

Decarbonizing Humanitarian Energy Multi-Partner Trust Fund (DHE MPTF)

Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

The Decarbonizing Humanitarian Energy Multi-Partner Trust Fund (DHE MPTF) was established in early 2023 with \$22 million in seed funding from the German Federal Foreign Office to address needs and challenges identified by the Global Platform for Action on Energy Access in Displacement Settings (GPA) in foundational research assessing the humanitarian energy sector, estimating greenhouse gas emissions in displacement settings, and identifying key barriers to clean energy transitions in humanitarian response. Programme partners (PPs) are the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and NORCAP (part of the Norwegian Refugee Council). Since the DHE MPTF's inception phase and initial delivery of its operational phase, limited progress has been achieved towards the intended results. The DHE MPTF Steering Committee (SC), in alignment with all PPs, has mandated the Secretariat to undertake a Mid-Term Review to inform a restructuring of the DHE MPTF within 2025.

2. Background and Context

2.1 Background

Electricity is vital for effective humanitarian response. It is needed to power operational premises in cities (such as offices, logistics centres, and warehouses) and to support infrastructure delivering essential services in displacement settings (including healthcare facilities, schools and community centres, water pumps, site offices, and communications).

Conservative estimates from the GPA calculated in 2021 that six UN agencies and the ICRC operate 11,365 diesel and petrol generators in displacement settings, collectively spending around \$110 million per year on fuel and emitting almost 200,000 tonnes of CO₂ annually.¹

To reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions in humanitarian infrastructure, the DHE MPTF aims to establish a **Centralised Clean Energy Service (CCES)** to provide interested humanitarian actors with coordinated, scalable support for sustainable energy transitions. Addressing structural barriers to transition is core to the CCES model. The DHE takes a holistic approach and goes one step further to identify and support ways in which these transitions can expand energy access for displaced and host communities.

2.2 Challenges to Clean Energy Transitions

Energy efficiency measures could rapidly and significantly reduce electricity usage, and in many cases renewable energy transitions can further reduce costs and decarbonise the electricity supply. However, this energy transition is inhibited by several factors:

- **Humanitarian agencies** are hindered by short-term annual funding cycles, limited in-house technical capacity, budget constraints, and early termination clauses in multi-year contracts.

¹ Estimating the use of Diesel Generators in Displacement Settings: assessed 7 humanitarian actors using 11,400 diesel generators and used a Monte Carlo model to generate the global projections cited here.

- **Donors** are hesitant to use precious humanitarian funding to invest in long-term energy infrastructure.
- **Private clean energy companies** lack experience in humanitarian contexts, view displacement contexts as complex and risky, lack coordinated entry points for engaging in humanitarian energy projects, and cannot absorb high contract and long-term agreement risk.
- **Energy projects** in the humanitarian context are typically small scale, often remote, and typically funded through grant-based (rather than service delivery) models. This leads to the piecemeal development of projects that struggle to capitalise on green financing, fail to reinvest potential savings from effective energy transitions into new projects, and are not self-sustaining.

2.3 Centralised Clean Energy Services for Decarbonizing Humanitarian Energy

The DHE MPTF aims to facilitate a Centralised Clean Energy Service (CCES) that provides coordinated support for clean energy transitions, energy efficiency, and energy access in humanitarian settings at scale. To achieve these aims the DHE MPTF seeks to (a) reduce energy consumption and costs for humanitarian Energy Transition Partners (ETPs); (b) facilitate private sector engagement and establish viable delivery models for renewable energy services suitable for humanitarian contexts; (c) “bundle” projects within geographic regions to achieve economies of scale, attract private investment, and unlock additional revenue from innovative finance mechanisms; (d) produce a suite of evidence-based communications materials that promote lower carbon operations; and (e) facilitate expanded energy access for displaced and local host communities.

