



Terminal Evaluation

Operationalization of the SE4All Action Agenda: Promoting inclusive, environmentally-sound and low- carbon development (SAP: 160041)

Final Report

Prepared by



FOKABS INC.

2500 St. Laurent Blvd, Ottawa, Ontario, K1H 1B1, Canada
kenongene@fokabs.com

2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Evaluators wish to express their profound gratitude for the time and effort expended by all project participants and stakeholders during the evaluation interviews. These provided valuable insights, candid perspectives, and above all informed the evaluation findings. The Evaluators are thankful to the guidance, feedback, and support of the Government of The Gambia. The Evaluators equally appreciate the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) team, especially **Mrs. Caterina Bianco and Mr. Emmanuel Correa** respectively, for their feedback, guidance and logistic support provided for the successful completion of the evaluation. It is our hope that this report will inform the design and implementation of subsequent projects and programmes in The Gambia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	<i>i</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	<i>ii</i>
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	<i>iv</i>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	<i>v</i>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Purpose and objectives of the terminal evaluation	1
1.2. Scope of the Evaluation	1
1.3. Evaluation approach and methodology	1
1.3.1. Desk review and inception.....	1
1.3.2. Data collection and analysis	2
1.3.3. Report writing and reporting	2
1.3.4. Principles of the design and execution of the interim evaluation	3
1.3.5. Roles and responsibilities of actors engaged in the TE.....	3
1.3.6. Quality assurance in the evaluation process	4
1.3.7. Limitations of the evaluation.....	4
1.4. 1.4 Structure of the Terminal Evaluation report	4
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
2.1. Background.....	5
2.1.1. Institutional Context	5
2.1.2. Environmental context.....	5
2.1.3. Demographic context	5
2.1.4. Social and Cultural Context	6
2.1.5. Political and legal context	6
2.1.6. Economic Context	7
2.1.7. National Policy Framework	7
2.2. Problem Statement.....	7
2.3. Project Objectives	8
2.4. Project duration and budget	8
2.5. Main Stakeholders	8
2.6. 2.7 Theory of Change	8
3. FINDINGS.....	9
3.1. Project design and formulation	9
3.1.1. Analysis of results framework.....	9
3.1.2. Assumptions and risks	9
3.1.3. Lessons from other relevant projects	9
3.1.4. Planned stakeholder participation.....	9
3.1.5. Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector	9
3.2. Project implementation	9
3.2.1. Adaptive management	9
3.2.2. Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements	10
3.2.3. Project finance and co-finance.....	10
3.2.4. Monitoring and evaluation system	10
3.2.5. Project implementation and execution	10
3.2.6. Risk Management.....	10
3.3. Project Results	11
3.3.1. Progress towards Objectives and Expected Outputs and Outcomes	11

3.3.2.	Relevance	18
3.3.3.	Effectiveness.....	18
3.3.4.	Efficiency.....	22
3.3.5.	Overall Outcome Rating.....	23
3.3.6.	Country Ownership	23
3.3.7.	Gender	23
3.3.8.	Crosscutting Issues.....	23
3.3.9.	Environmental and Social Safeguards	23
3.3.10.	Sustainability	23
3.3.11.	Project Additionality	24
3.3.12.	Catalyst/Role Replication	25
3.3.13.	Innovations.....	25
3.3.14.	Progress to Impact	25
4.	CONCLUSION, LESSON LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	27
4.1.	Conclusion	27
4.2.	Lessons Learnt.....	27
4.3.	Recommendations.....	28
ANNEXES	30
Annex A:	Terms of reference of the terminal evaluation	30
Annex B:	Inception report of the terminal evaluation	36
Annex C:	TE Mission Itinerary.....	48
Annex D:	Stakeholders consulted	49
Annex E:	List of documents reviewed	50
Annex F:	Evaluation question matrix.....	51
Annex G:	Questionnaire used for data collection	61
Annex H:	Rating scales	76
Annex I:	Co-financing Table.....	77
Annex J:	TE audit trail	78
Annex K:	Signed UNEG code of conduct form.....	79
Annex L:	Signed TE clearance form	80

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

DCD:	Department of Community Development
ECREE:	ECOWAS Centre on Renewable Energy Efficiency
EE:	Energy Efficient
FAO:	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FGD:	Focus Group Discussion
FTT:	FAO Thiaroye Technology
GEF:	Global Environmental Facility
GNAIP:	Gambia National Agricultural Investment Plan
ICS:	Improved Cook Stoves
KII:	Key Informant Interview
MOPE:	Ministry of Petroleum and Energy
M & E:	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR:	Mid Term Review
NDP:	National Development Plan
NEA:	National Environment Agency
PMO:	Project Management Office
PURA:	Public Utilities Regulatory Authority
SDF:	Social Development Fund
SDG:	Sustainable Development Goals
SE4ALL:	Sustainable Energy For ALL
TE:	Terminal Evaluation
TGSB:	The Gambia Standards Bureau
UNIDO:	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
WIG:	Women Initiative The Gambia

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Information Table

Project Title	Operationalization of SE4All Action Agenda
Project Objective	Promoting inclusive, environmentally sound and low carbon development.
Project ID	9495
UNIDO SAP ID	160041
GEF Replenishment Circle	GEF6
Country	The Gambia
Region	AFR-Africa
GEF Focal area	Climate change
Implementing Department/Division	ENE Division
Co-Implementing Agency	
Executing Agency	UNIDO
Other Implementing Partners	MoPE, PURA, FAO, ECREER, TGSB, NEA, Africell
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Project Duration	36 Months
GEF Project Financing	USD 1,781,484
Agency Fee	USD 169,241
Co-financing amount	USD 6,418,013
Date of CEO endorsement	August 2016
UNIDO Approve Date	January 2018
Actual Implementation start Date	June 2019
MTE Start Date	2 June 2022
Project Completion Date	July 2023

Project Description

The project "Operationalization of the SE4All Action Agenda: Promoting inclusive, environmentally sound and low- carbon development (SAP: 160041)" is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The objective of the project is to promote inclusive, environmentally sound, and low carbon development, in GEF focal area of climate change. The cost of the project is US\$ 8,199,497, of which a GEF allocation of US\$ 1,781,484 and a co-financing of US\$ 6,418,013 from diverse sources including: the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), Ministry of Petroleum and Energy (MoPE), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Ecowas Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE), Federation of Cashew Farmers Association, Africell, Balafon Company Limited, Petrogas, and NAWEC. The project has as start and end dates April 30, 2017, and July 31, 2023 respectively. The project is composed of five components:

- Component 1: National Platform to foster Nexus issues;
- Component 2: Promoting the use of Energy Efficient Appliances;
- Component 3: Promoting the production and use of efficient cook stoves and alternative cooking fuels;
- Component 4: Quality Assurance;
- Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation.

Evaluation ratings table

The table below summarizes the project ratings:

Area	Rating
Quality of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system	
Monitoring and evaluation	Satisfactory
Project results	
Effectiveness	Satisfactory
Relevance	Highly satisfactory
Efficiency	Satisfactory
Overall rating	Satisfactory
Gender	Highly Satisfactory
Environmental and social safeguards	Highly Satisfactory
Financial risk	Moderately Likely
Socio-political/economic risk	Likely
Institutional framework and governance risk	Moderately Likely
Environmental risk	Moderately Likely
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability risk	Moderately Likely
Overall Project Rating	Satisfactory

Summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned

Project Relevance to Global and The Gambia National Priorities: The project was well designed because it was based on the SE4ALL ACTION AGENDA by 2030 which is congruent to the national

priorities in the energy sector. The project design entailed consultation of diverse stakeholders, an approach which promotes inclusivity and country ownership.

The project design was informed by past and ongoing projects at the time. The conception of the SE4ALL project was informed by previous projects that were being implemented by UNIDO in The Gambia under the GEF 4 and GEF 5 cycles. SE4ALL was also designed to coordinate with the FAO GEF 5 project in The Gambia to generate mutual benefits and synergy. The GEF 6 project was envisaged to impact the “Community-Based Dryland Forest Management” project through the design, production and distribution of adapted, available, and affordable EE cook stoves to curb firewood consumption and deforestation. Equally, the GEF 6 project was envisaged to support the “Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change” project by possibly providing support to targeted community gardens through the introduction of EE lighting and cold storage powered by solar.

Project Implementation

Adaptive management: COVID-19 pandemic has had a negative impact on the project leading to delays in the implementation of activities. At the inception of the project, workplan and budgets were agreed upon between the project developers and UNIDO. However, with time the supply chain was interrupted especially for equipment that were procured outside the country leading to considerable delays and subsequent increase in prices. The remedial actions taken by the project were to (1) Extend the project duration, 2) Revise the project and 3) Reduce the scope of work.

Project finance and co-finance: The GEF 6 project has a total financing of US\$ 6,223,490 of which US\$ 4,441,865 was co-financed by the project developers. Generally, UNIDO provided 30 percent of the funds as grants and 70 percent as co-financed by project developers. However, the co-financing was in some instances higher or lower than 70 percent depending on the type of activity,

Monitoring and evaluation system: The rating for monitoring and evaluation is **Satisfactory**. The evaluation revealed that there is a monitoring and evaluation plan for individual projects complemented by weekly/bi-weekly meetings between UNIDO HQ and PMO. Dedicated meetings were also held between UNIDO HQ, MoPE and other relevant stakeholders, although not an integrated one. Individual project plans underwent revisions due to delays in fund disbursement as well as project execution. For instance, delays were recorded in the Department of Community Development, The Gambia Standard Bureau, and Women Initiative the Gambia of up to a year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Monitoring and evaluation data was used to inform and enhance delivery of the project. As data was collected, recommendations were made and sent to UNIDO HQ on issues such as project extension, certification for work completion, contract amendments and updates on the status of project implementation.

Project Results

Relevance: The overall relevance of the project is Highly Satisfactory. The Project has been aligned with the national priority needs and blueprints such as The Gambia National Development Plan, Vision 2020, National Energy Policy (2021-2030), Agenda 2063, Sustainable Energy for All Agenda 2030, The Climate Change Policy, The Gambia Climate Strategy, The Gambia Environmental Action Plan, as well as the priorities of all implementing partners and project beneficiaries. The project is also relevant to the institutional mandate of the project developers which includes advocacy, promote, and contribute to environmentally sound and low carbon development which is evident and manifested in the service they render to the Gambian populace. Among the services they provide are production and distribution of clean and efficient cook stoves for households and institutions, production of clean cooking fuels, light testing

laboratory, goniophotometer, light spectrometer, provision of energy efficient bulbs (led) Air conditioners for institutions and community streetlights as well as solar fridges, solar lights for the community gardens. Equally important is the relevance of the project and the immense contribution it has made in addressing the needs of the communities particularly women.

Effectiveness: The rating for overall effectiveness of the project is **Satisfactory**. Energy efficiency is a key priority for The Gambia's sustained economic growth and development in the context of sustainable development. Therefore, the use of energy efficient appliances and ICS has contributed towards the reduction of operational cost of services and reduce the carbon footprint of the country. The interventions from the implementing partners varied in nature as a per their mandate and expertise. However, the project was effective in delivering the following among others: plant for the production of cook stoves, agro-waste to produce briquette (carbonised groundnut and coconut shell) as clean cooking fuels, production and distribution of clean cook stoves, provision of energy efficient LED bulbs, energy efficient air conditioners, energy efficient cook stoves, kitchens built in schools, FAO Thiaroye Technology stoves, FTT built in fish landing sites, environment education manual for school children developed, solar street lights, solar freezers, light testing laboratory, goniophotometer and spectrophotometer.

Efficiency: The project experiences a judicious use of resources even though the lack of project developers for heat pump killers and solar thermal necessitated the re-allocation of funds for the supply of water, solar panels and freezer to Dampha Kunda Women's Garden and SDF for energy efficient lighting and improved cook stoves. Delays in disbursement were also reported which led to the delays in the timely completion of project activities. The efficiency of the project is rated **Satisfactory**.

Sustainability: The rating for Sustainability is **Moderately Likely**. The environmental risk to sustainability of the project is rated **Moderately Likely** as improved stoves come with a positive environmental benefit pertaining to the reduction in the use of charcoal which translates into reduced forest degradation, the mining of clay to produce these stoves could lead to environmental degradation. The financial risk to sustainability is **Moderately Likely**, as companies that have adopted energy efficient appliances have recorded associated benefits, although for households, the situation could be different since they may find it financially challenging to replace an LED bulb at its end-of-life and may rather prefer to go after a cheaper bulb. The evaluation did not identify any socio-economic risk to sustainability which is therefore rated as **Likely**. The institutional framework and governance risk to the project is **Moderately Likely** because the project supported the establishment of a laboratory for testing light bulbs, purchased a modern equipment for the testing, and trained staff of the TGSB in the use of the equipment. There is a risk that if the trained individuals are transferred or appointed to other functions, a void might be created due to the lack of a competent personnel to continue conducting the testing of the light bulbs.

Gender: The rating for Gender Mainstreaming is **Highly Satisfactory**. The project recognizes gender equality, equity, and women empowerment as an important element in the attainment of Sustainable Energy for All Agenda and ensured that gender perspectives pervade all aspects of the project cycle. The evaluation assessed the extent to which gender was mainstreamed in the project cycle. The TE revealed that gender was mainstreamed in the project cycle by UNIDO, MoPE, project developers and all the other stakeholders including the beneficiaries at the community level. Almost all implementing partners and beneficiaries also reported that women were highly involved in all the activities of the project including the installation of LED Bulbs in the beneficiary communities. In fact, some key project activities were reported to be headed by women.

Environmental and Social Safeguards: The rating for the Environmental and Social Safeguards is **Highly Satisfactory**. Prior to project implementation, an Environmental Impact Assessment was undertaken to

determine the potential impact on the project. The evaluation revealed that except the mining of clay in Kombo East for the manufacturing of improved cook stoves which can lead to land degradation, the project did not have any negative impact on the environment. Regarding social safeguards, women, youth, and other vulnerable groups have been considered during the design of the project.

Lessons learned

1. Dominance of non-Gambians in production of metal frames for the Furno Jambar (ICS) can affect sustainability. Gambians need to be trained to produce metal frames so that reliance on non-Gambians will be minimized.
2. Adequacy in funding is key to successful implementation of energy efficient appliances and improved cooking solutions. The project could have had a greater impact if the funding was much bigger with lower co-financing amounts. The demand for EE lights and ICS at the community level was overwhelming but the project developers could only provide support according to the size of the budget.
3. The use of FTT is pivotal in reducing greenhouse gas and the overall management of the environment. The FTT innovation should be widely disseminated to encourage its use in all parts of the country given its efficiency as an ICS.
4. Extended turnaround time for projects can lead to implementation delays which can negatively affect the achievements of the project outcome.
5. Building local capacity can enhance project implementation and sustainability. Some communities were able to harness and build local expertise for the upkeep of EE appliances particularly street lights significantly contributing to reduction in maintenance cost and enhancing sustainability of the investment.
6. The effective use of domestic and agricultural waste can positively impact on the environment.
7. Community interaction has created an increased demand for the project.
8. Training in project execution will help in ensuring smooth implementation of the project.
9. Lack of evidence-based information on greenhouse emissions from energy efficient appliances makes it difficult to assess the real impact of the project.
10. Unnecessary bureaucracy and lack of transparency can cause delays and chaos in project implementation and ultimately affect project outcomes.
11. Good project execution can lead to good project outcome.
12. Committed staff and management can lead to good project outcomes.
13. Delay in payment can have negative impact on the timely delivery of project results.

Recommendation

The TE recommends the following:

To the Government, ECREEE and UNIDO:

14. **The TGSB should expedite the development of performance labelling scheme for energy efficient appliances and standards for Improved cooking stoves.** The Quality Assurance component of the project has suffered setbacks including delays in disbursement and other administrative bottlenecks with ECREEE, leading to delays in implementation. For these reasons, all hands should be on deck for TGSB to expedite the development of performance labelling scheme for energy efficient appliances and standards for Improved cooking stoves.

Timeline: Immediate till the completion of project activities

To the Government:

15. **Producers of ICS using clay should be supported by Government to ensure a sustainable mining of the product in the communities.** Clay is used as lining of Furrno Jambarr, a widely used Improved Cook Stoves in The Gambia. However, extensive and uncontrolled mining of this scarce resources could negatively affect the environment. Therefore, Government including, NEA, Geology Department and Area Council should provide support for the mining of clay in the production of this Improved Cook stove.

