



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*



**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
Government of Malawi**

**Increasing Access to Clean and Affordable Decentralised
Energy Services in Selected Vulnerable Areas of Malawi**

GEF ID: 5587
Atlas Award ID 00086833
Project ID 00094026
UNDP PIMS No. 5270

Mid Term Evaluation Inception Report

Review Team Members

Lead Consultant: Alfredo Caprile
Supporting Consultant: Magi Matinga

January 2018

Index

Acronyms	ii
1. Introduction	3
2. Objectives of the MTR.....	4
3. MTR Approach	4
4. Scope of the MTR.....	6
5. Proposed methodology and work plan.....	8
5.1 Preliminary review of project documentation and preparation of the MTR Inception Report	8
5.1.1 Preliminary review of project documentation.....	8
5.2 Mission to Malawi.....	8
5.3 Draft Final Report.....	9
5.4 Final Report.....	10
6. Evaluation Matrix Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness.....	11
7. Sample survey questionnaire.....	17

Acronyms

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CEM	Community Energy Malawi
ESCOM	Electricity Supply Corporation of Malawi
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IACADES	Increasing Access to Clean and Affordable Decentralised Energy Services to Selected Vulnerable Areas of Malawi
MEGA	Mulanje Electricity Generation Agency
MHPP	Micro-Hydro Power Plant
MTR	Mid Term Review
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PRODOC	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SEM	Sustainable Energy Management
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

1. Introduction

In accordance with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, Mid-Term Reviews (MTRs) are a mandatory requirement for all United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) supported, GEF-financed full size projects This Inception Report covers the MTR of the GEF-UNDP project entitled: **“Increasing Access to Clean and Affordable Decentralised Energy Services in Vulnerable Areas of Malawi” (IACADES).**

The IACADES project is being implemented by the Government of Malawi through the Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining with the support of the GEF and UNDP. The project started in January 2015¹ and is in its fourth year of implementation.

The main objective of the IACADES project is to increase access to energy in selected remote, rural areas in Malawi by promoting innovative, community-based mini-grid applications in cooperation with the private sector and civil society. The IACADES project consists of three main components as follows:

- **Component 1:** Expansion of the Mulanje Electricity Generation Agency (MEGA) Micro-Hydro Power Plant (MHPP),
- **Component 2:** Replication of MEGA model via piloting of new clean energy mini-grid schemes in other areas of Malawi, and
- **Component 3:** Institutional strengthening and capacity building for promotion of decentralised mini-grid applications across the country.

This UNDP-GEF project was developed soon after the start of implementation of the UNDP-supported project on Sustainable Energy Management (SEM) which was concluded in December 2016. The SEM project provided advisory support, assisted in updating policies, developed standards, and established coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements. Another feature of the SEM project was the capacity building and training activities at the district level.

¹ The project had a slow start primarily due to severe floods that took place during early 2015 in Malawi that affected 14 out of the 28 districts which did not spare the hydro-electric infrastructure that generates electricity for the MEGA’s mini-grid, damaging part of its generating infrastructure. The Inception Workshop took place in June 2015 which marked the actual Project Launch and the first Project Board meeting was held in October 2015.

2. Objectives of the MTR

The objectives of the MTR are:

- Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document (PRODOC)
- Examine early signs of project success or failure with the goal of recommending corrective actions to achieve stated outcomes
- Review the project strategy and project risks to sustainability

In addition to reviewing progress towards the achievement of the IACADES project objectives and outcomes, the MTR will also assess the SEM project regarding the activities which has direct bearing on the IACADES project initiative.

3. MTR Approach

The MTR will provide evidence based on credible reliable and useful information. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase. This includes the following documents which have already been submitted to the MTR team:

- Project PRODOC,
- SEM PRODOC
- IACADES project work plans and progress reports
 - Annual Work Plans (AWPs) 2015, 2016 and 2017
 - Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs): 2016, 2017
 - Annual Progress Report for Component 1 implemented by MEGA July 2016 to June 2017
- IACADES project Management Minutes of Meeting
 - Minutes for Project Management Meeting held on April 21, 2016
- IACADES Progress Reports
 - IACADES Quarterly Progress report January to March 2016
 - IACADES Quarterly Progress report April to June 2016
 - IACADES Progress report January to June 2017
 - IACADES Quarterly Progress report July to September 2017
- SEM project Board Minutes of Meeting
 - Minutes of Project Board SEM project July 18, 2014
- SEM and IACADES project Steering Committee (PSC) Minutes of Meeting
 - Minutes of the CEM PSC Meeting held on October 7, 2015
 - Minutes of the 3rd CEM and IACADES PSC Meeting held on February 4, 2016
 - Minutes of the 4th CEM and IACADES PSC Meeting held on February 3, 2017 including invitation documents