2.4 Key Stakeholders

- **Programme Partners (PPs)** – *Responsible for developing and delivering the DHE model*
 - **UNITAR (GPA)**: Programme coordination and research support²
 - **UNDP**: Technical support
 - **NORCAP**: In-country support
- **Energy Transition Partners (ETPs)** – *Users of the CCES*: Any UN agency, INGO, NGO, or government entity that provides humanitarian services and is looking to power their infrastructure with clean, sustainable energy.

2.5 How the CCES Aims to Deliver Transitions at Scale and Expand Energy Access

Through the CCES model, the DHE MPTF seeks to deliver the following five distinct advantages over the status quo:

- ▶ **Bundling projects** geographically creates economies of scale to increase private sector interest in remote/small-scale facilities and increase opportunities to engage with suppliers.
- ▶ **Countrywide coordination** centralises existing and emerging knowledge, processes, and tools in the humanitarian and development sectors to mobilise energy transitions. It is open to all actors supporting the humanitarian response and provides tailored support to fill identified gaps, meet each ETPs unique needs, and push for clean humanitarian energy at scale.

² DHE's Secretariat is also hosted at UNITAR.

- ▶ **Effective private sector engagement** through innovative delivery models and financing mechanisms (e.g. de-risking and blended finance), seeking to address early termination clauses in humanitarian contracts, and enabling viable third-party service delivery models to improve sustainability and cost-effectiveness of energy systems and to shore against risk of stranded assets.
- ▶ **Centralised aggregation** unlocks new financing mechanisms that are typically unavailable to smaller, single-premise interventions. Monitoring projects via a centralised DHE dashboard facilitates the reinvestment of cost savings into new projects within the CCES or other areas of humanitarian response, and provides information to support organisational, national, and global sustainability strategies and emissions reduction targets.
- ▶ **A holistic approach** offers the opportunity to leverage CCES-supported transitions to improve energy access in displaced and host communities and increase livelihood opportunities and mainstreams a gender and inclusivity lens through this approach. The DHE programme directly supports the development of energy access projects anchored to CCES-supported transitions, with a particular focus on community-led project development, productive use, and local training to support systems maintenance.

The DHE is implemented through six work packages:

1. **Coordination and Strategic Project Development:** Coordinating at global, national, and local levels, background research, connecting suppliers and other local partners to humanitarian organisations, kickstarting country- and region-level implementation, aggregating monitoring and reporting at the country and organisation level, coordinating scale-up of the CCES, collecting and analysing lessons learnt.
2. **Evidence and Technical Assistance:** Purchasing energy meters and conducting site assessments and energy audits to measure consumption, applying standard sustainable energy project development processes (with energy efficiency considerations) to assess sustainable energy value proposition, developing business cases for humanitarian organisations for individual and bundled sites, developing technical specifications for tender documentation, developing centralised procurement processes.
3. **Greening Humanitarian Energy Infrastructure:** Supporting implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of concrete sustainable energy projects (energy efficiency solutions and/or sustainable energy systems), producing evidence on public-private collaborations, monitoring systems performance systems, quantifying impact of transitions to sustainable energy solutions.
4. **Leveraging Finance:** Applying de-risking mechanisms to humanitarian contracts, refining contractual frameworks, integrating opportunities for green financing and blended finance solutions.
5. **Capacity Strengthening and Knowledge Sharing:** Training on programme design through a standard project development process (UNDP 7 Step Green Energy Solution), vocational training for end users/communities on installation, operations and maintenance of sustainable energy systems, producing and disseminating knowledge products through webinars, events, and international conferences.
6. **Enabling Community Access:** Supporting creative business model development and implementation to extend electricity to communities and community resources, supporting innovative community-based energy access funds.

3. Purpose and Scope of the Mid-Term Review (MTR)

3.1 Purpose of the MTR

On request from the DHE MPTF Steering Committee and through the Secretariat, UNITAR's *Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME)* is commissioning an independent MTR to (i) take stock of the fund's performance and progress to date – insofar as its current state of implementation allows; (ii) review its design, current structures and implementation arrangements; and (iii) provide a comprehensive analysis, identifying opportunities for effectiveness and efficiency, and offering actionable recommendations to support progress toward its intended impact.