Timeline: Process to begin now

To the Government and other financial institutions:

16. **Provision of funds by Government, Commercial Banks, Micro-finance institutions and donors for business start-ups for EE lighting Appliances and Improved Cooking Solutions.** To ensure an increased use of EE Appliances and ICs, Government should work closely with the commercial banks and donors to provide support such as the establishment of Micro-finance institutions, Flagship programmes and other funding mechanisms for EE Appliances and ICS.

Timeline: After the completion of Project activities

17. **More Government investment in renewable energy particularly solar.** A demand for Solar energy to reduce expenditure on electricity was reported extensively by Government and private institutions during the TE. The findings suggest that government should invest more on solar energy so that further cuts can be made to their energy bills.

Timeline: As soon as possible

To UNIDO:

18. **UNIDO should improve on timely disbursement of funds.** The timely implementation of some key project activities was stifled by the late disbursement of fund. Whilst this may be partly due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the procedures in place for fund disbursement as revealed by the Implementing partners are too cumbersome and led to delays. These procedures have to be reviewed to ensure to improve the timeliness in the disbursement of funds without contravening UNIDO financial rules and regulations.

Timeline: As soon as possible

19. **Provision of funds by UNIDO to complete pending project activities.** Some key activities in the project components such as Quality Assurance, Production and use of Improved Cooking Solutions are yet to be completed. Therefore, it is imperative that these activities be completed to ensure a successful completion of the project.

Timelines: As soon as possible

To Government and other implementing Partners:

20. **Development and operationalisation of a Strategic Development Plan to promote the use of ECO briquette.** Given that the production of Eco briquette as an innovative Cooking solution requires the active involvement of key Government institutions including but not limited to Agriculture, Forestry, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources etc as well as the communities. There is a need for a Strategic Development Plan that will canvass support in the generation and use of agro-waste in the production of the Eco briquette.

Timeline: Consultations to begin now with relevant institutions

Follow-ups on Project activities to ensure sustainability:

21. It is imperative that MoPE leads the Project Steering Team and PMO to continue monitoring and executing the remaining project activities. At the completion of the remaining project activities, Project Steering Committee to monitor the sustainability mechanisms identified by the beneficiaries of the project.

Timelines: At the completion of the project activities

22. **The Department of Community Development to expedite the construction of a Plant for the construction of Improved Cook Stoves:** Due to delays in disbursement of funds, the construction of the second plant for the production of Improved Cook Stoves is yet to be completed and hence every effort should be made by UNIDO to expedite the disbursement of funds for the completion of the activity.

Timeline: Immediate

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose and objectives of the terminal evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) assessed the achievement of project results against expected objectives and drew lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNIDO programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

More specifically, the TE has:

- Assessed how effectively the project has achieved its stated development objective or purpose;
- Measured how efficiently the outcomes were realized, and outputs delivered in attaining the development objective/purpose of the project;
- Assessed both negative and positive factors that have hampered and facilitated respectively the progress in achieving the project outcomes, including external factors/environment, weakness in design, management and resource allocation;
- Assessed the extent to which the application of the rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming are integrated within the planning and implementation of the project;
- Identified and documented substantive lessons learned, good practices and also opportunities for scaling up in future;
- Provided forward-looking programmatic recommendations for the project and the relevant portfolio of UNIDO.

1.2. Scope of the Evaluation

This TE assessed the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, factors affecting project performance and cross-cutting dimensions – including considerations such as gender, human rights; social and environmental safeguards applied to the project. In delivering on the assignment, the evaluation team followed GEF guidelines in terms of ranking the performance of key criteria: 1) Effectiveness; 2) Efficiency; 3) Relevance; 4) Sustainability; 5) Factors affecting performance. The team equally assessed the relevant cross-cutting issues such as risks and social and environmental safeguards (6), gender (7), progress towards impact but these were not scored/ranked in line with GEF evaluation guidelines.

1.3. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE was conducted using a mixed method approach with both qualitative and quantitative analyses. A three-phased review was completed, including an inception phase, a data collection and analysis phase and a close-out phase.

1.3.1. Desk review and inception

The objective of the inception phase was to ensure that project stakeholders and the evaluation team understand the objectives and scope of the assignment, as well as to exchange ideas, share relevant documents and agree on timelines for the assignment. This was done through a virtual meeting in June 2023, between FOKABS and the UNIDO team. An inception report was produced, which marked the end of the inception phase of the assignment.

Secondary data collection was done through a desk review, which involved content and context analysis of documents relevant to the project. This review served as a source of secondary qualitative and quantitative data and included the following documents, inter alia:

- The project funding proposal
- Project results/logic framework
- Annual and quarterly progress reports
- Reports submitted by sub-contractors
- Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan
- National relevant climate change and energy strategic policy documents

1.3.2. Data collection and analysis

The data collection and analysis phase consisted of primary data collection, which was carried out through interviews, consultations and group discussions where possible, and was followed by the reporting phase. Individual interviews and group discussions with project stakeholders were carried out between in July 2023. The stakeholders interviewed include:

- UNIDO project team,
- Ministry of Petroleum (MoPE),
- National Environment Agency (NEA),
- TGSB,
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO),
- Social Development Fund; and
- Department of Community Development.

Data analysis was done using content analysis. Through content analysis, the presence, meanings, and relationships of certain words, themes, or concepts were analyzed. The themes were generated in line with the GEF evaluation criteria and sub-questions while being sufficiently flexible to develop new themes based on emerging issues in the data.

Data triangulation

The evaluators combined interview data and literature review and therefore benefited from the advantages of mixed methods. A systematic triangulation of sources and data was a key strategy employed in this evaluation for mitigating bias. In this respect, at the first level of internal confrontation, the project documents were examined in terms of their intrinsic coherence to determine their quality and the reliability likely to result from them. Then, on the same subject, the different documents available were compared with each other to identify a second level of consistency and possible discrepancies. The primary data collected was in turn compared with what emerged from the secondary data, to determine a third level of confidence.

1.3.3. Report writing and reporting

Once data analysis had been concluded, a debriefing meeting was organised in July 2023 with the UNIDO project team during which preliminary findings from the data collection were presented. The debriefing meeting was followed by the elaboration and submission of the draft TE report to UNIDO. Based on comments made by UNIDO on the draft, a final version of the report was elaborated by the evaluators and submitted to UNIDO.

1.3.4. Principles of the design and execution of the interim evaluation

When designing and executing the TE, the evaluators adhered strictly to the ethical and professional requirements of the United Nations Evaluation Group, accepting and scrupulously respecting its Code of Conduct for evaluation. This included, but was not limited to, impartiality, objectivity, independence, relevance, utility, credibility, measurability, ethics, and partnerships. More specifically, to ensure the highest standard of the mission, the following attitudes were observed:

- Ensuring sources all necessary confidentiality and anonymity;
- Giving equal respect to interviewed stakeholders;
- Respecting the freedom of speech of interviewees;
- Respecting the diversity of stakeholders and reflecting it in an inclusive sampling, with special attention towards women and vulnerable parties;
- Using appropriate protocols to adequately reach women and the most disadvantaged groups;
- Making it clear, at the outset, to all interlocutors that the evaluator is neither a UNDP staff member nor a member of any other stakeholder, but an external and independent professional seeking feedback on the project and its implementation, and that information shared is done so anonymously;
- Communicating with all individuals in a transparent, respectful and calm manner; and
- Refraining from any practices prohibited by law and morality.

1.3.5. Roles and responsibilities of actors engaged in the TE

The roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved in the TE process is presented in **Table 1**.

Table 1: Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in the IE process

Stakeholder	Role and responsibility in the IE process
UNIDO	As the GEF accredited entity (AE), UNIDO commissioned the evaluation including the contracting of external independent evaluators for the TE. UNIDO provided all the relevant project documentation to the external evaluators which included the source of secondary data. Quality checks were provided by UNIDO through the review and provision of feedback on the inception report (evaluation design) and the TE report. Finally, UNIDO took charge for the drafting of a management response and action plan to address recommendations from the TE and submit the document to the GEF Secretariat.
Project stakeholders	These actors engaged with the external evaluators and provided their views relating to project implementation in line with the evaluation criteria used. The information provided by these actors constituted primary data for the evaluation.
Independent external evaluators	The evaluators from FOKABS were responsible for conducting the evaluation assignment. This entailed exploring the primary and secondary data to provide an informed and impartial judgement of the state of implementation of the project in line with the adopted evaluation criteria and UNIDO-GEF guidelines for on TE. To avoid bias, the evaluators used diverse sources of information and employed data triangulation.

	The evaluators have had no prior engagement in the programme thereby guaranteeing independence and objectivity of the evaluation.
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.3.6. Quality assurance in the evaluation process

Quality assurance was employed at two levels within the framework of this evaluation: firstly, within the evaluation team, and secondly between the evaluators and UNIDO. Within the team of evaluators, all deliverables for this assignment were elaborated as per the terms of reference of the IE. All the deliverables were reviewed by the team leader for completeness, ensuring that the deliverables are aligned with the requirements prescribed in the terms of reference. Deliverables that pass the completeness check were submitted to UNIDO. The second level of quality assurance was achieved through the review of the deliverables by the UNIDO team. Comments received from UNIDO and other actors on each deliverable were addressed by the evaluators, after which a revised version of the deliverable alongside a comment matrix was resubmitted to UNIDO.

1.3.7. Limitations of the evaluation

Limitations of the evaluation are two-fold. Firstly, key implementing partners were non-responsive to the questionnaire that was designed for the generation of quantitative data towards the the rating of the evaluation criteria. This posed a challenge in providing a perception of the respondents pertaining to the progress of the project in line with the evaluation criteria. However, the evaluation team provided rating based on their objective judgement of the project's progress. Secondly, the absence of a comprehensive baseline and endline information for the project indicators constrained the effective analysis of project results.

1.4. 1.4 Structure of the Terminal Evaluation report

The TE report is devised into 4 Sections. Section 1 is the Introduction which includes purpose and objective, methodology, limitations of the evaluation among others. Section 2 describes the project and includes the background. In its section 3, the findings of the evaluation are presented in line with the evaluation criteria. Section 4 presents the conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Background

2.1.1. Institutional Context

The key stakeholders of the Gambian electricity sector are National Water and Electricity Utility (NAWEC), the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA), the Ministry of Petroleum and Energy (MoPE), and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs (MoFEA). Electricity, water, and sewerage services in The Gambia are provided by NAWEC, a vertically integrated public utility that handles generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity, as well as water production and distribution, and sewerage. The MoPE is responsible for the implementation of Government policy in relation to electricity supply and distribution and renewable energy. PURA was established in 2001 and conducts tariff reviews and recommends tariff adjustments to the MoFEA, which evaluates the financial implications and provides advice to the president for final decisions. At the institutional level, there is a strong commitment as shown by the following past and ongoing efforts: In 2014, The Government of The Gambia was the first country in Africa to adopt its SE4All Action Agenda together with an Investment Prospectus (IP)¹ for achieving SE4All goals by 2030.

2.1.2. Environmental context

The Gambia is one of the countries that are most prone to climate change due to its low-lying topography, high dependence on subsistence rain-fed agriculture, inadequate drainage and storm water management system coupled with a rapidly expanding un-regulated urban expansion. This has increased the vulnerability of the country to hazards such as flash floods and windstorms which continues to cause loss of life and property in various parts of the country.

The situation is further aggravated by the unequally higher proportion of the population, more than 50 per cent, live in the western part of the country (GBoS, 2016). According to McGranahan, Balk et al. 2007, cited in Jaiteh and Sarr, 2011, the Gambia is ranked among the top ten countries in the world with the highest share of population living within the lower elevation coastal zone (LECZ). Windstorms, floods, rising sea level and coastal erosion and drought have been identified as climate change challenges for the Gambia (Jaiteh and Sarr, 2011).

2.1.3. Demographic context

According to The Gambia Labour Force Survey (2018) the population of The Gambia stands at 2,335,507; with females constituting 51.2% of the total population. Although the majority of the population resides in the urban areas (54%), females constitute the majority of the rural population who have limited opportunities and access to finance for entrepreneurship development, political decision making and information services. About 59.6% of the population lived in urban cities and secondary towns in 2015, which was a substantial increase from the 28.4% recorded in 1980 (Economic Commission for Africa, 2017). The annual rate of urbanization is 3.7% (MOFEA, 2011), and with this pace, if unabated, 71.5% of the population will be city and town dwellers by 2025. The demographic changes are enormous, and it is estimated that by 2025 there will be significant increase in population. Also, about 45% shall be youth (15 to 30 years old) that will be living in the Greater Banjul Area (GBA) and secondary urban centres. This will naturally change policy focus and developmental efforts towards urban programming in The Gambia. It will also create new poverty and welfare challenges, widening gender inequality gaps including growing

demands on reproductive care in both urban and rural localities and pressure on basic service in urban areas. Consequently, these issues have important implications for social protection policy and programming; and the Ministry should be geared to match-up.

2.1.4. Social and Cultural Context

The Gambia is a multi-ethnic and multi-racial society, exhibiting a high degree of ethnic and religious tolerance. Albeit there exists a certain degree of diversity in cultural beliefs and practices among ethnic groups, similar overarching traditions contribute to strong social cohesion. This has significant bearing on informal and community-based child and social protection, which is a main source of support for poor and vulnerable populations. Majority of communities are made-up of patriarchal societies, comprising several clans with family ties that sustain the existing social and economic safety-nets for households, at the same time covering up for matters of domestic violence that take place, thereby justifying female subordination. According to the MICS 2018, 75.70% of girls have gone through Female Genital Mutilation /Cutting and 33.4% of boys and girls are married between the ages 15 - 18. They cherish extended family systems, but the traditional family structures and values are no longer the same as in the past as people struggle to improve their earnings by diversifying income sources to change their way of life. The Gambia has made significant progress towards child and social development in the last decade, becoming one of the top four African countries progressing toward the MDGs related to hunger, primary schooling, and child immunization. Despite these achievements, the country's demographic, economic and social indicators remain disturbing.

2.1.5. Political and legal context

Gambians have ushered in a third Republic following the historic election victory of Coalition 2016 on 2nd December 2016 and a protracted standoff peacefully resolved through the intervention of ECOWAS. A new Administration headed by His Excellency President Adamma Barrow was formed.

However, the historic change that ushered in a new democratic dispensation with the promise of expanded freedoms, security and safety for citizens also underscores the urgent need for vigorous action to address the political, social, and economic problems of the people including national reconciliation. The Administration has subscribed to the Sustainable Energy for All 2030 Agenda as an important pre-requisite for the attainment of the NDP goals and other blueprints such as the National Energy Policy (2015-2020).

Conversely, The Gambia's constitution of 1997 provides for participatory democracy, separation of powers, judicial independence and fundamental human rights. The country has a unicameral legislature with the National Assembly (Parliament) consisting of 58 members for a five-year term. The Gambia's laws include Acts of the National Assembly and subsidiary legislation made under said Acts, the common law and principles of equity, Customary law so far as concerns members of the communities to which it applies, the Sharia (which is applicable to over 95% of the population) as regards matters of marriage, divorce, and inheritance among members of the communities to which it applies. The practice of Sharia in matters of inheritance among male and female siblings (and matters of marriages) are issues of concern, and not in sync with the principles of equity. The Ministry must recognize and operate within the trajectories of these legislations with caution to mitigate the negative aspects of culture to promote equality of women and men, girls and boys, to sustain stability and co-existence. The Gambian legal system is modelled on the English Legal system as it incorporates the Common Law, doctrines of equity and statute of General Application.

Regarding the energy sector, the main regulatory framework for RE in The Gambia is the RE Act (2013). The law marks a major step by the Government of The Gambia to promote RE in the country. Specifically, the law creates the RE Fund to facilitate investments in RE. Other key issues the Act addresses is standards

in the RE sector for both equipment and also for installers. There is a legal requirement for each installer to guarantee all installation for a minimum of one year. On the issue of investment, the Act provides for far reaching incentives such as a 25 years tax exemption for VAT and corporate tax. Building on the RE Act, the government adopted a second National Energy Policy [NEP] 2014 – 2018 and in 2016 the National Renewable Energy Action Plan, the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan and the SE4ALL Action Agenda.