- Minutes for the 5th CEM and IACADES PSC Meeting held on June 23, 2017
- Community Energy Malawi (CEM) Agreements
 - CEM Mini-grid proposal
 - Cover letter from CEM on Revised Proposal dated April 13, 2017
 - Signed CEM Grant Agreement (Micro Capital Agreement) for Non-Credit Related Activities
 - Technical and Financial Viability Analysis of the Photovoltaic Powered Micro-grid for the Sitolo Village in Mchinji, Malawi
 - Project Brief for Sitolo Solar PV Mini-grid Project
 - Sitolo Solar PCV Mini-grid Technical Assessment Review
 - VG Sitolo letter offering land
- Practical Action (3rd mini-grid operator)
 - Map of project site in Usingini-Nhkata Bay at Luzunkhuni River
 - Stakeholder support letter for the Katalika Mini-grid operation (undated)
 - Signed Practical Action Grant Agreement (Micro-Capital Grant Agreement) for Non-Credit Related Activities
 - UNDP Award letter to Practical Action for the Installation and Operation of a Mini-grid at Usingini Nkhata Bay
 - Usingini Project Management Practical Action letter dated May 24, 2017
 - Practical Action Proposal for the Usingini Micro-Hydro power project

In addition, the MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement and review and complete the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool.

The MTR team will follow a collaborative and participatory approach to ensure close commitment with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, and other key stakeholders.

Since engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR, stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, local government representatives.

The Evaluation Team is expected to conduct field missions to: (i) Mchinji visit the proposed site for the Mchinji Solar Mini-grid project and held interviews with project beneficiaries and the District Council, (ii) Blantyre for interviews with the Electricity Supply Corporation of Malawi (ESCOM), (iii) Mulanje for interviews with MEGA, (iv) Mzuzu for interviews at Mzuzu University and (v) Nkhata Bay for interviews with beneficiaries of the Usingini mini-hydro project. Actual travel itinerary will be decided at the start of the mission subject to availability of interviewees and climate conditions at the project sites.

The final report should describe the MTR approach taken and its rationale making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

4. Scope of the MTR

Based upon the Terms of Reference, the MTR evaluation team will assess the following four categories of project progress:

1. Project Strategy

Project Design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.
- Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities and took stock of linkages with the SEM project.
- Review decision-making processes.

Results Framework/Log frame:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timebound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the [Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#); colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Using the [Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#); assess the following categories of project progress:

- Management Arrangements
- Work Planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4. Sustainability

- Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:
- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic risks to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report setting out the MTR evidence-based conclusions and recommendations, in light of the findings. Additionally, the MTR consultant/team will make recommendations to the Project Team including succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and a recommendation table will be included in the Executive Summary of the MTR report.

5. Proposed methodology and work plan

The following summarizes the proposed methodology that the Evaluation Team plans to follow for the conduct of the MTR of the IACADES project:

5.1 Preliminary review of project documentation and preparation of the MTR Inception Report

The soundest basis for the most cost-effective delivery of the MTR of a GEF funded project rests on a clear understanding of the specific scope of services and responsibilities together with a transparent working relationship among all key parties that will be involved in the process from the outset including the participation of key stakeholders.

5.1.1 Preliminary review of project documentation

Having received the package of project information, the MTR Evaluation Team has reviewed key project related information listed previously under section 3..

The review of the project documentation has served as the basis for preparing an Evaluation matrix which includes the main review criteria and the indicators and/or benchmarks together with a set of questions that need to be answered to determine project results and to identify where the information is expected to come from.

Deliverable 1: Inception Report including a set of evaluation questions covering the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as defined in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting MTR of UNDP supported, GEF financed projects.

5.2 Mission to Malawi

Right after receiving approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Team will travel to Malawi to start the mission by having a formal Kick-off meeting with the UNDP officer in charge of the Project and the Project Team with the objective of reviewing the mission work plan and agenda, and discussing any pending issues that may have arisen after the review of the Inception Report.

The Evaluation Team will conduct a series of interviews with key stakeholders to collect evidence based information and facts that are credible, reliable and useful. It is anticipated that the UNDP office and the Project team will be responsible for setting up stakeholder meeting schedule and be responsible for the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country. The overall length of the Field Mission will be of approximately 10 days. The following table presents the proposed schedule for the mission which may have to be adjusted during Kick-off meeting based upon the availability of interviewees and climate conditions to travel to the project sites.