The review is intended to support learning and accountability. It should be a forward-looking exercise to inform decisions related to the future implementation, the overall approach and structure of the DHE MPTF. As such, this will require consideration for possible amendments to the Terms of References and the Manual of Operations of the Fund and the Secretariat.

3.2 Scope of the MTR

The MTR will take stock of the fund's progress to date and review its design, current structures and implementation arrangements, with an emphasis on key aspects such as its governance, management and operational efficiency.

Given the extended inception phase, interruptions during the implementation phase, and limited progress toward targets during this period, the MTR will focus less on reviewing the DHE MPTF's performance and the extent to which it has met its objectives, and more on understanding what has or has not worked – analysing the underlying reasons, and capturing lessons learned to highlight opportunities, gaps or areas for improvement and possible pitfalls to avoid. The main purpose of this exercise (see 3.1) will be to guide the necessary structural changes and strategic realignment of the fund, to set it on track to achieve its intended results.

The MTR will look at the DHE MPTF in its entirety, covering the period from February 2023 to March 2025, spanning both the inception period (Feb 2023-March 2024) and the initial operational/implementation phase beginning in October 2023. While there is some overlap between the inception period which was extended twice, and implementation, there will need to be a distinction between these two different phases and their respective objectives and outcomes.

Due to the multi-partner nature of the fund and how it operates, this will encompass various projects with their respective Project Documents and Budgets, under different PPs (GPA-UNITAR, NORCAP, UNDP) but also its Secretariat and the overarching fund structures and governance bodies, including the Steering Committee. It is imperative to look at the DHE MPTF holistically, while also considering each party's role and responsibilities, to ensure that the review and ensuing recommendations can inform a revised and improved structure for the fund as a whole, but also for its constituents to take the relevant actions within their organizations.

In terms of geographical scope, the MTR will look at global activities undertaken by the DHE MPTF and its PPs with teams in Geneva, Oslo, Copenhagen, and New York, as well as remote consultants, and in-country activities in Nigeria and Niger – noting that those in the latter were disrupted by the July 2023 coup and suspended.

The primary audience of the MTR will be the DHE's SC, which includes the donor, the three PPs, the Secretariat and the MPTF Office. The secondary audience for the MTR will be ETPs and other humanitarian agencies and partners both at a global level and in-country.

4. Review Criteria and Questions

4.1 Review Criteria

The Terms of Reference (ToR) of the DHE MPTF stipulate that evaluations must be credible, independent, impartial, and transparent, and should assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the fund's results and its contribution to achieving the desired goals. This is aligned with UNITAR's [Evaluation Policy](#) which adopts the six Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee criteria for evaluation (i.e. relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability).³

More broadly, according to the MPTF Office, the performance of an MPTF can be assessed across the following four levels:⁴

- i. **Fund Impact Effectiveness:** *Is the fund contributing towards the achievement of larger, sustainable goals?*
- ii. **Fund Outcome Effectiveness:** *Is the fund effectively supporting transformative change?*
- iii. **Fund Output Efficiency:** *Are the fund's projects delivering intended outputs?*
- iv. **Fund Operational Efficiency:** *Is the fund operating efficiently to support satisfactory performance of its portfolio and improve aid effectiveness?*

Given the specific scope and purpose of the present MTR (see 3.1) and considering the fund's limited results to date and short implementation period, it is important to ensure that the criteria applied and specific questions focus on areas that are most relevant and useful to this MTR and seek to uncover root causes for the Fund's current performance. A targeted approach will help ensure the MTR leads to actionable recommendations that can inform the restructuring within a reasonable timeframe, enabling the timely resumption of DHE activities under an improved structure.