2.1.6. Economic Context

The Gambia is among the Low-Income, Food Deficit Countries (LIFDC) of the world, and has a Human Development Index (HDI) estimated at 0.466 ranking the country 174 out of 189 countries in 2018. Gambia's value of the HDI is below the average of 0.507 for countries in the low human development group and below the average of 0.541 for countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) at current prices is at GMD 49.2 billion² equivalent to slightly above US\$1 billion (with exchange rate at GMD48.50 per US\$). The main drivers of growth are services, contributing 58 percent to 61 percent of the GDP from 2013 to 2017 respectively; followed by the Agriculture Sector, which is the main source of livelihood for most of the population³ contributing 24 to 27 percent to GDP within the same period; but predominantly subsistence with rice being the main staple food and groundnuts being the main cash crop. The tourism sector has contributed approximately 20 percent of GDP in 2016 and has been the largest foreign exchange earner. However, over the years remittances and international aid have played an important role in sustaining the economy. The main features of the economy are its small size and narrow market; and is little diversified relying mainly on agriculture, tourism, re-export trade. The country has a small export base, with groundnuts, cashew and fish as the main export commodities.

2.1.7. National Policy Framework

The policy and regulatory framework of the energy sector in The Gambia is nascent but continues to play an important role in the policy, administration and promulgation of legislation. Overall, the legislative and regulatory frameworks for renewable energy and energy efficiency are still in their infancy in the country and further development is required specially to encourage private-sector involvement and investment. One of the constraining factors to ensuring in renewable energy and energy efficiency development is inadequate investment especially the private sector and inadequate technical capacities in the Government and private sector. An important national Blueprint for the energy sector is the National Energy Policy of The Gambia, (2015-2020) which among others seeks to: improve and expand existing energy supply systems through private sector partnership with the public sector; provide an impetus to socio-economic development through enhanced productive use of energy in industry and in rural areas; reduce the Gambia's dependence on imports of petroleum products for energy supply; minimise environmental impacts of energy supply through the promotion of more environment-friendly energy supply sources such as renewable energy and natural gas. Reduce the inefficient utilisation of energy resources through utilisation of energy efficient technologies; UEMOA-IREN Initiative for Sustainable Energies among others.

2.2. Problem Statement

A low adoption of innovative technologies such as EE appliances, Improved Cooking solutions and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration has led to an increase in GHG emissions, and other unintended consequences.

2.3. Project Objectives

The project's objective is to operationalize the Sustainable Energy for All Action Agenda in The Gambia by catalysing investments in improved cook stoves and energy efficient appliances.

2.4. Project duration and budget

The project "Operationalization of the SE4All Action Agenda: Promoting inclusive, environmentally-sound and low- carbon development (SAP: 160041)" is financed by the GEF. The cost of the project is US\$ 8,199,497, of which a GEF allocation of US\$ 1,781,484 and a co-financing of US\$ 6,418,013 from diverse sources including: UNIDO, MoPE, FAO, ECREEE, Federation of Cashew Farmers Association, Africell, Balafon Company Limited, Petrogas, and NAWEC. The project has as start and end dates April 30, 2017 and July 31, 2023 respectively⁴. UNIDO is the implementing agency of the project, the executing entities of the project include:

- NEA;
- MoPE;
- TGSB;
- ECREEE;
- FAO;
- Africell.

2.5. Main Stakeholders

The main stakeholders of the project are MoPE, UNIDO, AFRICELL, ABC Enterprise, TSGB, Unique Solution, SDF, NEA, FAO, and Women Initiative the Gambia.

2.6. 2.7 Theory of Change

A theory of change for the project was not identified through the review of the project document.

⁴ See: <https://open.unido.org/projects/GM/projects/160041>

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Project design and formulation

The project was well designed because it was based on the SE4ALL ACTION AGENDA by 2030 which is congruent to the national priorities in the energy sector. The project design entailed consultation of diverse stakeholders, an approach which promotes inclusivity and country ownership.

3.1.1. Analysis of results framework

The Results Framework has all the characteristics of GEF funded projects. The results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) is well defined with corresponding indicators and targets as elaborated in the project document. However, lack of or paucity of data to conduct a thorough assessment of results has posed challenges. A baseline survey for all the indicators in the results chain at the beginning of the project and endline survey at the end would have helped.

3.1.2. Assumptions and risks

The assumptions and risks identified at the beginning of the project design have helped in the achievement of project outputs and outcomes. In all, a total of the 13 assumptions were made during the conception of the project. Of these, the stability of the political and social situation of the country, the Government of The Gambia's commitment to implementing the SE4All Action Agenda, the willingness of the private sector to sell EE solutions and Consumers' willingness to shift to energy efficient lighting materialized during project delivery.

3.1.3. Lessons from other relevant projects

The project design was informed by past and ongoing projects at the time. The conception of the SE4ALL project was informed by the GEF 4 and GEF 5 projects that were being implemented by UNIDO in The Gambia at the time. SE4ALL was also designed to coordinate with the FAO GEF 5 project in The Gambia to generate mutual benefits and synergy. The GEF 6 project was envisaged to impact the "Community-Based Dryland Forest Management" project through the design, production and distribution of adapted, available and affordable EE cook stoves to curb firewood consumption and deforestation. Equally, the GEF 6 project was envisaged to support the "Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change" project by possibly providing support to targeted community gardens through the introduction of EE lighting and cold storage powered by solar.

3.1.4. Planned stakeholder participation

Effective stakeholder participation is crucial for the effective implementation and sustainability of projects. At the planning phase, the stakeholders that were planned to participate in the project include MoPE, FAO, Africell, ECREEE, SDF, ABC, Enterprise, NAWEC, the Hotel Industry, Federation of Cashew Farmers Association, Petrogas, Ecobank, and NRA. However, the last 5 listed institutions did not effectively participate due mainly to the delays in funding, as well as technical and financial reasons.

3.1.5. Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector

The findings of the TE did not suggest any linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector. The project's had talks with NAWEC for potential partnership but it did not materialize.

3.2. Project implementation

3.2.1. Adaptive management

COVID-19 pandemic has had a negative impact on the project leading to delays in the implementation of activities. At the inception of the project, workplan and budgets were agreed upon between the project developers and UNIDO. However, with time the supply chain was interrupted especially for equipment that were procured outside the country leading to considerable delays and subsequent increase in prices. The remedial actions taken by the project was to (1 Extend the project duration, 2) Revise the project and 3) Reduce the scope of work.

3.2.2. Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements

Stakeholder participation was high because a number of institutions and agencies were brought together notably Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, Department of Community Development, and regional authorities. The National Platform on nexus issues and the Project Steering Committee serve as appropriate and conducive avenues for stakeholder engagement. MoPE was able to purchase 1000 improved cook stoves from ABC Enterprise. The evaluation revealed that all stakeholders were engaged, including MoPE, NEA, TRADE, Agriculture, Youth Representative and Gender Directorate. National Platform established and used on a regular basis to discuss and address the nexus between energy and policies, programs and projects in other sectors. Project Steering Committee level brought in different stakeholders' government, non-governmental and private sector.

3.2.3. Project finance and co-finance

The GEF 6 project has a total financing of US\$ 6,223,490 of which US\$ 4,441, 865 was co-financed by the Project developers- Generally, UNIDO provided 30 percent of the funds as grants and 70 percent as co-financed by project developers. However, the co-financing were in some instances higher or lower than 70 percent depending on the type of activity,

3.2.4. Monitoring and evaluation system

The rating for monitoring and evaluation is **Satisfactory**. The evaluation revealed that there is a monitoring and evaluation plan for individual projects complemented by weekly/bi-weekly meetings between UNIDO HQ and PMO to track project's progress. Dedicated meetings were also held between UNIDO HQ, MoPE and other relevant stakeholders as needed. The individual project plans underwent revisions due to delays in fund disbursement as well as project execution. For instance, delays were recorded in the Department of Community Development, The Gambia Standard Bureau, and Women Initiative the Gambia up to a year due to covid 19 pandemic. Monitoring and evaluation data was used to inform and enhance delivery of the project. As data was collected, recommendations were made and sent to UNIDO headquarters on issues such as project extension, certification for work completion, contract amendments and updates on the status of project implementation.

3.2.5. Project implementation and execution

The rating for Project implementation and execution is **Satisfactory**. The strategic leadership of UNIDO in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project has paid dividends in the attainment of the project objectives. However, the evaluation reveals that a lot more needs to be done by UNIDO including the following:

- Need for more regular project monitoring and feedback,
- Minimization of bureaucracy in the disbursement of funds,
- Improvement in the limitless of fund disbursed by UNIDO,
- Increase funding to increase outreach and scale up existing operations,
- Improvement in the turnaround time,
- Implementation of more training programs for women and youth.

3.2.6. Risk Management

Projects are designed and implemented to achieve optimal benefits that are to ensure continuity and sustenance. Such arrangements and mechanisms are normally embedded in some project design and formulation. Similarly, studies have also shown that a lot of projects do not witness continuity because such mechanisms were not factored during project design. However, for the GEF6 project and as highlighted by the project stakeholders, adequate and explicit mechanisms that will avert any risks to sustainability have been identified in the project so that the benefits that accrued will continue beyond project implementation. These mechanisms include but are not limited to:

- Development and operationalization of a maintenance plan for the equipment;
- Capacity building of the communities on management of the project eg, cleaning of the solar panels;
- Annual fees paid by beneficiaries of vegetable gardens;

- Community fund for the maintenance of street lights;
- Ensuring availability of skilled personnel in the communities for any maintenance of equipment;
- Full operationalisation of the National Platform for dispute resolution on forest and land matters;
- Government funding through subventions; and
- Generation of funds from the testing of appliances and MoPE involving the private sector through private public partnership.

3.3. Project Results

3.3.1. Progress towards Objectives and Expected Outputs and Outcomes

The project sought to implement the Sustainable Energy for All Agenda by providing energy efficient lighting and improved cook stoves to institutions and communities as well as establishing quality assurance of the products among others. The evaluation reveals that except the latter, which suffered some setbacks due mainly to the delay in the disbursement of funds, both implementing partners and beneficiaries of EE lighting and improved cooked stoves have expressed great satisfaction in the project results.

Moreover, the TE reveals that the GEF 6 project was well designed to meet its intended objectives. However, the impact of COVID-19 pandemic has led to an alteration of the design. The heat pump chillers originally meant for the hotel industry had to be re-allocated to support the provision of water and other facilities for the community gardens. Despite the pandemic which affected the supply chain and led to price hikes, most of the project results were achieved. The project to a large extent achieved its intended objectives and targets. The project has a total of 26 Output targets. Out of these, 11 targets were achieved, the targets for 2 have been exceeded while the targets for 10 have not been attained at the time of the TE. The achievement of 3 of the output targets could not be determined due to lack of data.

Assessment of Project Outputs

The overall output rating is **Satisfactory**. The tables below shows the project outputs, and their indicators by the respective Components. The table indicates that the targets for 11 and 2 outputs were achieved and overachieved respectively.

Component 1: National Platform to foster Nexus issues

Results Analysis of outputs under Component 1: This component has 2 outputs and targets for both of them have been achieved.

Table 1: Result analysis of outputs in Component 1:

Output	Output Indicators	End of Project status	Rating
1.1 National platform established and used on a regular basis to discuss and address the nexus between energy and policies, programmes and projects in other sectors	Availability and use of a National Platform to discuss and address nexus between energy and policies, programmes and projects in other sectors	Platform established; quarterly meetings are held to discuss energy nexus issues and provides advisory services and also communicates to members & non-members of the platform. Customs-tax reduction and exemption are made to EE solutions imports, the Platform is gender sensitive in its composition as well.	Achieved

1.2_ Policy recommendations around energy nexus issues are made	Number of recommendations made on energy nexus issues	Several recommendations were made on energy nexus to relevant sectors such as Health, Education, Environment, Agriculture and Water Resources among other.	Achieved
-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------

Component 2: Promoting the use of Energy Efficient Appliances

Results Analysis of outputs under Component 2: This Component has 4 outputs. The indicator for Output 2.1 has three targets- 55,000 LED Bulbs sold to the public, 2000 LED bulbs installed in public buildings and 5,000 street lights. The project procured through Unique Solutions, 300 street lights which is below the target. Regarding the LED bulbs in public buildings, the project installed 4000 exceeding its target however, the evaluation could not determine the level of achievement of the LED bulbs sold to the public due to lack of data. Equally, the achievement for Output 2.2 could not be determined due to lack of data. Output 2.3 has exceeded its target by training 22 people in marketing and distribution skills and Output 2.4 was not implemented.

Table 2: Results Analysis of Outputs in Component 2

Output	Output Indicator	End of project Status	Rating
2.1. LED bulbs adopted in public buildings, street lights, households and private sector	Number of LED bulbs adopted in public buildings, street lights, households and private sector:	The business community in The Gambia did not apply for this component of the project from SDF and hence was not implemented in place of this activity, UNIDO issued a contract to SDF to manage grant financing to the private sector, public institutions, community organizations, non-governmental organizations in the production and/or distribution of efficient cooking devices and alternative cooking fuels and distribution of energy efficient appliances.	Target not Achieved
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55,000 LED Bulbs are procured and sold to the public by the private businesses 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5000 street lights 	3000 street lights	Target not achieved
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2000 LED bulbs for public building 	4000 LED Bulbs	Exceeded
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10,000 collection points for the disposal of the incandescent bulbs 	This activity was not conducted because of resource constraints	Not Achieved

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10,000 vouchers distributed • About 2 SMS sent per year on EE lighting • 1 awareness-raising campaign based on a promotion video/audio and interviews done with partners through other media channels will be rolled out (incl. radio, TV) and face-to-face demo sessions undertaken on EE lighting in a targeted geographical area 	<p>This activity is linked to the disposal of incandescent bulbs which was not conducted</p> <p>At least 2 SMS texts were sent per year by AFRICEL which reached about 1.5 million people</p> <p>A promotion video was developed and aired on the TV with interviews, face-to-face demo sessions were conducted in 5 of the 10 targeted communities in the West Coast Region.</p>	<p>Not Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>
2.2 Other EE appliances are installed across the country	<p>Number of Acs, Freezers installed across the country</p> <p>Target: 1000</p>	<p>8 Freezers were installed by the project in the vegetable gardens. AFRICEL installed 342 EE ACs in their offices. It should be noted that the fund allocated for the 20 solar. Thermal systems were re-allocated to support the vegetable gardens due to the non-responsiveness of the business sector to the Thermal system. However, Information on the number of Freezers sold by SDF to the public was not available to determine the achievement of the target Acs and Freezers of 1000</p>	Undetermined
2.3 Technical and marketing & distribution skills related to EE appliances are built	<p>Number of people trained in technical expertise, marketing and distribution skills), at least 40 % women and one third to come from the provinces</p> <p>Target: 20</p>	<p>22 people were trained in marketing and distribution skills, over half of them were women but none of them came from the provinces.</p>	Exceeded
2.4 Facilitating access to finance and other incentives for EE appliances dissemination	<p>Finance and other incentives for EE appliances dissemination on the supply and demand side are accessed</p>	<p>All but one target has been met which is the exemption of tax for EE appliances. The activities leading to the</p>	Not achieved

on the supply and demand side		achievement of the output were stalled.	
-------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------	--

Component 3: Promoting the production and use of efficient cook stoves and alternative cooking fuels

Results Analysis of outputs under Component 3: This Component has 4 outputs of these, only output 3.1 had been achieved at the time of the TE. Due to the lack of data, the achievement of Output 3.2 could not be determined. Output 3.3 did not meet its target of 20 trainees and the target for Output 3.4 was not met because the activity was not implemented.

