fully trained and capacitated staff able to favourably, effectively and efficiently respond to the challenges and targets set by the Government for renewable energy sector;
- ii. Component 2 – strengthened and technologically enhanced electricity grid able to accept/connect an additional 125MW of intermittent renewable energy in Phase I (through the installation of a number of technologies including BESS and AGC) followed by the installation of 25MW of rooftop solar PV small and medium scale systems in Phase II; and
- iii. Component 3 – installed and operational mini grid at Agalega able to supply stable and clean power to the islanders (main village 25).

Key outcomes

The key outcomes for each component are:

- i. Component 1 - Institutional and regulatory systems that improve incentives for low-emission planning and development and their effective implementation;
- ii. Component 2 - Increased number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers through the increase in the grid absorption capacity on Phase I and roll-out of 25MW of rooftop installations in Phase II of the project.

Timeframe and location

The FAA was signed in June 2017 with the planned start date for activities set in September 2017. The Inception Workshop was held on 11 and 12 November 2017. The project is implemented in the Republic of Mauritius comprising of the main island of Mauritius and the outer islands of Rodrigues and Agalega.

The updated timeframe of the project is as follows:

- i. Phase I: (July) 2017- (July) 2021 (following approved extension request granted by GCF on 20 October 2020)
- ii. Phase II: (July) 2021 - (June) 2025

Budget

The project, which is implemented at national level, is funded by the GCF grant resources of USD 28.21 million, where it is split across phase 1 (USD 12 million) and phase 2 (USD 16.21 million), to overcome identified barriers to low-carbon investment.

Planned Co-financing

A total of USD 161,800,000 of co-financing is expected to be achieved during the project duration per the following breakdown:

Co- Financing Institution	Amount (USD)
Government- MEPU	USD 1,000,000
Government- CEB	USD 122,000,000
Agence Francaise de Developpement (AFD)	USD 37,900,000
Government- OIDC	USD 900,000
Total co-financing	USD 161,800,000

Additional note on impact of COVID 19 on project timeline

The first case of Covid-19 was registered in Mauritius on 18 March 2020 and a national curfew was imposed on 20 March 2020 and further extended till 1 June 2020. Most economic activities were resumed except for tourism sector where mandatory quarantine was imposed for entering tourist. Following a new wave of local transmission in early March 2021, a second lockdown was imposed and a gradual deconfinement applied for the resumption of economic activities

As at June 2020, the country has registered approximately 1,500 cases and 18 death and economic activity is expected to shrink due to reduced activity in the tourism sector. Project implementation was also affected owing to disruption in supply chain, travel restrictions and curfew imposed for

sanitary reasons. While most of the consultations were held remotely on the project, some activities like the setting up of the 18 MW Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) was severely impacted as the various components of the system were manufactured in Korea, China, and France and the assembly in Spain. Moreover, as at August 2020, travel restrictions are still in place in Mauritius with uncertainty remaining on when these restrictions will be waived. As the commissioning and testing of the BESS will require support from technical expertise outside of Mauritius, the exact date for the completion of the installation of the BESS, corresponding with the end of Phase1, is expected to be delayed by up to 1 year from the project start (FAA effectiveness).

3. Objectives of the Interim Evaluation

The IE will assess implementation of the project and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the UNDP Project Document and GCF Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The IE team will assess implementation of the project and its alignment with FAA obligations and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. The evaluation will assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal **of identifying the necessary changes** to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.

The IE will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the following evaluation criteria from the [GCF IEU TOR](#) (GCF/B.06/06) and [draft GCF Evaluation Policy](#), along with [guidance](#) provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Additional evaluation criteria can be assessed, as applicable. The IE must assess the following

- **Implementation and adaptive management** – seeks to identify challenges and propose additional measures to support more efficient and effective implementation. The following aspects of project implementation and adaptive management will be assessed: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.
- **Risks to sustainability** – seeks to assess the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The assessment of sustainability at the Interim Evaluation stage considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The IE should validate the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Reports, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date.
- **Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency** - seeks to assess the appropriateness in terms of selection, implementation and achievement of FAA and project document results framework activities and expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts).