Table 1 Proposed Mission Schedule

Calendar Date	Item #	Activity	Purpose
7 Feb		International consultant arrives at Lilongwe	
8-17 Feb		MTR mission, interviews, field visits	
8 Feb		Meetings with UNDP; DOE; MERA Interviews with Practical Action Interviews with Community Energy	Stakeholder meetings
9 Feb		Visit Mchinji: proposed site for solar mini-grid interviews with beneficiaries and with District Council	Field visit to site for Community Energy
11 Feb		Travel South: Interviews with ESCOM in Blantyre and MEGA at Mulanje	Interviews with MEGA and ESCOM
13 February		Travel to Mzuzu and Nkhata-Bay Interviews with beneficiaries for the proposed site, meeting with Muzu University	
15 Feb		Return to Lilongwe	
16 February		Wrap-up meetings & presentation of initial findings-/ end of MTR mission	

A Mission Wrap up session to present initial findings of the mission will take place after the field missions are completed.

Deliverable 2: A presentation with the initial findings at the end of the Mission which will take place at the end of the missions.

5.3 Draft Final Report

Armed with the information and additional data collected during the Mission to Malawi, the Evaluation Team will proceed to prepare the Draft Final Report. The MTR Evaluation report will be structured in accordance with the proposed outline that has been included in the Guidance for Conducting Mid Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.

The evaluation will cover the following five major criteria:

- (i) Relevance,
- (ii) Effectiveness,
- (iii) Efficiency,
- (iv) Results and
- (v) Sustainability

while ascertaining all aspects of project intervention related to: Project Strategy, Progress Towards Results, Project Implementation and Adaptive Management and Sustainability and taking into account the views of all relevant stakeholders.

Particular attention will be placed to present conclusions and recommendations that are Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART) and include a section with the rating of the project's results and a description of the associated achievements. Achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency will be rated in a six-level scale as follows:

- Highly satisfactory (HS), the project had no shortcomings
- Satisfactory (S), minor shortcomings
- Moderately satisfactory (MS) moderate shortcomings
- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU), significant shortcomings
- Unsatisfactory (U), major shortcomings
- Highly unsatisfactory (HU), severe shortcomings

The evaluation will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Specific attention will be placed in evaluating the project monitoring system in order to identify quantifiable information that could lead to a forceful assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the project.

Deliverable 3: A Draft Final Report with annexes will be submitted for its review and comments within 3 weeks of the MTR mission.

5.4 Final Report

All comments and suggestions received from UNDP and which may include comments from all those with any responsibility in oversight regarding the project as well as key government counterparts and other key stakeholders will be incorporated into the Final Report. Also, a Power Point presentation with key findings, forward-looking analysis and recommendations will be submitted together with the Final Report

Deliverable 4: Final Report and Power Point presentation within 2 weeks of receiving comments on draft

6. Evaluation Matrix Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the objectives of the project relate to the main objective of the GEF focal area and UNDP, and to the environment and development priorities of the local beneficiaries?				
Is the project Relevant to GEF priorities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the GEF focal area and strategic priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Documents GEF focal areas strategies and documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses GEF website Interviews with UNDP and project
Is the project Relevant to UNDP priorities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To which extent does the project correspond with the Country Project Action Plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities and work areas are incorporated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Documents UNDP Country Action Plan for Malawi National policies and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses UNDP website Interviews with UNDP and project
Is the project relevant to Malawi environment and sustainable development objectives including the need to increase access to energy in rural areas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Country? Does the project support Malawi's objectives in terms of increasing access to energy in rural areas by promoting innovative, community-based mini-grid applications in cooperation with the private sector and civil society? Is the project Country-driven? What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? What was the level of stakeholder ownership in Implementation? Does the Project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional capacity and legal and policy frameworks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the project supports National environmental objectives Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies in particular for those associated with rural electrification Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and Implementation to national realities and existing capacities Level of Involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF Criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents National policies and strategies Key project Partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with UNDP and project partners
Is the project addressing the specific needs of target beneficiaries at the local and national levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the specific needs of relevant stakeholders? Has the Implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant Stakeholders? Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project partners and stakeholders Needs assessment studies Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews with all relevant stakeholders

Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there Logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of Resources etc.)? • Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve Project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of coherence between project • Expected results and project design internal logic • Level of coherence between project Design and project implementation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program and Project documents • Key project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Key interviews
How is the project relevant with respect to other UNDP / GEF-supported Activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the GEF funding support activities and objectives not being addressed by other donors? • How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? • Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents from other donor supported activities • Other donor representatives • Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents analyses • Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned from activities that have been implemented so far 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which indicators in project document results framework and log frame have been achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Project team and relevant stakeholders • Data reported in project reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interviews
How have and are risks and risk mitigation being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? • What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are they institutionalized for future learning and cooperation? • Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and Design • Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues • Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interviews