Table 3: Results Analysis of outputs in Components 3

Output	Output Indicator	End of Project status	Rating
3.1 Demonstration of agro-waste promoted as clean cooking fuels	Tons of agro-waste used to produce briquettes and biochar Target: 17,000 tons of agro- waste based briquettes & biochar produced annually by different producers	The delay in the receipt of funds from SDF has led to the delay in the achievement of project outputs. The machinery for the processing of agro-waste has been procured and 5 out of the 10 targeted communities are currently being trained but production of agro-waste as a clean cooking fuel has not started hence targets for this indicator have not been met.	Not Achieved
	Number of new point of sales Target: 12 points of sales at existing retailers in addition to production sites are set	Activity not implemented hence target not met	Not Achieved
	Average number of SMS on alternative cooking fuels sent per year Target: 2 SMS/year are sent on alternative cooking fuels to 1.5 M Africell subscribers	2 SMS/year were sent on alternative cooking fuels to 1.5 M Africell subscribers	Achieved
	Number of awareness raising campaigns other than via SMS Target: TV, radio, printed media and community meetings are organized	TV, radio, printed media and community meetings were used to raise awareness on alternative cooking solutions	Achieved
	Number of people sensitized on the usage of alternative cooking fuels via face-to face demo and other media	A face-to-face demo on the usage of alternative cooking fuels was conducted in 5 of the 10 targeted communities. More than 70 % of the population	Achieved

	Sensitization Target: At least 70% of the population is sensitized on alternative cooking fuels	has been sensitized on alternative cooking fuels.	
3.2 Private companies and distributors as well as public and development institutions engaged in manufacturing and distribution of ICS	Number of Private companies and distributors as well as public and development institutions engaged in manufacturing and distribution of ICS	Data not available	Undetermined
3.3 Technical and marketing & distribution skills related to clean cooking solutions are built	Number of people whose skills were built in technical, marketing and distribution of clean cooking solutions (20)	25 people were trained in technical marketing and distribution of clean cooking solutions	Achieved
3.4 Facilitating access to finance and other incentives for clean cooking solutions dissemination on the supply and demand side	Finance and other incentives for clean cooking solutions dissemination on the supply and demand side are accessed	Activity not implemented	Not Achieved

Component 4: quality Assurance

Results Analysis of outputs under Component 4; This Component has 2 outputs. The target for output 4.1 has been achieved whilst the target for output 4.2 was not.

Table 4: Results analysis of Outputs in component 4

Output	Output Indicator	Current status	Rating
4.1 National Quality Assurance Committee on EE Solutions established to develop performance labelling schemes for EE appliances and standards for clean cooking solutions	Dedicated committee on quality assurance for targeted EE solutions operational Target: National EE Solutions Committee under TGSCB is put in place and operational	A National EE Solutions Committee has been established and operational	Achieved
4.2 Performance labelling scheme for EE appliances and standards for clean cooking operationalized	Number of adapted performance labelling scheme for EE appliances incl. testing protocols Target: At least one performance	Performance labelling has not started	Not Achieved Not Achieved

	labelling scheme for EE appliances developed incl. testing protocols		
	Number of standards developed for clean cooking incl. testing protocols Target: Standards for cook stoves and clean cooking fuels developed incl. testing protocols	Standards not developed	Not Achieved

Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation

Results Analysis of Outputs under Component 5. This Component has 3 outputs - Outputs 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, all of which had been attained at TE.

Table 5 Results Analysis of Outputs under Component 5

Output	Output Indicator	Current status	Rating
5.1 Initial environmental impact assessment carried out	Report on the Environmental Impact Assessment for the project	Report on the Environmental Impact Assessment for the project is available	Achieved
5.2 Progress monitored, documented and recommended actions formulated	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting on project activities	Even though monitoring has not been done regularly on quarterly basis, progress on project implementation has been monitored, evaluated, reported and remedial actions taken. Moreover, lack of or paucity in baseline and endline data has constrained the measurement of the results of the project.	Achieved
Output 3: Conduct a Terminal Evaluation of the Project	A terminal Evaluation of the GEF 6 Project conducted	Terminal Evaluation is being conducted	Achieved

Assessment of Project Outcomes

The project has 5 Outcomes with 10 Outcome indicators, half of which have not been achieved. The target for 2 of these indicators has been achieved and 1 has exceeded its target and two could not be determined due to lack of data. The table below gives an analysis of the outcomes.

Table 6: Results Analysis of Outcome Indicators

Outcome	Outcome Indicator	End of Project Status	Rating
Outcome 1: increased integration of energy issues into policies,	Number of projects from different sectors that	Data/information not available. Advocacy activities through the Platform are ongoing but the relevant institutions could not provide	Undetermined

programmes and projects into other sectors	incorporated the energy dimension Target: 20	information on the indicator target which could only be obtained through a survey.	
Outcome	Indicators	End of Project Status	Rating
Outcome 2: Increased use of efficient lights and other EE appliances	2.1 Number of EE appliances adopted Target: 62,000 EE light are installed across the country	Due to lack of data, 55,000 of the 62,000 LED bulbs targeted to be sold in the market as well as 1000 refrigerators could not be determined; 300 out of the targeted 5,000 street lights were installed	Undetermined
	2.2 Number of beneficiaries trained on tailored training programme Target 20	22 people were trained on tailored-made training on EE light and other EE appliances	Achieved
	2.3 Number of awareness raising activities conducted Target 2	Over 1.5 million people were reached in the awareness raising on EE light	Achieved
	2.4 Catered financial products developed	Activity not conducted and hence outcome not achieved	Not Achieved

Outcome	Indicators	End of Project Status	Rating
Outcome3: Increased production and use of efficient cook stoves and alternative cooking fuels	3.1 Number of improved cook stoves produced and used in The Gambia Target 5,000	Over 20,000 improved cook stoves were produced.	Exceeded
	3.2 Tons of firewood saved Target 5,000 tons annually	Production of alternative cooking fuel like agro-waste has not started but currently on-going	Not Achieved
	3.3 GHC emissions reduced Target At least 30,000 tCO ₂ e direct emissions reduction per year (from EE stoves using less firewood and EE stoves using alternative cooking fuels)	Even though the 5000 target for ICS has been exceeded by 15,000 ICS, the production of 17,000 tons of alternative cooking fuels (agro-waste) has not been met due to delays in fund disbursement to Gambia Women's Initiative project.	Target not Achieved

		However, with this significance increase and use of ICS, one could surmise that a reduction in GHG emissions has occurred but not with the use of agro-waste but charcoal.	
	3.4 Share of alternative cooking fuels Target: Increased share of alternative cooking fuels		Not Achieved

Outcome	Indicators	End of Project status	Rating
Outcome 4: Increased national capacity to uptake energy efficient appliances and clean cooking solutions in compliance with quality standards	4.1 Institutional and commercial capacities of market enablers from public & private sector for the supply and demand side Target: Relevant market enablers are able to develop, enforce and follow standards for EE solutions for the supply and demand side	Despite the delay, due partly to the COVID-19 pandemic, a laboratory has been built for light testing, the relevant equipment procured and staff trained in the use of the spectrophotometer but training on the goniophotometer is yet to commence which will be followed by another training in labelling before the commissioning and full operationalization of the scheme.	Not Achieved

3.3.2. Relevance

The overall relevance of the project is **Highly Satisfactory**. The Project has been aligned with the national priority needs and blue prints such as NDP, Vision 2020, National Energy Policy (2021-2030), Agenda 2063, Sustainable Energy for All Agenda, 2030, The Climate Change Policy, The Gambia Climate Strategy, Gambia Environmental Action Plan, GNIP, as well as that of all implementing partners and project beneficiaries. The project is also relevant to the institutional mandate of the Project Developers which include advocacy, promote and contribute to environmentally sound and low carbon development which is evident and manifested in the service they render to the Gambian populace. Among the services they provide are production and distribution of clean and efficient cook stoves for households and institutions, production of clean cooking fuels, light testing laboratory, Goniophotometer, light Spectrometer, provision of energy efficient bulbs (led) Air conditioners for institutions and community street lights as well as solar fridges, Solar lights for the community gardens. Equally important is the relevance of the project and the immense contribution it has made in addressing the needs of the communities particularly women.

3.3.3. Effectiveness

The rating for overall effectiveness of the project is **Satisfactory**. Energy efficiency is a key priority for The Gambia's sustained economic growth and development in the context of sustainable development. Therefore, the use of energy efficient appliances and ICS has contributed towards the reduction of operational cost of services and also reduce the carbon footprint of the country. The interventions from the implementing partners varied in nature as a per their

mandate and expertise. However, the project was effective in delivering the following among others: plant for the production of cook stoves, agro- waste to produce briquette (carbonised groundnut and coconut shell) as clean cooking fuels, production and distribution of clean cook stoves, provision of energy efficient LED bulbs, energy efficient air conditioners, energy efficient cook stoves, kitchens built in schools, FAO Thiaroye Technology stoves, FTT built in fish landing sites, environment education manual for school children developed, solar street lights, solar freezers, light testing laboratory, goniophotometer and spectrophotometer among others.

Component 1: National platform to foster nexus issues

This component aims at integrating energy issues in a more systematic manner in other sectors as energy is crucial to any income generating and public services activity. This component was geared at creating the institutional framework and necessary capacities to adopt and apply the nexus approach by targeted public and private organizations (all members of the national platform) to ensure that the activities continue even after project completion.

Even though the activities under component 1 of the project have largely been implemented, a lot more needs to be done for effective integration of energy nexus into the various policies and programmes. Regarding the extent to which energy issues are integrated into policies, programmes and projects in other sectors, it can only be determined through a national survey. However, anecdotal evidence shows that energy issues are being mainstreamed into the policies and programmes of other sectors given the indispensability of this vital resource. Policy recommendations continue to be made for sectors to embrace the energy nexus and to have it fully institutionalized.

Component 2: Promoting the use of energy efficient appliances

This component builds on the feasibility study conducted during the development of the SE4ALL IP of The Gambia and sought to promote the use of energy efficient appliances including LED bulbs, Improved cook stoves and air-conditioners among others.

The evaluation reveals that the highest level of satisfaction reported by the project beneficiaries is in the provision of EE lights. A leading GSM company reported that as a result of the positive impact of the project, they have started installing EE Acs and LED light bulbs in all their offices and outlets. Less consumption of electricity, durability of the energy efficient bulbs, improved lighting system to a great extent, saved hospital resources and improved reproductive health services leading to better maternity outcomes in health facilities. Improved lighting equally led to reduction in theft and burglary and an improvement in security.



Figure 1: People of Mamutfana showing appreciation and joy for the provision of street lights in their community during interview



Figure 2: Water Supply in Dampha Kunda Vegetable Garden, Upper River Region of The Gambia

Component 3: Promoting the production and use of efficient cook stoves and alternative cooking fuels

The component sought to promote the production and use of efficient cook stoves and alternative cooking fuels through the establishment of 17,000t of agro waste facility. It also aims to promote cooking fuels, private companies and distributors as well as public and development institutions engaged in manufacturing and distribute 5,000 ICS. Initiatives under the component also support technical, marketing & distribution skills related to clean cooking solutions, train 20 practitioners, and facilitate their access to finance. The component is being implemented in partnership with UNIDO, Women Initiative Gambia, ABC Gaye and FAO while Africell and other partners play sensitization and advocacy roles. The Gambia Women's Initiative is processing Agro-waste into briquette (cooking fuel), cooking demonstrations using the product were conducted in the communities creating a high demand in the market. However, the project has not started the full production of the briquette.

Pertaining to the production of improved cook stoves, two production plants have been constructed which will enable the production of improved stoves all year round. Training on improved cook stoves production has improved institutional mandates, broadened networks and partnerships, improved health status of women and reduced charcoal consumption which drives depletion of forest resources.



Figure 3: Improved Cooking Stoves (Jambarr) at the DCD Production Plant

Component 4: Quality Assurance

This component undertakes to increase national capacity to uptake energy efficient appliances and clean cooking solutions in compliance with quality standards and aims at ensuring quality assurance and control for EE solutions via performance labelling schemes for EE appliances and quality standards for improved cook stoves. The main implementing agent under the component is TGSB with the responsibility to develop National Quality Assurance for EE Solutions Committee and deliver training on developed quality standards and performance labelling scheme to key stakeholders.

Quality assurance, labelling and capacity building for the uptake of all targeted EE solutions is a key component of the project in order to ensure the uptake of all the targeted EE solutions. The national capacity is being increased in the uptake of energy efficient appliances and clean cooking solutions with the procurement of the necessary equipment for testing of light such as a Goniophotometer which has an edge over spectrophotometer and Spectrometer. Training for the use of these state of art equipment has been done and the commissioning will follow very soon.

Key Enabling Factors

Successes in project implementation were a result of the following:

- High levels of awareness creation on the project. The multi-media campaign organized under the project has helped in raising awareness of the project.

- Cost-effectiveness of the products. The products of the project including LED bulbs and ICS are reasonable in price resulting in an increase in demand of the products.
- High demand for the products. Due to their intrinsic value, demand for the products such as street lights, EE LED bulbs in office buildings, Freezers, etc outstripped supply particularly the beneficiary institutions and communities.
- The PMO has shown commitment and dedication to the project by monitoring individual project milestone achievements and providing the implementing partners and beneficiaries, constant advice in the implementation of the project.
- The project design was comprehensive and built on experience of the previous GEF projects in The Gambia. This has strengthened the project design and avoided duplication of activities.
- An Environmental Impact Assessment conducted before the commencement of the project has helped in mitigating potential negative environmental impact of the project.
- Strong project ownership. Due to the extensive consultations during project design and the good participation of both Government and Private Sectors as well as the communities, institutions, a strong ownership of the project was built facilitating the success of the project.
- Several engagements with project partners and stakeholders were held to solicit their views and garner their buy-in. Face-to-face meetings and stakeholder workshops were held and this contributing towards stakeholders' buy-in for the project.
- High commitment of the stakeholders. Almost if not all Project Developers fulfilled their co-financing obligations and have actively participated in project activities including membership to the National Platform among others.
- Most public and private institutions have corporate and social responsibilities towards the masses. The desire to fulfil their corporate and social responsibilities which are also aligned to the project objective motivated them to embrace the project.
- Commitment to addressing Climate Change issues. Climate change is global issue which galvanized the public and private sector institutions into taking appropriate actions to address the menace.

Constraining factors

- Co-financing which is a precondition for the Project Implementing Partners has been reported as a major constraint especially for institutions with a limited revenue base. The magnitude of co-financing varies from one project to another. For the GEF project the co-financing percentage ranges from 70 to 90 percent depending on the type of investment and institution which was reported to be too high by some implementing partners.
- Inflation and supply chain disruptions as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and delay in disbursement of funds by UNIDO lead to increase in the cost of EE appliances, manufacturing and prices of ICS.
- Poor quality project proposals from beneficiaries. The TE revealed that an awful lot of Project proposals were poor in quality limiting the success of many genuine institutions and beneficiary communities. This is ascribed to the inadequate technical expertise in project proposal writing.
- Inadequate budget has also been reported as per the evaluation report. There is a high demand for energy efficient products such as cook stoves, LED bulbs, solar street lights, solar freezers but the fund is inadequate. In order words, the demand is higher than the supply. The high demand for energy efficient appliances is mainly due to the high rate of return and the cost effectiveness.
- The ECOWAS Centre on Renewable Energy Efficiency, ECREE located in Praia challenged delivery leading to delays and other implementation challenges.

3.3.4. Efficiency

The project experiences a judicious use of resources even though the lack of project developers for Heat Pump killers and Solar Thermal necessitated the re-allocation of funds for the supply of water, solar panels and freezer to Dampha Kunda Women's Garden and SDF for energy efficient lighting and improved cook stoves. Delays in disbursement

were also reported which led to the delays in the timely completion of project activities. The efficiency of the project is rated **Satisfactory**.

3.3.5. Overall Outcome Rating

Based on the assessment/rating of efficiency, effectiveness and relevance, the overall outcome rating is **Satisfactory**.

3.3.6. Country Ownership

The TE revealed that the country ownership for the SE4ALL project is quite strong since the project addressed the priorities and needs of the government and people of The Gambia. Extensive consultations with stakeholders prior to the execution of the project were made. Additionally, an Environmental Impact was carried out at the beginning of the project to determine whether the project will have any negative impact on the environment. The establishment and operationalization of the Project Steering Committee and the energy nexus Platform for the project, the provision of counterpart funding and coordination by Government, the active involvement of the private sector, CSO as well as the communities in the project are all clear manifestation of country ownership.

3.3.7. Gender

The rating for Gender Mainstreaming is **Highly Satisfactory**. The project recognizes gender equality, equity and women empowerment as an important element in the attainment of Sustainable Energy for All Agenda and ensured that gender perspectives pervade all aspects of the project cycle. The evaluation assessed the extent to which gender was mainstreamed in the project cycle. The TE revealed that gender was mainstreamed in the project cycle by UNIDO, MoPE, Project Developer and all the other stakeholders including the beneficiaries at the community. Almost all implementing partners and beneficiaries also reported that women were highly involved in all the activities of the project including the installation of LED Bulbs in the beneficiary communities. In fact, some key project activities were reported to be headed by women.

3.3.8. Crosscutting Issues

Whilst the importance of training in any institution cannot be overemphasised, the TE reveals that the project received some training opportunities and shared experience and learned from others during project delivery. A case in point is the visit of personnel from Fisheries Department to FAO to learn and share with them the ICS innovations of the Thiaroye Technology stove, FTT. Moreover, a video documentary was produced by UNIDO on success stories and lessons learnt the ICS and cold storage.