4.2 MTR Questions

The following key questions are *proposed* to guide the review, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the reviewer following the initial document review and engagement with stakeholders in the review matrix/question designs. Suggested guiding questions have been included in Annex G to complement the proposed key questions below. These are meant to provide further context to the reviewer and may or may not be included in the final review design/question matrix (see section 8 below).

► Governance and management

- To what extent are the DHE's institutional framework, governance structure, and management arrangements fit for purpose and supportive of effective and efficient implementation?
- To what extent are the DHE's fund management and administrative arrangements appropriate and effective, and how might they be improved, if required?

► Theory of Change and Impact Measurement

- To what extent do the Theory of Change (ToC) and its underlying assumptions, accurately reflect the DHE's strategic focus and intended impact, and provide clear pathways for achieving the desired change?

³ The UNITAR Evaluation Policy stipulates that not all criteria necessarily apply to all evaluations and decisions on which criteria apply to a given undertaking should be based on the type of evaluation, the objective/purpose of the evaluation, consultations with the evaluation's stakeholders, the main evaluation questions and considerations related to methodology, feasibility and resources.

⁴ https://mptf.undp.org/sites/default/files/documents/20000/designing_pooled_funds_for_performance_manual.pdf

- To what extent has the DHE's Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) framework enabled effective tracking of progress toward outcomes, and facilitated results-based management and evidence-based learning? What improvements, if any, are needed?

► **Fund Design and Coherence**

- To what extent do the DHE's design and delivery model align with, and enable progress toward, its strategic objectives, and support effective and adaptive implementation?
- To what extent does the DHE effectively coordinate with and complement other humanitarian energy and energy access initiatives, while leveraging partnerships, existing networks, and stakeholder expertise at the global, regional, and country levels?

► **Effectiveness, Efficiency and Likelihood of Impact**

- To what extent has the DHE been planned and implemented in an effective and efficient manner, and delivered expected outputs? Based on this, what is the likelihood it will lead to tangible and measurable impact?

5. Approach and Methods

The review will be conducted in alignment with the overriding principles of the [UNITAR Evaluation Policy](#), [the operational guidelines for independent evaluations](#) and the [United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#), and the [UN Evaluation Group \(UNEG\) Ethical Guidelines](#). The review will be carried out by an international consultant (the "reviewer") or a team of consultants under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME). PPME shall support the review team in gathering background documentation and other data collection processes.

The review shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of stakeholders, including the DHE MPTF Secretariat, SC, programme partners, the donor, the MPTF Office, the beneficiaries, and other relevant stakeholders. Engagement with the DHE MPTF Secretariat as well as PPs will be particularly important in so far as the Secretariat has been tasked by the SC to engaged in an internal exercise to identify reasons for the fund's present shortcomings and performance challenges and lead a restructuring process.

The review should follow a mixed-methods approach, and data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings. Data collection could draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder mapping and analysis; surveys; review of the log frame and the theory of change (reconstruct if needed); key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if deemed essential, travel to attend a programme partners' meeting.

Suggested methods and data collection tools include:

- **Comprehensive desk review:** The reviewer will compile, review and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the programme, including a results framework indicator tracking review. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex C. A template for document review suggested by PPME, can be found [here](#).
- **Stakeholder analysis:** The reviewer will identify and relate the different stakeholders involved in the programme. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited, to:
 - DHE Secretariat
 - DHE Steering Committee
 - Programme Partners (NORCAP, UNDP, UNITAR)