- **Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities** - looks at how GCF financing is additional and able to amplify other investments or de-risk and crowd-in further climate investment.
- **Gender equity** - ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts of climate change are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioural changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to climate change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making.
- **Country ownership of projects and programmes** - examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the GCF investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes.
- **Innovativeness in results areas** - focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and the extent to which the project interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways..
- **Replication and scalability** – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporated in independent evaluations).
- **Unexpected results, both positive and negative** - identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (governments, stakeholders, civil society, AE, GCF, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.
- **Impact of the Covid19 pandemic on the project implementation and performance**

4. Interim Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The IE team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The IE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, FAA, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The IE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful IE. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the Interim Evaluation team is expected to conduct field missions to project sites in Mauritius, to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection (government data/records, field observation visits, CDM verifications, public expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

The specific design and methodology for the IE should emerge from consultations between the IE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the IE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The IE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the IE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the IE must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the IE team.

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the Interim Evaluation team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the Interim Evaluation report.

Owing to the travel restrictions since 18 March 2020, there is a possibility that the international consultant might not be able to reach the country for the evaluation. In this case, the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Project team.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

UNDP Mauritius will be providing the necessary support in the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings and will provide the evaluation team with an updated stakeholder contact list.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5. Detailed scope of the Interim Evaluation

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the Interim Evaluation team to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the GCF investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to GCF investment.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.
- Ensure that the indicators (gender-disaggregated) are SMART, aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the [GCF programming manual](#).

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of indicators against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ²	Baseline Level ³	Level in 1 st APR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁴	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵	Achievement Rating ⁶	Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved
Fund Level Impact:	Indicator:							
Outcome 1:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

² Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

³ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴ If available

⁵ Colour code this column only

⁶ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- Assess impact of Covid-19 on project and recommend budget reallocation
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the FAA and Funding proposal. Have changes been made and have these been approved by GCF? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.
- Assess the feasibility of completing the proposed activities within the given project timeline (if extension was sought for any project milestone; please consider the revised timelines as well) and make recommendations for extensions, as need be.

Financing:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Comment on the use of different financial streams (parallel, leveraged, mobilized finance), as applicable in the context of the project – see GCF policy on co-finance⁷. Discuss whether co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, have been fulfilled, as applicable.
- Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

⁷ <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf>

- If co-finance is not materialising as planned, discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.
- Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- Is a grievance mechanism in place? If so, assess its effectiveness

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
 - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks⁸ (in the SESP).

⁸ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

- The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

v. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the FAA and Funding proposal, APRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GCF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability 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? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

vi. Country Ownership

- To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- Is the project, as implemented, responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

vii. Gender equity

- Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?
- How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

- What are the lessons learned to enrich learning and knowledge generation in terms of how the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
- Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change?⁹

x. Replication and Scalability

- What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- Assess the effectiveness of exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints? Is there a need for recalibration?
- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The Interim Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary.

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

⁹ See Section '9.4 Major Changes and Restructuring' in the [GCF Programming Manual](#)

Ratings

The Interim Evaluation team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Interim Evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the GCF funded project – ‘Accelerating the transformational shift to a low carbon economy in the Republic of Mauritius’

Measure	Interim Evaluation Rating ¹⁰	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

10 Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings; 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings; 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings; 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings; 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings; 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings, Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

Ratings for Sustainability: 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability; 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability; 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability; Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

6. Timeframe

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be approximately 40 working days over a time period of 16 weeks. The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
I. Desk review and Inception Report		
Document review and preparation of Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report; Submission of IE Inception Report (Inception Report due no later than 1 week before the evaluation mission)	5 days	28 July 2021
II. Mission and Data Collection		
IE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	15 days	13 August 2021
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the Interim Evaluation mission	2 day	18 August 2021
III. Report Writing		
Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #1 (at least 5 ½ weeks before final report due date)	9 days	31 August 2021
Incorporation of comments on Draft IE Report #1; Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #2 (at least 5 weeks before final report due date)	4 days	7 September 2021
Incorporation of comments from Draft IE Report #2 and Finalization of IE report + completed audit trail from feedback on draft report (note: there might be a need to accommodate possible time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report, as some feedback/questions might be coming from the donor outside of this timeline; therefore flexibility within the contract period might be required)	5 days	8 October 2021

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. Midterm Review Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report	Proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the Interim Evaluation report, and options for site visits	by 23 July 2021	Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission by 18 August 2021	Interim Evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft IE Report #1	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	by 31 August 2021	Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
4	Draft IE Report #2	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	by 7 September 2021	Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
5	Final Interim Evaluation Report* + Audit Trail	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	by 8 October 2021	Interim Evaluation Team sends final report Commissioning Unit
6	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop	Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key actions in response to the report.	Within 1-2 weeks of completion of final Interim Evaluation report	Led by Interim Evaluation team or Project Team and Commissioning Unit