As study tour to Ghana was also organized by the project which added value to the project implementation by broadening the exposure of the project beneficiaries. Lastly but not the least, Project Steering Committee meetings created a conducive platform for stakeholders to share and learn from each other's experience. Workshops also served as an important avenue for sharing of experiences.

3.3.9. Environmental and Social Safeguards

The rating for the Environmental and Social Safeguards is **Highly Satisfactory**. Prior to project implementation, an Environmental Impact Assessment was undertaken to determine the potential impact on the project. The evaluation revealed that except the mining of clay in Kombo East for the manufacturing of improved cook stoves which can lead to land degradation, the project did not have any negative impact on the environment. Regarding social safeguard, women, youth and other vulnerable groups have been considered during the design of the project.

3.3.10. Sustainability

The rating for Sustainability is **Moderately Likely**.

Environmental risk: while improved stoves come with a positive environmental benefit pertaining to the reduction in the use of charcoal which translates into reduced forest degradation, the mining of clay for the production of these stoves could lead to environmental degradation. The use of energy efficient light bulbs has great potentials for

reducing energy consumption which could translate into reduced GHG emissions. The environmental risk to sustainability of the project is rated **Moderately Likely**.

Financial risk: while the project supported some beneficiaries in the acquisition of energy efficient light bulbs, it is uncertain how things will play out after the life of the project. Companies that have adopted energy efficient appliances have recorded associated benefits and these actors are financially viable to replace an energy efficient appliance and its end of life. However, for households, the situation could be different. Households may find it financially challenging to replace an LED bulb at its end-of-life and may rather prefer to go after a cheaper bulb. Continuous sensitization on energy efficient technologies over the national media could convince households to stick to LED bulbs due to their economic benefits. The financial risk to sustainability is **Moderately Likely**.

Socio-economic risk: the evaluation did not identify any socio-economic risk. The socio-economic risk to sustainability is therefore **Likely**.

Institutional framework and governance risk: the project supported the establishment of a laboratory for testing light bulbs, purchase of modern equipment for the testing, and the training of staff of the TGSB in the use of the equipment. There is a risk that if the trained individuals are transferred or appointed to other functions, a void might be created due to the lack of a competent personnel to continue conducting the testing of the light bulbs. The institutional framework and governance risk to the project is **Moderately Likely**.

3.3.11. Project Additionality

The Additionality of the project assesses the following: Global Environment benefits, Legal or Regulatory Reforms, Institutional Strengthening, Financing Flows, and Adoption of New Technologies. Below is a summary of the assessment:

Global Environment benefits: The project aims at operationalizing the Sustainable Energy for All Agenda, 2030 in The Gambia through the provision of EE lights, Improved Cooking solutions, cold storage, etc, with the ultimate aim of reducing GHG emissions. It was estimated that the project will lead to a reduction of 316,443 CO₂e which will be a direct contribution of the project. Given the non-availability of endline data the TE could not ascertain the reductions. However, the anecdotal evidence during interviews shows that the project beneficiaries in no uncertain terms are now more aware of the benefits of using energy saving appliances resulting in reductions in energy consumptions and expenditure on their energy bills.

Legal or regulatory reforms:

The implementation of the project led to an introduction of regulation for the exemption of tax on EE appliances and ICS. Other than that, the TE findings did not reveal the adoption of any legislative or regulatory reform that would not have happened without the project.

Institutional strengthening for a supportive environment for achievement and measurement of environmental impact:

The SE4ALL project strengthened the capacity of institutions in the country. TGSB's capacity was strengthened on quality assurance through training and provision of equipment while the Department of Community Development and ABC Enterprise had their capacity enhanced by the project through the provision of production plants and equipment for ICS.

Financing Flows: As to whether the involvement of the GEF led to greater flows of financing than would otherwise have been the case from private or public sector sources, The Gambia Government in recent years has prioritized the adoption of renewable energy and hence continued to increase investments in renewables particularly solar energy. The TE could not determine whether the project has led to greater financial flow than there would have been with the government or the private sector, even though the GEF 6 led to greater flows of financing the GEF grant funding and galvanized institutions to participate by co financing their part of the project.

Improvements in the living standard among population groups affected by environmental conditions: The results of the TE have strongly shown improvements in the living conditions of the beneficiaries of the project. The EE lights have improved service delivery at the health facilities, increased productivity in government and private sector institutions, enhanced security, and improved income and conversely, the ICS has reduced the rate of deforestation, improved health status of women, and reduction in household expenditure on food among others.

Adoption of new technologies, or the demonstration of market readiness for technologies: GEFs involvement has brought about the rapid adoption of new technologies with huge market potential in both the private sector and the communities.

3.3.12. Catalyst/Role Replication

Overwhelmingly, the implementing partners and beneficiaries have been expressed interest in participating in similar projects in the future. Their motivation was predicated by their commitment to promoting inclusive environmentally sound and low carbon development coupled with the successes registered by the project in improving lives and livelihood. However, a few indicated that their involvement will be dependent on the amount of investment by UNIDO.

3.3.13. Innovations

The innovations introduced by the project are as follows: construction of a factory for production and distribution of clean and efficient cook stoves for households and institutions, construction of a factory for the production of alternative cooking fuels, construction of a laboratory for testing of lights, goniophotometer, light spectrometer, provision of energy efficient bulbs (LED), energy efficient air conditioners for institutions, energy efficient cook stoves kitchens built in schools, FAO Thiaroye technology, FTT built in fish landing sites and community street lights as well as solar freezers Solar street lights and water supply for the community gardens. Equally important are some implementing partners whose mandates are endorsement, regulatory and quality assurance, and standards.

3.3.14. Progress to Impact

The TE reveals that project has contributed significantly to improvement of the lives of beneficiaries both at the institutional, individual and community levels. The use of EE light, cold storage facilities, improved cooking solutions, alternative cooking fuels, has not only contributed to greenhouse gas emissions but also positively impacted on areas such as poverty reduction, health, agriculture, the environment, security, gender equality and women empowerment to name but a few. Specifically, the reduction in emissions of GHG by using EE appliances and ICS have a positive impact on the environment; the use of improved cook stoves and briquette also means less consumption of fuel wood which leads to reduction in deforestation. The TE also reveals that the use of ICS has improved the health status of women, minimising their loss of lives, property as well as drudgery especially fetching of firewood.

Moreover, the provision of streetlights has to a great extent increased commercial activities in the communities. The brightness had created a conducive environment especially at night, and shops are able to open for longer hours. Woman vendors especially those who leave their homes during early morning hours to carry out their business transactions also reported increases in their business activities with increased income.

In the field of horticulture, the provision of EE lights and solar freezers has improved horticulture production and productivity and subsequently led to improved food and nutrition security. With solar freezers women vegetable producers can store and preserve them for a longer period while looking for markets, thus adding value to their products. Directly quoting from a female respondent during one of interviews she had this to say about the EE lights installed in their garden "EE lights are our watchmen".

As security is indispensable in any meaningful and sustainable development, the provision of streetlights has a significant impact in the sector. The TE revealed that because of the streetlights, there is a high reduction in crime particularly, burglary and theft. In one of the communities, it was reported that intruders into the community at night to feast on their poultry and small ruminants are scared. This has also improved food and nutrition security. There is now free movement of people to attend to their businesses, religious matters, and social activities. A woman

participant explained that she feels safer now than before. To cite an example, she informed the meeting that she now practises her religion during early morning and night prayers without fear.

The health sector also reported positive impacts from the GEF 6 project. The project beneficiary's health sector in no small measure highlighted the numerous ways in which the impact of the project was felt. The energy efficient led bulbs supplied to health facilities especially in the Maternity units contributed significantly to improvement in maternal outcomes, service delivery, security as well as eye health.

Lastly and not the least, the availability and operationalization of a quality assurance scheme will improve standards in EE light and ICS and assure quality in EE appliances and improved cooking solutions in the country.

4. CONCLUSIONS, LESSON LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Conclusion

The project has been implemented in The Gambia with positive results. The project was firmly anchored on the global environment benefits with innovations such as Energy Efficient Appliances, Improved Cooking Solutions and laboratory for light testing and performance labelling scheme among others. From the perspective of the project developers and beneficiaries, the EE light has tremendous benefits in saving energy and related cost, improving service delivery especially at the health facilities and institutions, improved security and safety of the communities. Conversely, the ICS has also helped in saving cost in energy consumption, improved health status of women, reduced drudgery of women among others. However, the project has not completed all its components due to delays in disbursement of fund as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The need for the remaining activities to be completed before final project closure cannot be emphasized. The lessons learnt and recommendations are detailed below.

4.2. Lessons Learnt

- Dominance of non-Gambians in production of metal frames for the Furno Jambar (ICS) can affect sustainability in the production of this type of ICS. Gambians need to be trained to produce metal frames so that reliance on non-Gambians will be minimized.
- Adequacy in funding is key to successful implementation of energy efficient appliances and improved cooking solutions. The project could have had a greater impact if the funding was much bigger with lower co-financing amounts. The demand for EE lights and ICS at the community level was overwhelming but the Project Developers could only provide support according to the size of the budget.
- The use of FTT is pivotal in reducing greenhouse gas and the overall management of the environment. The FTT innovation should be widely disseminated to encourage its use in all parts of the country given its efficiency as an ICS.
- Extended turnaround time for projects can lead to implementation delays which can negatively affect the achievements of the project outcome.
- Building local capacity can enhance project implementation and sustainability. Some communities were able to harness and build local expertise for the upkeep of EE appliances particularly street lights significantly contributing to reduction in maintenance cost and enhancing sustainability of the investment.
- The effective use of domestic and agricultural waste can positively impact on the environment.
- Community interaction has created an increased demand for the project.
- Training in project execution will help in ensuring smooth implementation of the project.
- Lack of evidence-based information on greenhouse emissions from energy efficient appliances makes it difficult to assess the real impact of the project.
- Unnecessary bureaucracy and lack of transparency can cause delays and chaos in project implementation and ultimately affect project outcomes.
- Good project execution can lead to good project outcome.
- Committed staff and management can lead to good project outcomes.
- Delay in payment can have negative impact on the timely delivery of project results.

4.3. Recommendations

The TE recommends the following:

To the Government, ECREEE and UNIDO:

1. **The Gambia Standard Bureau, TGSB should expedite the development of performance labelling scheme for energy efficient appliances and standards for Improved cooking stoves.** The Quality Assurance component of the project has suffered setbacks including delays in disbursement and other administrative bottlenecks with ECREEE, leading to delays in implementation. For these reasons, all hands should be on deck for TGSB to expedite the development of performance labelling scheme for energy efficient appliances and standards for Improved cooking stoves.

Timeline: Immediate till the completion of project activities

To the Government:

2. **Producers of ICS using clay should be supported by the Government to ensure a sustainable mining of the product in the communities.** Clay is used as lining of Furrno Jambarr, a widely used improved cook stoves in The Gambia. However, extensive and uncontrolled mining of this scarce resources could negatively affect the environment. Therefore, the Government including, NEA, Geology Department and Area Council should provide support for the mining of clay in the production of this improved cook stove.

Timeline: Process to begin now

To the Government and other financial institutions:

3. **Provision of funds by the Government, Commercial Banks, Micro-finance institutions and donors for business start-ups for EE lighting Appliances and Improved Cooking Solutions.** To ensure an increased use of EE Appliances and ICs, Government should work closely with the commercial banks and donors to provide support such as the establishment of micro-finance institutions, flagship programmes and other funding mechanisms for EE Appliances and ICS.

Timeline: After the completion of Project activities

4. **More Government investment in renewable energy particularly solar.** A demand for solar energy to reduce expenditure on electricity was reported extensively by Government and private institutions during the TE. The findings suggest that government should invest more on solar energy so that further cuts can be made to their energy bills.

Timeline: As soon as possible

To UNIDO:

5. **UNIDO should improve on timely disbursement of funds:** The timely implementation of some key project activities was stifled by the late disbursement of fund. Whilst this may be partly due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the procedures in place for fund disbursement as revealed by the Implementing partners are too cumbersome and led to delays. These procedures have to be reviewed to ensure to improve the timeliness in the disbursement of funds without contravening UNIDO financial rules and regulations.

Timeline: As soon as possible

6. **Provision of funds by UNIDO to complete pending project activities:** Some key activities in the project components such as Quality Assurance, Production and use of Improved Cooking Solutions are yet to be completed. Therefore, it is imperative that these activities be completed to ensure a successful completion of the project.

Timelines: As soon as possible

To Government and other implementing Partners:

- 7. Development and operationalisation of a Strategic Development Plan to promote the use of ECO briquette.** Given that the production of Eco briquette as an innovative cooking solution requires the active involvement of key Government institutions including but not limited to Agriculture, Forestry, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources etc as well as the communities. There is a need for a Strategic Development Plan that will canvass support in the generation and use of agro-waste in the production of the Eco briquette.

Timeline: Consultations to begin now with relevant institutions

Follow-ups on Project activities to ensure sustainability:

- 8.** It is imperative that MoPE leads the Project Steering Team and PMO to continue monitoring and executing the remaining project activities. At the completion of the remaining project activities, Project Steering Committee to monitor the sustainability mechanisms identified by the beneficiaries of the project.

Timelines: At the completion of the project activities

- 9. The Department of Community Development to expedite the construction of a Plant for the construction of Improved Cook Stoves.** Due to delays in disbursement of funds, the construction of the second plant for the production of Improved Cook Stoves is yet to be completed and hence every effort should be made by UNIDO to expedite the disbursement of funds for the completion of the activity.

Timeline: Immediate

ANNEXES

Annex A: Terms of reference of the terminal evaluation



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

For the provision of services related to the Terminal Evaluation of the GEF6 project: Operationalization of the SE4All Action Agenda: Promoting inclusive, environmentally-sound and low- carbon development (SAP: 160041)

Date: 15 March 2023

1. General Background Information

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) is the specialized agency of the United Nations that promotes industrial development for poverty reduction, inclusive globalization and environmental sustainability. The mission of UNIDO, as described in the *Lima Declaration* adopted at the fifteenth session of the UNIDO General Conference in 2013 as well as the *Abu Dhabi Declaration* adopted at the eighteenth session of UNIDO General Conference in 2019, is to promote and accelerate inclusive and sustainable industrial development (ISID) in Member States. The relevance of ISID as an integrated approach to all three pillars of sustainable development is recognized by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will frame United Nations and country efforts towards sustainable development. UNIDO's mandate is fully recognized in SDG-9, which calls to "Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation". The relevance of ISID, however, applies in greater or lesser extent to all SDGs. Accordingly, the Organization's programmatic focus is structured in four strategic priorities: Creating shared prosperity; Advancing economic competitiveness; Safeguarding the environment; and Strengthening knowledge and institutions.

The main objective of the project is to operationalize the Sustainable Energy For All Action Agenda in The Gambia by catalyzing investments in improved cooking stoves and efficient appliances. The project brings about a scenario that combines both technical assistance for supporting the existing institutional framework as well as catalyzing investment in more efficient lamps, refrigeration, air conditioning (RACs) appliances and cookstoves, that will, together, result in transformational change with regards to the country's energy access situation and end-user' behavior. The project features five

(5) components, including its monitoring and evaluation. All the components of the project contribute to Program 1 of the focal area CC1- Promote Innovation, Technology Transfer and Supportive Policies and Strategies - as it promotes a nexus approach between energy and other environmental issues. This will ensure the mainstreaming of sustainable energy issues into the broader policies, programmes and projects within the country. Component 2 and 3 of the project contribute to Program 1 by demonstrating the cost effectiveness of low carbon devices and technologies, such as efficient lighting and heat pump chillers in an integrated manner. Component 4 of the project seeks to establish quality control standards, as well as improve various capacities for market players and market enablers that will catalyse and sustain private sector led dissemination of the improved cooking devices and efficient appliances beyond the life of this project. Component 5 of the project relates to the effective monitoring, evaluation and implementation of the project activities.

To learn more about UNIDO go to www.unido.org, to learn more about the project 'Operationalization of the SE4All Action Agenda: Promoting inclusive, environmentally-sound and low-carbon development' <https://open.unido.org/projects/GM/projects/160041>

2. Scope of Required Services

The objective of the required services is to carry out the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project.