- Beneficiaries, including Energy Transition Partners (ETPs)
 - The donor ([German Federal Foreign Office](#) and the [International Climate Initiative \(IKI\)](#))
 - [MPTF Office](#).
- ▶ **Benchmarking:** The reviewer shall compare the Fund against other MPTFs and similar funds from other organizations.
 - ▶ **Strategic foresight:** The reviewer may choose to incorporate strategic foresight tools, e.g. applying the futures wheel, 3 horizons, futures triangle tools, to make this a forward-looking MTR.
 - ▶ **Survey(s):** If useful, with a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of programme stakeholders, such as beneficiaries⁵, the consultant will develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the reviewer to easily probe during the key informant interviews.
 - ▶ **Key informant interviews:** Based on stakeholder identification, the reviewer will identify and interview key informants. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global, national or local level. Generic interview guidelines can be found [here](#).
 - ▶ **Focus groups/Workshops:** Focus groups could be organized with selected programme stakeholders to complement/triangulate findings from other data collection tools. A workshop with PPs and other key stakeholders could also be considered.
 - ▶ **Travel to attend partner meeting:** Whether travel to attend a partner meeting is deemed essential shall be discussed at the inception/review design.

Gender, disability and human rights, and environmental sustainability

As relevant to the review questions, the reviewer should incorporate [human rights, gender, disability, and environmental sustainability](#) perspectives in the review process and findings, particularly by involving women and other groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, UN country classification, and age grouping and be included in the review report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this review should particularly put emphasis on gender equality and environment.

The guiding principles for the review should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow [ethical and professional standards](#).

6. Roles and Responsibilities

The principal responsibility for managing the MTR resides with UNITAR's *Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME)* which will commission the MTR on behalf of the Secretariat.

The UNITAR PPME will contract the consultant(s) who will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of PPME ('review manager'). The review manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR's Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR's evaluation function's

⁵ At this stage beneficiaries of the DHE are ETPs as there are no energy access projects nor decarbonization projects that have been implemented on the ground.

independence and ability to better support learning and accountability. This independence extends to related exercises, such as reviews.

The Secretariat will be responsible for liaising with the review team to provide all relevant documents and help set up stakeholder interviews.

The reviewer should consult with the review manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The reviewer is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys in close collaboration with the UNITAR PPME.

7. Ethics

The reviewer selected should not have participated in the design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with DHE MPTF activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines and the Guiding Ethical Principles for using AI in Evaluation, as required](#).

8. Deliverables

The proposed timeframe for the review spans from May 2025 (recruitment of the reviewer) to August 2025 (submission of final review report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.

The reviewer shall submit a review design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial consultations with the DHE MPTF Secretariat and PPs. The review design/question matrix should include a discussion on the review objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested review questions or data collection methods. The review design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the review exercise, as well as a list of documents reviewed highlighting insights from every reviewed document.

Following data collection and analysis, the reviewer shall submit a zero draft of the review report to the review manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the review manager.

The draft review report should follow the structure presented under Annex D. The report should state the purpose of the review, and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the review. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 20 pages, excluding annexes.

Following the submission of the zero draft, a presentation of emerging findings with discussion of review recommendations and a draft report will then be submitted to the Steering Committee, Secretariat and PPs to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex E by 15 August 2025. Within one week of receiving feedback, the reviewer shall submit the final review report. The target date for this submission is 22 August 2025. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report. The report will be shared with all concerned stakeholders (see section 9 for more details) and the reviewer will present the final findings, recommendations and lessons learned to the SC, PPs and the Secretariat.

Activity	April 2025	May 2025	June 2025	July 2025	Aug. 2025	Sept. 2025
Drafting of Review's Terms of Reference						
Reviewer selected and recruited						
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis						
Review design/question matrix						
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups						
Zero draft report submitted to review manager						
Draft review report consulted with UNITAR review manager and submitted to the Secretariat and PPs						
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned						
The Secretariat, the SC and PPs review draft report and recommendations and shares comments						
Review report finalized and final findings, recommendations and lessons learned presented to the SC						
Management response by the Secretariat and PPs					TBC	
Dissemination and publication					TBC	

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline*
Review design/question matrix	Reviewer	Review manager	23 May 2025
Comments on review design/question matrix	Review manager	Reviewer	30 May 2025
Zero draft report	Reviewer	Review manager	18 July 2025
Comments on zero draft	Review manager	Reviewer	25 July 2025
Draft report	Reviewer	Review manager	1 August 2025
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Reviewer/review manager	The SC, PPs and the Secretariat	TBD
Comments on draft report	the SC, PPs and the Secretariat	Review manager	15 August 2025
Final draft report	Reviewer	Review manager	22 August 2025
Presentation of final findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Reviewer	The SC, PPs and the Secretariat	TBC

*Deadlines are indicative and may be subject to some adjustment while maintaining overall timeframe delivery target for final report.