*The final Interim Evaluation report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. Interim Evaluation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's IE is *UNDP Mauritius/Seychelles Country Office*. During this assignment, the Interim Evaluation team will report to the M&E Focal Point in the Commissioning Unit who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the IE team and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Mauritius. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Interim Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. Team Composition

A team of *two independent consultants* will conduct the IE - *one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one local expert, usually from the country of the project and/or with expertise in a relevant area)* The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

Education

- A Master's degree in Engineering, Renewable Energy, Economics, Management, or other closely related field with 5 years relevant experience or a Bachelor's degree in the above fields with 7 years of relevant experience (20 points)

Work Experience

- At least 5 years of post-Master's degree or 7 years of post-Bachelor's degree of relevant professional experience in environment (Climate action, Adaptation, Mitigation) projects management and/or project evaluation (20 points);
- Demonstrated experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (15 points);
- Experience working in undertaking Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in Small Islands Developing States (10 points)
- Familiarity with donor funded project within the United Nations Development System (10 points);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and social and environmental safeguards; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (15 points).
- Excellent communication skills;

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English, French and Mauritian Creole (10 points)

10. Evaluator Ethics

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct (see ToR Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). The IE team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The IE team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the IE and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the IE process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. Payment modalities and Specifications

20% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report

50% upon satisfactory delivery of the of the first draft Interim Evaluation report

30% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation report by the Commissioning Unit, UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor and UNDP NCE Principal Technical Advisor +submission of completed Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%¹¹:

- i) The final IE report includes all requirements outlined in the IE TOR and is in accordance with the IE guidance.
- ii) The final IE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other IE reports).
- iii) The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
- iv) RTA approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)

12. Application Process¹²

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

¹¹ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the IE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the IE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

¹² Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹³ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹⁴);
- c) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, 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.

Applications should be submitted online through the UNDP jobs website. No other mode of application will be accepted.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Applicants scoring a minimum of 70% of the technical evaluation would be considered for the financial evaluation. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

The Evaluation Criteria will be as follows

Criteria (Technical)	Weight (%)
Education: A Master’s degree in Engineering, Renewable Energy, Economics, Management, or other closely related field or a Bachelor’s degree in the above fields with additional years of relevant project monitoring and evaluation experience	20
Minimum Experience: At least 5 years of post-Master’s degree or 7 years of post-Bachelor’s degree of relevant professional experience in environment projects and Project Evaluation	20
Specialisation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrated experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (15 points); 	15

¹³

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Experience working in undertaking Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in Small Islands Developing States (10 points) - Familiarity with donor funded project within the United Nations Development System (10 points); 	<p>10</p> <p>10</p>
<p>Gender:</p> <p>Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and social and environmental safeguards; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis</p>	<p>15</p>
<p>Communication:</p> <p>Fluency in written and spoken English, French and Mauritian Creole</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>Total</p>	<p>100</p>

13. Approval

This TOR is approved by:



Signature: _____

Name and Designation: Satyajeet Ramchurn, Head of Environment Unit

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team

1. Funding Proposal
2. Funded Activity Agreement (FAA)
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
7. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
15. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report¹⁵

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
 - Interim Evaluation time frame and date of report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Interim Evaluation team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- v. Project Information Table
1. Executive Summary (*2-3 pages*)
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary
 - Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendations Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, Interim Evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations
 - Structure of the Interim Evaluation report
3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (*12-14 pages*)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Relevance
 - 4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency
 - 4.4 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis

¹⁵ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
- 4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Financing
 - Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - Reporting
 - Communications
- 4.6 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 4.7 Country Ownership
- 4.8 Innovativeness in results areas
- 4.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative
- 4.10 Replication and Scalability
- 4.11 Gender Equity
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Interim Evaluation’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 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
- 6. Annexes
 - Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim Evaluation report

ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the Interim Evaluation team (in line with the assessment criteria outlined in Section 3 of the ToR) and included in the Inception Report and as an Annex to the final Interim Evaluation report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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: _____

¹⁶ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.
Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit, RTA and PTA included in the final report)

Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Regional Technical Advisor - Nature, Climate and Energy	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Principal Technical Advisor - Nature, Climate and Energy	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be listed as an annex in the final report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (date) from the Interim Evaluation of ‘Accelerating the transformational shift to a low carbon economy in the Republic of Mauritius’ (UNDP Project ID 00106328-PIMS 5681)

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

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft report	Interim Evaluation team response and actions taken