What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? • What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned from activities that have been implemented so far 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collected throughout the evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis
How effectively funds from the programme have been transferred to local partners and /or government?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely and transparent information on available funds • Timely disbursement • Correspondence between information on funds released and received amounts • Well defined (and respected) payment triggers • Relation to other (government) funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information from financial report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Energy, • Local partners / governments • Associations of NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? • Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? • Have progress reports been produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? • Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) • Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned? • Were financial resources utilized efficiently? • Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability and quality of financial and progress reports • Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided • Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures • Planned vs. actual funds leveraged • Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations • Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost • Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) • Occurrence of change in project design/implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and Evaluations • UNDP • Project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Key interviews

How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? ▪ Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? ▪ What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? ▪ Which methods were successful or not and why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, ▪ Examples of supported partnerships ▪ Evidence that particular partnerships / linkages will be sustained ▪ Types / quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ Project partners and relevant stakeholders ▪ UNDP ▪ Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document Analysis ▪ Interviews
Did the project efficiently utilised local capacity in implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? ▪ Has the project taken into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? ▪ Has there been an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national Experts ▪ Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents and ▪ Evaluations ▪ UNDP ▪ Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? ▪ How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc.)? ▪ What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lessons learned from activities implemented so far 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data analysis
How effectively has program management implemented the work plans / updated plans to match modified conditions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rate of delivery on the annual work plans? ▪ Achievements against targets (as set-out in the ProDoc and in the modified work plans if any) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program reports, ▪ Work plans ▪ Project staff ▪ NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
To what extent have the GEF /UNDP country / regional offices ensured oversight and guidance functions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of visits to project sites ▪ Existence of clear mechanisms / instruments to share information and provide feedback ▪ Sharing of lessons learnt ▪ Responsiveness to requests for TA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The role played by UNDP country and regional offices and its effects on project performances ▪ Levels of effectiveness of their performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program reports, ▪ Project staff, ▪ Regional office ▪ staff ▪ NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

How well has monitoring and evaluation been linked to the management processes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of baseline data ▪ Evidence that an ME systems are set-up and updated ▪ Evidence that the EMIS system is shared with NGOs ▪ Availability of up to date indicators of progress, regular and informative reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data sources of M&E unit, reports, ▪ Project staff, ▪ NGO staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data sources of M&E unit, reports, ▪ Project staff, ▪ NGO staff
Are M&E data and reporting used to share / disseminate information and/or to inform strategic decisions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality, comprehensiveness and timeliness of reporting ▪ Degree of use of data from M&E to inform investment decisions ▪ Degree of use of data and reports to enhance knowledge base of local and national policy makers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The structure of M&E systems ▪ Specific contribution of M&E structures to the overall project efficiency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data system used by M&E unit; ▪ M&E reports; ▪ Interviews with M&E and Project staff ▪ NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data system used by M&E unit; ▪ M&E reports; ▪ Interviews with M&E and Project staff ▪ NGOs
How effective has Technical Advice been in supporting the program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of technical reports ▪ Responsiveness of reports to program needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentary analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
Sustainability: How do the objectives of the project relate to the main objective of GEF focal area and UNDP, and to the environment and development priorities at the local beneficiaries?				
Has the program been conducive to replicating the MEGA model in other areas of Malawi?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are investments being planned to replicate the MEGA model in other areas of the country? ▪ How many new mini-grid projects have been implemented in other areas of the country? ▪ Is the energy policy & regulatory framework conducive to the implementation of RE projects in Malawi? ▪ Has the project been successful in promoting market approaches for the installation of new mini-grid schemes across the country? ▪ Does the type and amount of RE resources in Malawi allow for the implementation of profitable RE generation projects? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentary analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Which actions has the project put in place to guarantee the sustainability of the results? ▪ Which are the key challenges and risks that the project is facings to ensure the sustainability of the results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentary analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
Financial sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How did the project address its financial and economic sustainability in the medium to long run? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentary analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
Institutional sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the institutional framework capacity adequate to support the implementation of third party renewable electricity generation investments in Malawi? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentary analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
Catalytic Role: To which extent has the project demonstrated having a catalytic role in Malawi or in other geographic areas?				
Scalability and replicability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have the results of the project been applied across the country or in other geographic areas? ▪ How can the country benefit from the results and lessons learned from the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentary analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
Impact: To which extent did the project achieve impact or advanced in achieving the expected results and impacts? Has there been unexpected situations?				
Impact	<p>How has the project contributed to the expected impact with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environment ▪ Economic wellbeing of the country ▪ Other socio-economic aspects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentary analysis ▪ Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