9. Communication/dissemination of results

The review report shall be written in English. The final report will be shared with DHE's SC, which includes the donor, the three PPs, the Secretariat, the MPTF Office, and all partners, and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public in [UNITAR website](#) as well as the [UNEG website](#). The MTR will also be made available to the public through the DHE, the MPTF Office, and partner's websites.

10. Reviewer Profile

The reviewer will be well-versed in UNEG evaluation norms and standards, with relevant experience, preferably including previous evaluations or reviews of pooled funds, Joint Programmes or Multi-Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs).

Required skills and Experience

Education

- Advanced university degree at Master's level or equivalent in evaluation, international development, humanitarian action, sustainable energy, international affairs, political science, research, or another field related to the responsibilities.

Experience

- At least 7 years' demonstrable experience in evaluating strategies, policies, programmes and projects at the international level.
- Experience in conducting evaluations for UN and non-UN international organizations, including strategy and programme evaluations, change management, theory of change, etc. Experience leading reviews or evaluations of MPTF pooled funding is an advantage.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches.
- Excellent writing skills (report to be drafted in English).
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Advanced knowledge of humanitarian action, displacement settings, sustainable energy policies and practices in fragile and conflict-prone locations.
- Understanding of the UN system, the UN evaluation norms and standards is required.
- Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.

Languages: A high standard in both oral and written English are required. Knowledge of French or another United Nations official language is an asset.

11. Annexes

Annex A: Overview of projects implemented by the Fund

Project	Project Number	Organization	Start date	End date	Prodoc Link
DHE Secretariat Project (Inception Phase)	140051	UNITAR GPA	01/01/2023	15/03/2024	
DHE Secretariat Project (Inception Phase)	140051	UNDP	01/01/2023	15/03/2024	
DHE Secretariat Project (Inception Phase)	140051	NORCAP	01/01/2023	15/03/2024	
DHE Secretariat Budget 01 March 2024 to 28 February 2026	140627	UNITAR (Secretariat)	01/03/2024	28/02/2026	
Decarbonizing Humanitarian Energy (DHE) Global Coordination	140797	NORCAP	01/07/2023	31/12/2024	
DHE Work Package 6: Nigeria Energy Access Workshops	140812	UNITAR GPA	26/08/2024	31/12/2025	
DHE Work Package 6: Nigeria Energy Access Workshops	140812	NORCAP	26/08/2024	31/12/2025	
DHE - UNDP Global Coordination (Oct 2023 - Dec 2024) - WP3 Greening Humanitarian Energy Infrastructure	140976	UNDP	01/10/2023	01/01/2025	
DHE - UNDP Global Coordination (Oct 2023 - Dec 2024) - WP1 Strategic Coordination	140977	UNDP	01/10/2023	01/01/2025	
DHE - UNDP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2024) - WP2 Technical Assistance	140981	UNDP	01/01/2024	01/01/2025	
DHE - UNDP Nigeria (Oct 2023 - Dec 2024) - WP3 Greening Humanitarian Energy Infrastructure	140986	UNDP	01/10/2023	01/01/2025	
DHE - UNITAR Global Coordination (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP1 Strategic Coordination	140987	UNITAR GPA	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Global Coordination (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP1 Strategic Coordination	141006	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Global Coordination (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP2 Technical Assistance	141008	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Global Coordination (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP5 Capacity Strengthening	141009	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Global Coordination (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP6 Energy Access	141010	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP1 Strategic Coordination	141011	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP5 Capacity Strengthening	141012	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP2 Technical Assistance	141005	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2025) - WP6 Energy Access	141007	NORCAP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - NORCAP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2024) - WP2 Technical Assistance	141064	NORCAP	01/01/2024	01/01/2025	
DHE - NORCAP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2024) - WP1 Strategic Coordination	141066	NORCAP	01/01/2024	01/01/2025	
DHE - NORCAP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2024) - WP6 Energy Access	141067	NORCAP	01/01/2024	01/01/2025	
DHE - UNDP Global Coordination (Jan - Dec 2025)	141116	UNDP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	
DHE - UNDP Nigeria (Jan - Dec 2025)	141118	UNDP	01/01/2025	01/01/2026	