The contractor is expected to provide following services (in collaboration and coordination with UNIDO):

- Draft and submit inception report defining questionnaires, methodology, theory of change, stakeholder mapping, workplan
- Carry out field mission and conduct meetings to collect relevant data
- Present findings to UNIDO HQ and stakeholders
- Draft and submit project evaluation report.

Detailed instructions on the project background, evaluation methodology and approach can be found in Annex 1.

3. Deliverables and general time schedule:

All activities/deliverables shall be finalized and all stated payment supporting documents shall be submitted to UNIDO no later than 1 month from the date when the contract is signed by the contractor. Estimated time frame for activities to be delivered end or no later than April 2023.

Following project activities will be carried out as per the approved work plan;

ACTIVITIES	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	DELIVERABLES	Timeline	Location
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare an inception report which streamlines specific questions addressing key issues in the TOR, methods to be used and data to collect during field visits, detailed evaluation methodology, theory of change and agenda for field work. • Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information. • Determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context. • A stakeholder mapping, in coordination with the project team. • Methodology developed. 	Inception Report including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Workplan 2. Draft questionnaires, evaluation questions and logical models 3. Stakeholder mapping 4. Draft outline for the TE document 5. Methodology 6. Theory of Change 	5 days after contract signature	Home-based

ACTIVITIES	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	DELIVERABLES	Timeline	Location
(questionnaires, logic models).				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise documents submitted based on feedback received from UNIDO. Arrange required meetings with project partners and government counterparts. Coordinate and conduct meetings with beneficiaries, stakeholders, GEF focal points etc and conduct the field mission in cooperation with the Project Management Unit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field mission arranged and carried out. Data collected. 	First Progress Report, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed report of site visits, interviews conducted Pictures/videos of field mission 	17 days (including travel days) after contract signature	Various sites in The Gambia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present findings and recommendations to UNIDO HQ and stakeholders. Draft project evaluation report according to the TOR and submit for feedback to UNIDO HQ, incorporating comments received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed Draft evaluation report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second Progress Report (draft project evaluation report) Presentation slides. 	22 days after contract signature	Home-based
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO HQ and stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final evaluation report. 	Final Report (Final project evaluation report)	25 days after contract signature	Home-based

At the completion of each deliverable, the counterpart shall submit in English a detailed report including description of all activities and related required documents as defined in the above table as well as a narrative section of the overall progress on all the activities in the preceding reporting period. Should any delay occur, or unexpected circumstance arises, the contractor should notify UNIDO's Project Manager in writing in a timely manner.

All requested documents should be provided to UNIDO in electronic copy to UNIDO HQ and UNIDO PMO, consisting of the following electronic files;

PDF

Original work files (word, power point, excel etc.)

The electronic copy can be provided via email, if the nature and size of the files make it possible, otherwise, the electronic copy should be provided through storage application as per UNIDO's suggestion.

Submitted reports will be approved by the UNIDO HQ Project Manager.

4. Personnel in the Field

The Contractor must guarantee all the administrative, technical, and general work force necessary to carry out the contracted services. In line with UNIDO policies on Gender Equity, bidders are strongly encouraged to ensure that their teams are gender balanced.

The minimum requirements for each position of the suggested Core Team are shown in table below. CVs for the proposed Contractor Core Team members must be attached to the proposal.

The evaluation team will be made of a national evaluator and an international senior evaluator (lead). International companies are welcomed to apply with the understanding that they have to provide a national evaluator as part of the team.

The evaluation experts shall meet the following requirements:

Education:

Advanced degree in environment, energy, engineering, development studies or related areas

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 5 years (evaluator expert) and 8 years (senior evaluator) of experience in the field of renewable energy and/or energy projects and programmes.
- Evaluation experience, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries is an asset.
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English. Fluency in Wolof is desirable.

Overall competencies:

- Analytical thinking; planning, organizing and problem-solving abilities
- Research and drafting skills.
- Skills in facilitating meetings effectively and efficiently and to resolve conflicts as they arise. Excellent ability and working experience in Gender, Social and Environmental mainstreaming in projects, processes and organizations
- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills and sensitivity to cultural, socio-economic and political differences.
- Knowledge of The Gambian policies and regulations with regard EE.

5. Language Requirements

All communication with UNIDO will be in English Language. Requested

reports should be provided in English.

6. Payment Terms

The timeline and payment terms based on the deliverables, as well as documents requested for each payment to be processed, are presented in the following table:

No.	Deliverables	Documents required for a payment to be processed	Expected completion	Payment
1.	Submission of all deliverables and completion of the assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Countersigned contract• Invoice• Completed/signed Banking Information Form• All reports	April 2023	100%

Payments will be payable within 30 days upon receipt and acceptance of deliverable and invoice (electronic version) indicating the contract number and instalment requested.

7. Qualification Requirements

Following are qualification requirements for bidder's technical offer to be considered.

- Corporate registration or certificate of incorporation
- Signed/completed Statement of Confirmation

8. Evaluation Criteria

The bidder should meet the following evaluation criteria;

9. Technical offer in compliance with TOR, describing proposed methodology and understanding of the assignment. Further instructions on the project background, evaluation methodology and approach can be found in Annex 1.
10. CVs of the evaluation team
11. Company profile
12. Draft workplan
13. At least 8 year work experience in project evaluation.

Evaluation of technical criteria, and therefore a decision whether an offer is considered technically compliant, will be done according to the compliance or non-compliance against the stated requirements in this TOR.

14. The bidder should submit a financial offer in Financial offer in Gambian Dalasi (GMD)

The financial offer should contain all costs involved to perform the required services specified in these terms of reference, breaking down expenses:

15. Experts' fees
16. Travel costs
17. All expenses for the field mission.

International bidders should confirm ability to engage with local representation in Gambia, provide details and include a commitment of ability to execute the services in The Gambia. In addition, bidders shall guarantee the inclusion of local team member in order to i) prevent excessive travel costs, and ii) procure knowledge of local stakeholders.

Note to suppliers: A **circular economy** is an economic system that tackles global environmental challenges like climate change, biodiversity loss, waste, and pollution. It is a framework of four principles, driven by design: eliminate waste and pollution, keep products and materials in use, regenerate natural ecosystems and use of renewable energy. **Bidders are encouraged** to display the products' circularity and sustainability compliance with the Economic, Social and Governance principles under the UN Compact (<https://www.unglobalcompact.org/take-action/leadership/integrate-sustainability/roadmap/supply-chain>).

DISCLAIMER: All information, figures and data presented in this Terms of Reference are the property of UNIDO and protected by copyrights. No part or parts of this document shall be used for purposes other than preparing the proposal.



Terminal Evaluation

Operationalization of the SE4All Action Agenda: Promoting inclusive, environmentally-sound and low- carbon development (SAP: 160041)

Inception report

Prepared by



FOKABS INC.

2500 St. Laurent Blvd, Ottawa, Ontario, K1H 1B1, Canada

kenongene@fokabs.com

1. Project background

The project "Operationalization of the SE4All Action Agenda: Promoting inclusive, environmentally-sound and low- carbon development (SAP: 160041)" is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The cost of the project is US\$ 8,199,497, of which a GEF allocation of US\$ 1,781,484 and a co-financing of US\$ 6,418,013 from diverse sources including: the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), Ministry of Petroleum and Energy (MoPE), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Ecowas Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE), Africell., Balafon Company Limited, Petrogas, and NAWEC. The project has as start and end dates April 30, 2017 and July 31, 2023 respectively⁵. UNIDO is the implementing agency of the project, the executing entities of the project include:

- National Environment Agency (NEA);
- MoPE;
- TGSB;
- ECREEE;
- FAO;
- Africell.

Project Objectives:

The UNIDO project funded by GEF aims to operationalize the Sustainable Energy for All Action Agenda in The Gambia by catalyzing investments in improved cook stoves and energy efficient appliances.

The project has five main components:

Component 1: National platform to foster nexus issues. This component aims to integrate energy issues in a systematic manner in other sectors, to do so it creates the institutional framework and necessary capacities to adopt and apply the nexus approach by targeted public and private organizations (all members of the national platform) to ensure that the activities continue even after project completion.

Component 2: Promoting the use of energy efficient appliances. It builds on the feasibility study conducted during the development of the SE4ALL IP of The Gambia. The aim is for private sector companies to demonstrate the successful and sustainable dissemination and adoption of EE appliances. Those who pass the initial due diligence are sub-contracted by the project to deliver specific measurable and quantifiable objectives. Therefore, demo project holders are subject to sustainability-oriented performance-based contracts, where they commit to specific activities and results. In addition, an appropriate price of the environmental- friendly products and services provided by the private sector companies is offered to customers to allow the market to pick-up.

Component 3: Promoting the production and use of efficient cook stoves and alternative cooking fuels. This component targets institutional and commercial cooking through a broad choice of household cooking appliances and fuel types, not only briquettes as in the SE4All IP CN2. This component envisages

⁵ See: <https://open.unido.org/projects/GM/projects/160041>

to create market-based environment for uptake of efficient cook stoves combined with cleaner fuel while recognizing the gender-responsive impact on management of local resources.

Component 4: Quality assurance. This component adapts existing appliance performance labelling schemes from countries in the ECOWAS region and introduces it to The Gambian market focusing on the most commonly used appliances in order to increase confidence in the performance of selected electrical appliances. In terms of standards for clean cooking, TGSB is closely working with the International Standardization Organization (ISO) and WACCA to develop standards for improved cook stoves and cooking fuels such as wood, charcoal, briquette and biochar, at international, regional and national levels.

Component 5: Monitoring and evaluation. Component 5 facilitates a detailed and extensive M&E structure to be put in place in compliance with UNIDO and GEF procedures.

Purpose:

The terminal evaluation (TE) report will assess the achievement of project results against expected objectives and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNIDO programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

More specifically, the TE will:

- Assess how effectively the project has achieved its stated development objective or purpose;
- Measure how efficiently the outcomes were realized, and outputs delivered in attaining the development objective/project;
- Assess both negative and positive factors that have hampered and facilitated respectively the progress in achieving the project outcomes, including external factors/environment, weakness in design, management and resource allocation;
- Assess the extent to which the application of the rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming are integrated within the planning and implementation of the project;
- Identify and document substantive lessons learned, good practices and also opportunities for scaling up in future;
- Provide forward-looking programmatic recommendations for the project and the relevant portfolio of UNIDO.

Scope:

In delivering on the assignment, the team will follow GEF guidelines in terms of ranking the performance of key criteria: 1) Relevance; 2) Effectiveness; 3) Efficiency; 4) Sustainability; 5) Factors affecting performance. The team will also assess the relevant cross cutting issues such as risks and social and environmental safeguards (6), gender (7), progress towards impact (8), and capacity strengthening (9) but these will not be scored/ranked in line with GEF evaluation guidelines.

Intended users:

The primary users of the evaluation report will be UNIDO and GEF, but the findings will be equally useful to the relevant ministries of the Government of The Gambia, development partners and donors.

2. Evaluation approach and methodology:

The evaluation will be delivered using a mixed methods approach. The process will generally constitute of:

- 1) Review of secondary literature: this will entail a context and content analysis of relevant documents. This will serve as a source of secondary data (qualitative and quantitative);
- 2) Data collection: this will entail primary data collection through interviews and consultations, focus group discussions and field visits. Interviews will be conducted using interview guides adapted to different stakeholders to generate qualitative data. In addition, a questionnaire will be employed to generate quantitative data on the evaluation criteria; and;
- 3) Reporting, which will be an interactive process led by the team lead working with the national consultant.

The use of both primary and secondary data will ensure the triangulation of findings. The evaluation team proposes a three-phase review: (i) Inception phase, (ii) Data collection and analysis phase and (iii) Close out phase. The final evaluation report will be submitted at the end of the close out phase.



A. *Inception phase*

The objective of this phase is to gain common understanding between the project stakeholders and the evaluation team on the objectives and scope of the assignment. A virtual meeting was organised between the evaluators and the evaluation commissioning team from UNIDO to exchange ideas, relevant documentation, and reach agreement on initial timelines. Following the meeting, a tentative field visit plan and evaluation stakeholders were agreed upon – UNIDO provided the list of potential stakeholders to be consulted by the evaluators as part of the evaluation mission. A preliminary review of the project document was conducted in this phase to permit the conception of data collection tools.

The approval of this inception report will mark the end of the inception phase.



B. *Data collection and analysis phase*

This phase represents the core of the assignment. To carry out a full and as objective an evaluation as possible, the evaluation team will adopt a mixed method/approach comprising secondary data analysis, qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis.



Desk review, research and analysis:

Initial documentary review commenced at inception and will continue as additional information becomes available. Documents reviewed/to be reviewed amongst others include:

- The project document (ProDoC)
- Project results framework
- GEF Annual Progress Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- Mid-term Review Report
- Quarterly progress reports
- Endorsement documentation
- Project reports submitted by sub-contractors
- Project Inception reports
- Field visit reports
- M&E plan



Primary data collection:

Primary data collection will take place through a quantitative and qualitative approach. Quantitative data will be generated through the use of questionnaires that will be administered electronically to the project stakeholders (UNIDO project team, MoPE, NEA, TGSB, FAO, Social Development Fund and Department of Community Development) for their completion. The questionnaire will contain likert scale questions destined for assessing and rating the evaluation criteria as necessary (Annex 2).

Regarding the qualitative approach, the TE team will collect data through in-person interviews with identified project partners and stakeholders based on the list of stakeholders agreed upon during the inception phase. In-country primary data collection will be done by the national consultant. As per the list and itinerary proposed by UNIDO for the evaluation, field visits for the collection of primary data will happen as per the schedule presented in Table 1.

Table 1: UNIDO/GEF 6 Project Terminal Evaluation Consultation meeting schedule

Greater Banjul Area (GBA)				
Date	Time	Institution	Individuals	Position
3rd July 2023	10:00am – 11:00am	ABC Gaye Enterprises		
	12:00pm – 1:00pm	Africell Gambia LTD	Sally Bittaye Jad Maoula	
	2:00pm – 3:00pm	Ministry of Petroleum and Energy	Kemo K. Ceesay	Director of Energy
4th July 2023	10:00am – 11:00am	Unique Solution	Vincent Mendy Njaga Ceesay	
	12:00pm – 1:00pm	Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)	Ebrima Dem	
	2:00pm – 3:00pm	The Gambia Standard Bureau	Papa Secka Amadou Jallow	Director General Senior Standard Officer
5th July 2023	10:00am – 11:00am	Social Development Fund (SDF)	Lamin Fofan Sonko Fofana a	Director of Finance and Administration Director General
	12:00pm – 1:00pm	Women Initiative Gambia (WIG)	Isatou Ceesay Lamin Bojang	
	2:00pm – 3:00pm	National Environmental Agency		
6th July 2023	10:00am – 11:00am	Tanji Fish Landing site		
	12:00pm – 1:00pm	Brufut Fish Landing site		
	2:00pm – 3:00pm	Department of Community Development		
Provinces				
8 th July 2023	10:00am – 1:00pm	Mansakonko Area Council		
	3:00pm – 4:00pm	Mamud Fana		
9 th July 2023	10:00am – 11:00pm	Japinne Community Garden		
	3:00pm – 4:00pm	Joben Community Garden		
10 th July 2023	10:00am – 11:00pm	Bwiam Hospital		
	3:00pm – 4:00pm	Mansakonko Area Council		
	10:00am – 11:00pm	2 nd Infantry Battalion		

11 th July 2023	12:00pm – 1:00pm	Farafinni Hospital		
	3:00pm – 4:00pm	Governor North Bank Region		
12 th July 2023	10:00am – 11:00am	Japinneh Community Garden		
	1:00pm – 2:00pm	Mamud Fana		
	3:00pm – 4:00pm	Joben Community Garden		
13 th July 2023	10:00am – 12:00pm	Bansang Hospital		
	2:00pm – 4:00pm	Basse District Health Center		
14 th July 2023	10:00am – 12:00pm	Governor Upper River Region		
	2:00pm – 4:00pm	Dampha Kunda Community Garden		

Field visits to project sites will also be made and will ensure that local authorities, beneficiary groups – men, women, youth perceptions of the project are captured in the evaluation. Data collection will be implemented through individual interviews and, where relevant, focus group discussions with beneficiary groups in each site visited.