7. Sample survey questionnaire

Please answer all questions to the best of your abilities:

A. Project Formulation /Design

- Conceptualization /Design: risks and assumptions
 - Explain some of the *inherent assumptions* in the original design. Are they correct? Examples include:
 - Scope of project vs. funding and capacity
 - Scale up possibilities
 - Sustainability- funding mechanisms, etc.
 - Capacities
 - others
 - Please provide an elaboration of the project conceptualization process to the best of your knowledge
 - Is the Log frame still appropriate?
 - Should baselines be added and indicator adjusted?
 - Does the risk matrix make sense and is it appropriate? Should it be upgraded? Is it used as management tool How are risks mitigated?
 - How would you rate the design on a scale of 1-5? (with five being highest)
- Country ownership/ Drivenness
 - How do the government partners engage / interact with this project?
 - Is the project a national priority? Why or Why not?
 - What is the institutional home of this project? Is this the optimal home?
 - What is the status of legislation supportive of the program expected outcomes?
 - Are there enforcement mechanisms?
 - Should the project be housed in another institution?
- Stakeholder participation in design:
 - Who are the key project stakeholders/beneficiaries? Describe how stakeholders were involved in the design process.
 - How would you rate the stakeholder participation on a scale of 1-5? (with 5 being the highest)
- Replication approach:
 - Does this project have a design / approach that can be replicated regionally, nationally or globally? Give evidence. Why or Why not?
- UNDP/GEF role:
 - Describe the UNDP Country office and GEF contribution in management and implementation.

- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Describe the linkages between this project and other similar projects in the sector.
- Other aspects:
 - Provide your rating of project design on a scale of 1 – 5 (with five being the highest rating possible)

B. Implementation/management approach

- Does the Project management employ the logical framework as a management tool? Provide concrete examples.
- Provide concrete examples of Project management and stakeholders use of adaptive management, i.e. comprehensive and realistic work plans every year?
- Please draw the current project management and implementation arrangements.
- Describe the general operational relationships between the various institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project outcomes.
- How would you rate the implementation approach on a scale of 1-5? (Five is the highest rating possible)

C. Monitoring and Evaluation

- Did project staff or stakeholders undertake periodic oversight?
- How often does the Project Board and the Steering Committee meet?
- Can you please describe what evaluations and or studies you have conducted on aspects of project?
- Describe the systems and tools employed for M&E, i.e. log frame, baselines established.
- Project indicators: are there results and progress indicators? Describe data analysis process.
- List staff and designation of responsibilities with respect to M&E i.e. capacities and resources for M&E
- How would you rate the M&E on a scale of 1-5? (Five is the highest rating possible)

D. Partnership strategies

- Are partnerships appropriate and effective including the range and quality of partnerships and collaboration developed with government, civil society, donors, the private sector and whether these have contributed to improved delivery?
- Which is the degree of stakeholder and partner involvement in the various processes related to the outputs and outcome?
- How could synergies be built with other projects within the sector?

E. Stakeholder Participation and Implementation

- How is information generated and disseminated by the project?
- Please comment on the overall strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project regarding stakeholder participation and implementation.
- Please describe the process and result of the establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities. Describe the effect of these on project implementation.
- Describe the involvement of government institutions in project implementation, the extent of government support of the project.
- How would you rate the stakeholder participation and implementation on a scale of 1-5? (Five is the highest rating possible).

F. Financial planning

- List activities and provide project cost by activity, outputs and activities (provide information to enable to allow an analysis of delivery by percentage)
- Describe the financial management (including disbursement issues),
- Describe the co-financing arrangements/agreements. Are they suitable?
- Has a project audit been conducted? What are the major findings? Do you agree?

G. Describe in detail the execution and implementation modalities

- Does National execution work or not?
- Describe the effectiveness of UNDP counterpart and project coordinators unit in participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts and national counterpart staff and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities.
- Are there any problems with the implementation i.e. current flow of staff in and out of the project, others?
- Describe the hiring process for Project staff- who is responsible for this? Are the donor and government partners involved?
- Describe the financial officer's roles? Does this work? Is it strategic and operational support toward project outcomes and for implementation?
- Does the project receive external technical backstopping and support from the wider partner knowledge network – why or why not?
- Do you think the procurement process is streamlined and efficient? What can be done to improve it? How does it affect overall implementation and expected results?
- What are some suggested improvements in the human resources situation?