Annex B: List of contact points

Contacts (email) to be complemented by Project Management

- **GPA UNITAR:**
- **UNDP:**
- **NORCAP:**
- **Energy Transition Partners (ETPs)**
Any UN agency, INGO, NGO, or government entity

Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Narrative and finance reports (in the absence of interim reporting requirements, internal reporting and monitoring data shall be provided, including self-evaluations, logframe updates etc.)
- Legal Agreement
- Logical Framework and outcome areas
- Monitoring and self-evaluation data
- Implementing partner documentation if applicable
- Inception phase results
- Stakeholder contacts
- Project Description
- UNITAR website content
- Event Management System Data if relevant
- Relevant international frameworks
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the review

Annex D: Structure of review report⁶

- i. Title page
- ii. Foreword
- iii. Table of contents
- iv. List of Figures and list of tables
- v. Executive summary
- vi. Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction
2. Fund description, objectives and development context
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Review findings based on criteria/principal review questions
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons Learned
9. Annexes
 - a. Terms of reference
 - b. Survey/questionnaires deployed
 - c. List of persons interviewed
 - d. List of documents reviewed
 - e. Review question matrix
 - f. Evaluation consultant agreement form

⁶ A report template will be provided to the reviewer by PPME.

Annex E: Review Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the review report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the review report.)

To the comments received on (date) from the midterm review of the “Decarbonizing Humanitarian Energy Multi-Partner Trust Fund (DHE MPTF)” Mid-Term Review

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

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft review report	Reviewer response and actions taken

Annex F: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form*

The reviewer:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

1. 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.
2. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. He/she should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. He/she must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. He/she are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. In the event evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. He/she should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
4. 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, he/she must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/she should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom he/she comes in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, he/she should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
5. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/she is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
6. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁷

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

*This form is required to be signed by each reviewer involved in the review.

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex G: Suggested guiding questions for the MTR

► Governance and management

- To what extent are the DHE's institutional framework, governance structure, and management arrangements fit for purpose and supportive of effective and efficient implementation?

Suggested guiding questions:

- *To what extent have the DHE's governance bodies provided adequate oversight and guidance, and facilitated efficient and effective decision-making, allocation of funds, and support for implementation? What improvements, if any, can be made to strengthen the DHE's governance?*
- *To what extent would an advisory board enhance the DHE's ability to validate its approach with sector experts on a regular basis, and gather valuable feedback and advice on how to improve implementation?*
- *How effective has the Secretariat been in performing its functions, and what factors (e.g. staffing, hosting arrangements, etc.) influence its performance? How can the Secretariat's capacity and effectiveness be strengthened?*
- *At an operational level, to what extent are coordination among PPs and decision-making processes clear, efficient, and conducive to effective implementation and accountability?*
- *To what extent has the distribution of roles and responsibilities among Programme Partners as well as the Secretariat influenced operational efficiency?*
- *To what extent does the DHE leverage the capabilities of PPs and existing structures to maximize efficiency and avoid duplication and unnecessary costs? Would more discrete partner-led work packages or projects allow for smoother and more effective execution?*
- To what extent are the DHE's fund management and administrative arrangements appropriate and effective, and how might they be improved?