Data analysis: The evaluators will use content analysis in the review of secondary data. Regarding primary data emerging from interviews and discussions, recorded interviews will be transcribed and translated as necessary. These will be reviewed by the team leader and then analysed using content analysis. Content analysis is a data analysis method that is used to determine the presence of certain words, themes, or concepts within some given qualitative data (i.e. text). Through content analysis, the presence, meanings, and relationships of certain words, themes, or concepts can be quantified and analyzed. The themes will be generated in line with the GEF evaluation criteria and sub-questions while being sufficiently flexible to develop new themes based on emerging issues in the data. Critical themes around the quality of delivery and innovation will be assessed. The mixed methods approach adopted will enable the team to triangulate the findings on the ground to ensure the reliability and robustness of the results presented.

In line with the evaluation questions and GEF guidelines set out in the evaluation’s Terms of Reference, the following key approaches will inform the data analysis:

Regarding **relevance**, the evaluators will assess the robustness of the project design, the appropriateness of the approach and the degree to which the project aligns with national and international priorities and the mandate of the government, UNIDO and GEF and global development and environmental goals. It will also assess compatibility with other ongoing initiatives to gauge value added and synergistic relationships.

In terms of **effectiveness**, the team will measure the degree to which the project objectives were delivered focusing on the global programme objectives, the immediate objectives and stated outcomes.

Efficiency assessment will focus on value for money and utilization of project’s human, material and financial resources, materialization of co-financing, quality and timely delivery of project outputs. The evaluators will also assess stakeholder engagement and participation and the optimal use of resources.

The following rating scale will be applied in line with GEF guidelines.

Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency Rating Description

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings
5 = Satisfactory (S)	Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.

1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements

Sustainability assessment will gauge the extent to which project gains can be sustained beyond the initial project period and actions put in place to perpetuate and consolidate gains in the future. Key risks and sustainability criteria (economic, financial, institutional, political, social and environmental) will be evaluated as well as the extent to which lessons learned were systematically documented and disseminated to stakeholders.

The 4 point rating scale for sustainability will be as below:

Rating	Description
4 = Likely (L)	There are little or no risks to sustainability
3 = Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks to sustainability
2 = Moderately unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks to sustainability
1 = Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks to sustainability
Unable to Assess (UA)	Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

In examining the **quality of project implementation**, the evaluators will assess the design and implementation of the M&E plan through review of the plan in terms of its achievements and deliverables and the extent to which the recommendations of the MTE were implemented. UNIDO's role in terms of supervision, management and administration will be scrutinised as well as the level of documentation of project best practices and dissemination. The evaluation team will gauge the level of materialisation of the project's co-financing through comparing planned contributions and effectively mobilised using the project co-financing matrix. Stakeholder engagement and partnership assessment will include interviews with stakeholders to evaluate the extent to which the project coordinated and created synergistic linkages and also favoured the participation of women, youth and any marginalised groups. As a learning exercise, the evaluators will seek to identify best practices in terms of what worked and what could be improved that could inform future project design and replication.

In addition to the above-mentioned criteria, the team will assess several cross-cutting factors in line with GEF guidelines. Starting with **environmental and social safeguards**, the team will assess whether environmental and social safeguards were addressed in the design and implementation. Three additional factors will be evaluated including **gender, stakeholder engagement and accountability and grievance mechanism**. Regarding gender, the evaluators will review the extent to which gender was mainstreamed from design through to implementation. Also, the extent to which the gender marker was effectively implemented will be assessed. Key informants, beneficiaries and project teams will also be asked to review the level of stakeholder engagement and the performance of the project's grievance mechanism. Regarding the stakeholder engagement, the questionnaires have been designed to collect data on the level of satisfaction of stakeholders regarding the intervention of their views and concerns in project delivery.

Finally, the evaluators will compare the level of **materialisation of co-financing** and its impact on the project delivery through assessment of financial reports. Project **knowledge management** will also be

documented through evaluating the extent to which the project documented best practices and provided opportunities for lesson learning and exchange of best practices. Throughout the assessment, the evaluators will seek to draw out key lessons learned and to **formulate recommendations**.

Findings will be presented in accessible forms including tables, figures, graphs etc.



C. Close out phase

An interim draft report based on the template provided in English, within 50 pages, shall be submitted to UNIDO following data analysis and write up phase. Sequel to the submission of the draft report, a debriefing meeting with UNIDO Headquarters and the Project Management Office (PMO) will be organised during which the evaluators will present the evaluation findings. Comments from debriefing meeting alongside annotated comments in the draft report reviewed by UNIDO and relevant stakeholders will be addressed and a revised document submitted to the client.

Ethics and norms

The evaluator will adhere to the highest ethical standards and requirements of the United Nations Evaluation Group, accepting and scrupulously respecting its Code of Conduct. UNIDO evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'. The consultants 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 evaluators must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected.

The information, knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNIDO and partners. The evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflict of interest and interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly or substantively involved as an employee or consultant in the formulation of UNIDO strategies and programmes.

More specifically, to ensure the highest standard of the mission, the following attitudes will be observed:

- Ensuring confidentiality and anonymity of all sources of primary data
- Giving equal respect to interviewed stakeholders
- Respect the freedom of speech of interviewees
- Respect the diversity of stakeholders and reflect it in an inclusive sampling, with special attention towards women and vulnerable parties
- Use appropriate protocols to adequately reach women and the most disadvantaged groups
- Make it clear, at the outset, to all interlocutors that the Evaluator is neither a UNIDO staff member nor a member of any other stakeholder, but an external and independent professional seeking feedback on the Programme and its implementation, and that information shared is done so anonymously
- Dealing with all in a transparent, respectful and calm manner
- To refrain from any practices prohibited by law and morality.

3. Limitations and risks

The limitations of the methodology are those of assessments based on qualitative and quantitative tools. Secondary and primary sources whether qualitative or quantitative in nature have their respective challenges. The former, especially in the case of progress reports from which most of the statistical information is drawn, refer to authors who are not independent, in this case internal staff involved in the implementation of the programme, who may therefore develop biases unknowingly or intentionally. The primary sources, on the other hand, even if carefully chosen and inclusive, remain a non-random qualitative sample, and therefore always a questionable representation of the general population. In other words, the extent to which the views of one or more actors are objective and/or significant of what happened in the programme as a whole can always be questioned.

The evaluators will combine field visits, interviews, focus group discussions and therefore benefit from the advantages of mixed methods. An additional strategy for mitigating the challenges identified lies in the rigour of a systematic triangulation of sources and data. In this respect, at a first level of internal confrontation, the documents are first examined in terms of their intrinsic coherence in order to determine their own quality and the reliability likely to result from them. Then, on the same subject, the different documents available are compared with each other to identify a second level of consistency and possible discrepancies. The primary data are in turn called upon and their indications compared with what emerges from the secondary data, to determine a third level of confidence.

4. Timeline and deliverables

S/N	ACTIVITIES	Duration of activity (after signature of contract)											
		May 2023				June 2023				July 2023			
		W1	W2	W3	W4	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8
	1. Inception												
1.1	Inception meeting (Evaluators and UNIDO)												
1.2	Preliminary desk review and elaboration of draft inception report												
1.3	Finalization of inception report												
	2. Data collection & analysis												
2.1	Desk review and research												
2.2	Primary data collection												
2.3	Data analysis												
	3. Reporting												
3.1	Elaboration of draft evaluation report												
3.2	Debriefing of UNIDO and PMO on preliminary findings												
3.3	Integration of feedback, finalization and submission of final evaluation report												

LEGEND	
	Duration of activity
	Submission of draft deliverable
	Submission of final deliverable
	Review of draft deliverables by UNIDO

Annex C: TE Mission Itinerary

NO	Date of visit	Place/institution of Visit
1	03 July, 2023	ABC Enterprise, Kanifing
2		AFRICELL, Kanifing
3		Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, West Coast Region
4	04 July, 2023	UNIQUE Solutions, Kanifing
5		Food and Agricultural Organization, Kanifing
6	05 July, 2023	Social Development Fund, Kanifing
7		Women Initiative, The Gambia, West coast Region
8	06 July, 2023	Department of Community Development Appropriate Technology Unit, West Coast Region
9	07 July 2023	National Environment Agency, Kanifing
10	13 July, 2023	The Gambia Standards Bureau, Kanifing
11	17th July, 2023	Governor's Office, North Bank Region
12		Farafenni General Hospital, North Bank Region
13		Farafenne Army Barracks, North Bank Region
14	18th July, 2023	Mansakonko Area Council, Lower River Region
15		Mamud Fana Village, Central River Region
16		Njoben Community Garden, Central River Region
17	19th July, 2023	Janjanbureh Area Council, Central River Region
18		Bansang General Hospital, central River region
19		Basse District hospital, Upper River Region
20		Damphakunda Community Garden, Upper River Region
21	20th July, 2023	Bwiam General Hospital, West Coast Region
22	25th July, 2023	UNIDO, PMO, Kanifing

Annex D: Stakeholders consulted⁶

- UNIDO, PMO
- ABC Gaye Enterprises
- Africell Gambia LTD
- Ministry of Petroleum and Energy
- Unique Solution
- Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)
- The Gambia Standard Bureau
- Social Development Fund (SDF)
- Women Initiative Gambia (WIG)
- National Environmental Agency
- Department of Community Development
- 2ND Infantry Battalion, Yundum Barracks
- Bwiam Hospital
- Farafinni Hospital
- Governor North Bank Region
- Mamud Fana
- Joben Community Garden
- Bansang Hospital
- Janjanbureh Area Council
- Mansakonko Area council
- Basse District Health Center
- Dampha Kunda Community Garden

⁶ Names have been withheld for the purpose of confidentiality.

Annex E: List of documents reviewed

- National energy policy (2015-2030)
- GEF 6 The project document
- Vision 2020 report;
- National development Plan, 2018-2021)
- Project results framework
- GEF Annual Progress Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- GEF Mid-term Review Report,2021
- Quarterly progress reports
- Project Inception reports
- Field visit Reports

Annex F: Evaluation question matrix

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
1. Relevance: The extent to which project objectives and design meet the needs of the country/recipient and continue to do so if circumstances change; the degree of alignment with country needs, UNIDO, GEF mandates, existing national strategies and policies, international conventions and SDGs Was project design/conception appropriate to reach intended results?			
Question 1.1: Has the program responded to the country's main development priorities as defined in the country's development plans on low carbon transition in the transport sector, UNIDO-GEF mandates, SDGs, sectoral policies and international conventions?	1a. Was the project design appropriate to achieve the intended results?	Project documents, Inception reports National policy documents GEF strategic goals and objectives	Documentary review and thematic analyses
	1b. Was the project design consistent with the GEF focal area objective and program, country priorities, and the UNIDO portfolio of actions in Gambia?		
	1c. Was the project design consistent with the SDGs?		
Question 1.2: Did the project respond to needs of beneficiaries and evolving context?	1d. Was the project design relevant to the final beneficiaries?	Interviews and FGDs with beneficiaries and stakeholders	Thematic analysis of primary data from interviews and FGDs
Question 1.3: Is the programme sensitive to	1f. To what extent has the program addressed immediate and	Gender action plan Results framework	Documentary Review:

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
gender development concerns?	long-term gender development concerns?	Project stakeholders	Interviews with beneficiary groups and stakeholders
2. Effectiveness: To what extent has the intervention met or is expected to meet its objectives and outcomes			
Question 2.1: How has or will the project objective be achieved?	<p>2a. To what extent and how effectively has the project objective " to operationalize the Sustainable Energy for All Action Agenda in The Gambia by catalyzing investment in improved cook stoves and energy efficient appliances " been achieved?</p> <p>2b. Did the project produce any positive or negative unintended/unexpected results? (applicable equally to each outcome)?</p>	<p>PIRs</p> <p>Project teams, partners, beneficiaries</p>	<p>Documentary review: comparison of project targets (indicators) and level of realization</p> <p>Interviews and FGDs</p>
Question 2.2: Does the project add value to ongoing efforts at the country level, and to what extent?	<p>2c. What is the added value of the project's approach?</p> <p>2d. To what extent can the achievement of these outcomes (including any spillover effects) be attributed to the GEF funding: GEF additionality)?</p>	<p>Prodoc</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement plan</p> <p>PIRs, progress reports</p> <p>Project stakeholders</p>	<p>Documentary review</p> <p>FGDs</p> <p>Interviews</p>

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
	<p>2e. Were there synergies between the project and other initiatives in the same country and/or region? If so, to what extent and how did the project take advantage of them (e.g., by establishing partnerships)?</p> <p>2f. What other contextual factors and actors contributed to the results achieved and how?</p> <p>2g. Did the project develop or adopt innovative solutions to achieve its results?</p>		
Results, Outcome level			
3. Efficiency: To what extent was the project delivered in an efficient manner in terms of outcomes, outputs and goals			
Question 3.1: How did government agencies deliver on their mandates and what was the impact of their actions (inaction)?	3a. To what extent did the government deliver on their roles and responsibilities in terms of management and project management.?	MoPE and relevant government agencies Project team members Financial reports Theory of change	Documentary review – Interviews:
	3b. To what extent was the project implemented in an efficient and valuable manner?		

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
Question 3.2: How did the project adapt to evolving external context and how did this affect implementation?	3c. To what extent was the leadership able to adapt to changing context to improve on the efficiency of delivery?		
Question 3.3: To what extent was the project budget realistic and co-financing mechanisms realistic and how did this impact project delivery?	3d. Was the budget sufficient to deliver on the objectives of the project? 3e. Were the co-financing arrangements feasible and how did this affect delivery? 3f. What budget adjustments have been made and why?		
Question 3.4: Were the human and material resources sufficient in quality and quantity and how did this inform delivery?	3g. Did the project team have sufficient technical, financial and human resources? 3h. What is the level of participation of beneficiaries and external stakeholders in the project and what was the impact?		
4. Sustainability: To what extent are project achievements likely to continue beyond the project and what risks could constrain extension, replicability and up scaling of this project			
Question 4.1: Are project achievements	4a. What is the likelihood that the results of the project will continue	Government agencies	Documentary review –

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
likely to live beyond the project initial period?	to be useful or remain even after the project has ended?	Project team and GEF focal point UNIDO team	Interviews: Focus group discussions
	4b. What results, lessons or experiences have been replicated?	Project stakeholders Project reports	
Question 4.2: Does the government demonstrate ownership and commitment to securing project gains?	4d. To what extent can the government of Gambia ensure wider adoption of project activities and results (through sustaining progress, scaling up, mainstreaming, replication and market change) after the project ends? (applies to all results)?		
Question 4.3 What factors are likely to impact the sustenance of project achievements?	4e. What are the main risks that may affect the sustainability of the project benefits (considering financial, socio-economic, institutional and environmental and governance aspects)?		
5. Factors affecting performance: To what extent did the M&E design and implementation, and management and supervision mechanisms affect project performance? How did the project document best practices, manage knowledge and ensure inclusive participation of beneficiaries and stakeholders			
Question 5.1: To what extent did the M&E design and	Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)	Prodoc M&E Plan and results framework	Documentary review

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
implementation, and management and supervision mechanisms affect project performance? How did the project document best practices, manage knowledge and ensure inclusive participation of beneficiaries and stakeholders?	<p>5a Was the monitoring and evaluation plan practical and sufficient?</p> <p>5b. Did the monitoring and evaluation system function according to the M&E plan? Was information systematically collected and used to make timely decisions and promote learning during project implementation?</p>	<p>MTR management response</p> <p>Interviews with project teams</p>	Interviews
	<p>Project supervision, implementation role:</p> <p>5c. To what extent did UNIDO provide project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation, approval and start-up, monitoring and supervision (technical, administrative and operational)?</p>	<p>Project team</p> <p>Prodoc</p> <p>Stakeholders</p>	<p>Documentary report</p> <p>Interviews</p>
	<p>Project implementation and management:</p> <p>5d. How effectively did UNIDO carry out its role and responsibilities in the management and administration of the project?</p>	<p>Project team</p> <p>Stakeholders</p> <p>Progress reports, PIRs, prodoc</p>	<p>Documentary report:</p> <p>Interviews:</p>

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
	What were the main challenges in terms of project management and administration? To what extent were risks identified and managed?		
	Financial management and mobilisation of expected co-financing 5e. To what extent did the expected co-financing materialise and did this affect the project results? 5f. What funding management challenges did the project face?	Co-financing table Project team	Review: Interviews with all stakeholders on the funding management challenges of the project
	Knowledge management, communication and public awareness 5g. How does the project evaluate, document and share its results, lessons learned and experiences? 5h. To what extent are communication products and activities likely to support the sustainability and scaling up of project results?	PIR reports, training reports, publications, studies, project website (if exist)	Documentary report: Interviews:

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
	<p>Project partnership and stakeholder engagement (including the degree of stakeholder ownership of project results):</p> <p>5i. Which stakeholders were involved in the design and/or implementation of the project? What was the effect of this involvement on the project results and to what extent do the project results belong to the stakeholders involved?</p>	Project document, PIR,	<p>Review:</p> <p>Interviews with all stakeholders</p>
6. Social and environmental safeguards: To what extent were environmental safeguard concerns effectively identified and addressed during project implementation?			
Question 6.1: To what extent were environmental safeguard concerns effectively identified and addressed during project implementation?	<p>6a. To what extent were environmental and social concerns taken into account in the design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>6.b. Were there unintended impacts created by this project?</p> <p>6c. Was there a complaints and redress mechanism and how did it work?</p>	Project document, PIR	<p>Review:</p> <p>Interviews with all stakeholders</p>
7. Gender and rights based approaches: To what extent were gender, vulnerable or marginalised groups involved in project implementation?			

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
Question 7.1: To what extent were gender, vulnerable or marginalised groups involved in project implementation?	7a. To what extent have gender equality and women's empowerment considerations been taken into account in the design and implementation of the project, and has the project been implemented in a way that ensures equitable participation and benefits for both sexes?	Project document, PIRs Project stakeholders	Documentary review Interviews Focus group discussions
	7b. Were there any missed opportunities or lessons learned with regard to gender mainstreaming?		
	7c. To what extent were vulnerable and marginalized groups involved in the project?		
	7d. Has there been any unintended effects on women, men and vulnerable groups	Project document, PIRs Project stakeholders	
Disability	7e. Were people with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in project planning and implementation?	Project document, PIRs Project stakeholders	Document review Interview

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions/Indicators	Sources	Methods/Informants
	7f. What proportion of the project beneficiaries were persons with disabilities	Project document, PIRs Project stakeholders	Document review Interview
	7.g What barriers did the project face in this process and what actions were undertaken by the project	Project document, PIRs Project stakeholders	Document review Interview
8. Progress to Impacts: What evidence exists that the project is contributing to project and GEF strategic goals and targets			
Question 8.1: What evidence exists that the project is contributing to project and GEF strategic goals and targets?	8a. Is the project contributing to expected impacts?	GEF tracking tools PIRs Prodoc	Compare trends regarding GEF indicators
9. Lessons to be learned to inform future programming: To what extent have the lessons learned been documented and available to inform future project design?			
Question 9.1: To what extent have the lessons learned been documented and available to inform future project design?	9a. What lessons learned from the design and implementation of the project could be useful for improving the implementation and/or design of future projects?	Project stakeholders Project teams PIRs, progress reports	Interviews: Documentary review

Annex G: Questionnaire used for data collection

Data collection protocol for UNIDO/ MoPE

Respondent's Information

Respondent's Name:

Institution:

Job title:

Email:

Gender:

Country of institution:

What has been your institution's involvement in the project? What was your role?

Relevance

1. How appropriate was the project design in delivering the expected outcomes?
2. How aligned is the SE4All project to national priorities?

Effectiveness

3. What types of innovations were introduced by this project – *in terms of products, services, processes, organizational, marketing etc.*)?
4. To what extent can the achievement of the project outcomes (including any spillover effects) be attributed to the GEF funding: GEF additionality – 1 to the least extent and 5 to a great extent
5. Please give an example of GEF additionality if applicable
6. What were the contributing factors to project success?
7. What were the constraining factors to project success - (*internal or external to the project – political, economic, social, technological, environment, environmental*)?
8. What synergistic relationships were established with other ongoing initiatives? Give examples
9. Were there any modifications or changes to proposed outputs and why?

Efficiency

10. Did the project team have sufficient human resources for efficient delivery of project outcomes?
11. Was the budget sufficient in line with the expected results?
12. What financial management controls⁷ were in place to ensure good financial management of project funds and timely submission of financial management reports to the GEF?

Sustainability

13. Was there an exit strategy?
14. How do you assess the likelihood of the achievements of this project to continue beyond the end of the project – give some examples of why you think so?
15. What are the most likely risks to sustainability?
16. How would you assess the level of government ownership and commitment to this project?

⁷ For instance budget monitoring, timely flow of funds and payment of satisfactory project deliverables

Impact

17. What in your view are the long term impacts of this project:
 - a. At individual level
 - b. At the level of your community
 - c. At national level
18. Are there any negative or unintended consequences of this project at any of these levels? Please explain

Performance Factors

Assessment of Monitoring & Evaluation Systems

19. Did the M&E system operate as per the M&E plan?
20. Did the M&E plan undergo revision in the course of the project implementation? If yes, comment on the timeliness of the revisions.
21. Were the resources allocated for M&E sufficient?
22. How was M&E data used to inform and enhance the delivery of the project?

Assessment of Implementation and Execution

23. What can you recommend to improve UNIDO's role?
24. How would you assess the role of the government in the delivery of this project and how did it affect the achievement of the project objectives?

Assessment of the Environmental and Social Safeguards

25. Please explain how environmental and social concerns were taken into account in the design and implementation of the project?

Gender

26. To what extent was gender mainstreamed into the project cycle?
 - a. At design phase? – 1 to the least extent and 5 to a great extent
 - b. During implementation: – 1 to the least extent and 5 to a great extent
 - c. During monitoring and evaluation: – 1 to the least extent and 5 to a great extent

Please explain with some examples.

27. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and women's empowerment?
28. Has there been any unintended effects on women, men and vulnerable groups?

Stakeholder engagement

29. In what ways did the project engage with national stakeholders to deliver the project activities? Were there any challenges?
30. What actions were taken to ensure no one was left behind? Were there some key stakeholders who were not part of the project implementation?

Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (AGM)

31. Was there a functional grievance mechanism established for the project? If yes, what measures were put in place to ensure stakeholders were aware about the project's grievance mechanism if at all?
32. Were any grievances received and dealt with? If yes, please provide details

Other Assessments

Knowledge Management

- 33. Please kindly explain how knowledge management took place in this project.
- 34. Were there opportunities for experience sharing, were lessons documented?
- 35. How did the project share its results and lessons?

Lessons learned and recommendations

- 36. In your view, what are some of the lessons that can be learned from this project?
- 37. What are your recommendations for the future?

Data collection protocol for individual interviews – for other stakeholders

Respondent's Information

Respondent's Name:

Institution:

Job title:

Email:

Gender:

Country of institution:

How did you first become aware of this project and how have you been involved?

Relevance

1. In what ways was the project trying to address your priority needs?
2. Do you think the project addressed your priority needs as an organization/community?

Effectiveness:

3. What types of innovations were introduced by this project – could be in terms of products, services, processes, organizational, marketing etc)?
4. What were the contributing factors to project success?
5. What were the constraining factors to project success (internal or external to the project – political, economic, social, technological, environment, environmental)?

Sustainability

6. In what ways do you think the achievements of this project will continue after it ends?
7. What are the most likely risks to sustainability?
8. Given another chance, would you still be interested to be involved?

Impact

9. What in your view are the long term impacts of this project:
 - a. At individual level?
 - b. At the level of your community?
 - c. At national level?

Are there any negative or unintended consequences of this project at any of these levels? Please explain

Assessment of Implementation and Execution

10. What can you recommend to improve UNIDO's role?
11. Do you have any recommendations to improve the performance of the Project Management Unit?

Gender

12. To what extent was gender mainstreamed into the project cycle?

a) During implementation: – 1 to the least extent and 5 to a great extent

13. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and women's empowerment

14. Has there been any unintended effects on women, men and vulnerable groups?

Stakeholder engagement

15. How would you assess the way in which the project brought in other stakeholders?

16. Are there any groups that were left behind or not involved – which ones?

Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (AGM)

17. Were you aware whether the project had an accountability and grievance mechanism?

Other Assessments

Knowledge Management

18. Did you take part in any training events?

19. Were there opportunities to share experiences and learn from others during this project?

Lessons learned and recommendations

20. In your view, what are some of the lessons that can be learned from this project?

21. What are your recommendations for the future of this project?

Focus group discussion guide

Name of group/community:

Location:

Date:

What has been the involvement of your group in the project?

How aligned is the project to your needs/priorities?

What are the achievements of the project you are most proud of?

What has been the facilitating factors for the project success(es)?

What have been some of the challenging factors or weaknesses of the project?

What has been the impact of the project in your lives/community?

Specifically, how did the project ensure the involvement of women? Are there some specific impacts of the project on women?

Did the project have an unintended negative impact on you/your community?

How satisfied are you with the way the project was implemented?

Were you aware of the existence of a project-level accountability and grievance mechanism for channeling concerns you may have about the project?

To what extent do you believe the project outcomes will be sustainable following the end of the project?

In your opinion, what are some of the key risks that could hamper the sustainability of the project after project funding phases out?

What measures could be taken to address the sustainability risks cited in the preceding question?

In the future, what would be your recommendations should a similar initiative be implemented in The Gambia?

Questionnaire for UNIDO HQ/PMO/MOPE

Relevance

1. How would you rate the overall relevance of this project in terms of alignment with national priorities, UNIDO, GEF mandates and international commitments of the country? – use table below

<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
The extent to which program objectives and design meet the needs of the country/recipient and continue to do so if circumstances change; the degree of alignment with country needs, existing national strategies and policies and SDGs	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
The extent to which program objectives and design meet UNIDO, GEF mandates, and international environmental conventions to which the government is engaged	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Effectiveness:

2. In your opinion, how satisfied are you with the achievement of project objectives (use the Table below)? What are those factors⁸ that affected the achievement/under achievement of the objectives?

3. Considering the above answers, how would you rate the overall effectiveness of this project?

<i>Effectiveness</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
How would you assess the level of achievement of the project goals and objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	

⁸ E.g. project design, project's linkages with other activities, extent and materialization of co-financing, stakeholder involvement

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------	--

Efficiency

4. How would you rate the overall efficiency of the project? Use Table below

<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
How satisfied are you with the efficiency of the project in delivering on its outcomes, outputs and goals?	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Sustainability

5. Overall, how would you rate the likely sustenance of the project achievements?

<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
To what extent are project achievements likely to continue beyond the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Likely <input type="checkbox"/> Likely <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately unlikely <input type="checkbox"/> Highly unlikely	

6. Considering the above, how would you rate the overall design and implementation of the M&E system?

<i>M&E Design</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Adequacy of M&E design	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

<i>M&E Implementation</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>

Adequacy of M&E implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Assessment of Implementation and Execution

7. How would you assess the role of UNIDO in the project cycle? Use table below

<i>UNIDO role in the design of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of UNIDO as the GEF agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
<i>UNIDO role in the implementation of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of UNIDO as the GEF agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
<i>UNIDO role in supervision of overall implementation of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of UNIDO as the GEF agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

8. How would you assess the role of the national executing agency –MoPE?

<i>MoPE role in the design of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of MoPE	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
<i>MoPE management role</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of MoPE	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
<i>Performance of PMO</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Assessment of the Environmental and Social Safeguards

9. Where there any unintended impacts created by this project?

<i>Environmental and social safeguards</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Assess how environmental and social safeguards were implemented in this project	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Stakeholder engagement

10. How satisfied are you with your participation in this project?

<i>Level of consideration of views and concerns by the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Level of satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Questionnaires for stakeholders**Respondent's Information**

Respondent's Name:

Institution:

Job title:

Email:

Gender:

Country of institution:

Relevance

1. How would you rate the overall relevance of this project?

<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
The extent to which program objectives and design meet the needs of the country/recipient and continue to do so if circumstances change; the degree of alignment with country needs, existing national strategies and policies and SDGs	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Effectiveness:

2. How satisfied are you with the level of achievement of project objectives (use the Table below)? What are those factors⁹ that affected the achievement/under achievement of the objectives?

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Level of achievement outcomes</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
1.1 Increased integration of energy issues into policies, programmes and projects into other sectors	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
2.1. Increased use of efficient lights and other EE appliances	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
3.1 Increased production and use of efficient cook stoves and alternative cooking fuels	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
4.1 Increased national capacity to uptake energy efficient appliances and clean cooking solutions in compliance with quality standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
Monitoring of results and evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

3. Considering the above answers, how would you rate the overall effectiveness of this project?

<i>Effectiveness</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>

⁹ E.g. project design, project's linkages with other activities, extent and materialization of co-financing, stakeholder involvement

How satisfied are you with the overall achievement of the project outcomes, outputs and goals	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Efficiency

4. How would you rate the overall efficiency of the project?

<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
How satisfied are you with the use of project resources (financial, HR, material etc) to achieve project outcomes, outputs and goals?	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Sustainability

5. Overall, how would you rate the likely sustenance of this project achievements?

<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
To what extent are project achievements likely to continue beyond the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Likely <input type="checkbox"/> Likely <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately unlikely <input type="checkbox"/> Highly unlikely	

Assessment of Implementation and Execution

6. Based on your knowledge of this project, how would you assess the role of UNIDO in terms of project implementation, management and supervision?

<i>UNIDO role in the design of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of UNIDO as the GEF agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory	

	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
<i>UNIDO role in the implementation of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of UNIDO as the GEF agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
<i>UNIDO role in supervision of overall implementation of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of UNIDO as the GEF agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

7. How would you assess the role of the national executing agency –MoPE?

<i>MoPE role in the design of the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of MoPE	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	
<i>MoPE management role</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of MoPE	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

<i>Performance of PMO</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Performance of implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Assessment of the Environmental and Social Safeguards

8. Where there any unintended impacts created by this project?

<i>Environmental and social safeguards</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Assess how environmental and social safeguards were implemented in this project	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Stakeholder engagement

9. How satisfied are you with your participation in this project?

<i>Level of consideration of views and concerns by the project</i>	<i>Level of achievement</i>	<i>Explanation/justification of factors that affected achievement</i>
Level of satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Unsatisfactory	

Annex H: Rating scales

Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency Rating Description

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings
5 = Satisfactory (S)	Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements

Rating scale for sustainability

Rating	Description
4 = Likely (L)	There are little or no risks to sustainability
3 = Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks to sustainability
2 = Moderately unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks to sustainability
1 = Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks to sustainability
Unable to Assess (UA)	Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

Annex I: Co-financing Table

A. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNIDO	Grants	45,000
GEF Agency	UNIDO	In-kind	200,550
Recipient Government	Ministry of Petroleum and Energy (MoPE)	In-kind	106,889.04
Recipient Government	Ministry of Petroleum and Energy (MoPE)	Grant	71,259.36
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	700,000
Utilities	NAWEC	In-kind	1,050,000
Private Sector	Africell	Equity	784,315
Private Sector	Petrogas	In-kind	50,000
Others	Eco Bank	Loan	400,000
Private sector	Federation of Cashew Farmers Association	Equity	400,000
Private sector	Federation of Cashew Farmers Association	In-kind	10,000
Others	ECREEE	In-kind	323,000
Others	ECREEE	Grants	100,000
Others	ECREEE	Loans	200,851.6
Total Co-financing			4,441,865

Annex J: TE audit trail

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization and track change comment number (“#” column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
UNIDO	1	Section 3.2.4. – monitoring and evaluation	Weekly or bi-weekly meetings were held between UNIDO HQ and PMO to monitor progress of activities and of the project more generally. Dedicated meetings were scheduled between UNIDO HQ, MOPE and relevant stakeholders where needed.	We thank the reviewer for this comment. The organization of bi-weekly meeting has been integrated as part of the M&E – see the version of the TE report in track change.
UNIDO	2	Section 3.3.1 – progress towards Objectives and Expected Outputs and Outcomes (Table 2)	The activities under those components were not implemented and we issued a contract to SDF in replacement of those activities. This was approved by the PSC and hence the revision in the logframe.	A justification has been provided as to why the target was not achieved. See Table 2 of the dirty version of the TE report.
UNIDO	3	Section 3.3.1 – progress towards Objectives and Expected Outputs and Outcomes (Table 3)	25 people were trained on the first day of the training and 21 people on the second day	The number of individuals trained was modified accordingly.
UNIDO	4	Assessment of project outcomes (outcome 3, Table 6)	How was this assessed?	The emission reduction target was not met because alternative fuels to be used with the efficient cookstoves were not produced. This has been adequately explained in Table 6.

Annex K: Signed UNEG code of conduct form

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

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 imitations, 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 and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: Kevin Enongene

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 __Ottawa, Canada____ (Place) on __June 1, 2023____ (Date)

Signature: _____