Suggested guiding sub-questions:

- *To what extent are the DHE's project and fund management processes as well as other support functions fit-for-purpose and well-suited for an MPTF – Consider all relevant aspects including risk management, SES, MEL, reporting, resource mobilization, communications, etc.? Are there any gaps to address? What improvements could be made based on best practices from other funds, if any?*
- *To what extent have administrative procedures (e.g., approvals, fund transfers) impacted delivery?*
- *What systems are in place to support effective fund allocation and results-based management, and promote cost-effective operations under the DHE MPTF?*
- *Are current funding mechanisms suitable for the types of interventions the DHE seeks to support?*

► Theory of Change and Impact Measurement

- To what extent do the Theory of Change (ToC) and its underlying assumptions, accurately reflect the DHE's strategic focus and intended impact, and provide clear pathways for achieving the desired change?

Suggested guiding questions:

- *To what extent are objectives and outcomes clear, practical, and feasible within the given time frame and operational context? How well do these translate into project-level outputs and activities?*
 - *To what extent are the ToC and its assumptions relevant given evolving humanitarian needs, shifting donor priorities, conditions in target countries, and broader energy transition and energy access goals?*
 - *To what extent does the ToC balance the dual priorities of decarbonisation of humanitarian operations (through transition to renewable energy and implementation of energy efficiency measures) and energy access?*
 - *To what extent does the ToC and the DHE's ToR provide a clear framework that ensures alignment and a common understanding among PPs, the SC and Secretariat on the overall approach, intended results and what constitutes success?*
- **To what extent has the DHE's Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) framework enabled effective tracking of progress toward outcomes, and facilitated results-based management and evidence-based learning? What improvements, if any, are needed?**

Suggested guiding questions:

- *How relevant and suitable are the DHE's results framework indicators in measuring performance and demonstrating change? Is there a clear baseline and are targets realistic?*
- *To what extent has the DHE's results framework been used as a management and planning tool to ensure efforts contribute towards the desired results?*
- *Are current monitoring tools effective and efficient? Do they provide the necessary information and means of verification?*
- *To what extent are challenges, lessons learned and, if any, adaptive management measures, well documented and shared?*

► **Fund Design and Coherence**

- **To what extent do the DHE's design and delivery model align with, and enable progress toward, its strategic objectives, and support effective and adaptive implementation?**

Suggested guiding questions:

- *Is the DHE designed to fully leverage the strengths of the MPTF mechanism? Conversely, have the limitations and potential drawbacks of the MPTF mechanism been adequately considered? What adjustments, if any, could enhance the DHE's effectiveness as an MPTF?*
- *To what extent does the structure of the DHE, with activities distributed across function-oriented work packages, enable or constrain its ability to deliver on its goals?*
- *Is the CCES model – currently the DHE's main implementation pathway – fit for purpose for achieving the DHE's objectives? What changes or alternative approaches could be considered to enable the DHE to better seize opportunities and deliver outcomes on the ground?*
- *To what degree does the DHE incorporate innovative approaches (e.g., third-party service delivery or Energy-as-a-Service (EaaS) models, bundling, de-risking, and innovative financing, etc.) that address systemic barriers and have the potential to transform energy provision in humanitarian settings?*

- *To what extent does the current country prioritization approach – with country-wide interventions and an initial focus on Nigeria (and Niger prior to the coup in 2023) – provide an effective pathway to achieving the DHE’s objectives? To what extent could a multi-country strategy offer more agility and responsiveness?*
- *Is the DHE adequately equipped to effectively engage with the private sector? Does it provide clear avenues for such engagements?*
- *Is there a clear exit strategy to ensure the benefits derived from the DHE are sustained beyond the fund’s lifecycle?*
- *To what extent does the DHE effectively coordinate with and complement other humanitarian energy and energy access initiatives, while leveraging partnerships, existing networks, and stakeholder expertise at the global, regional, and country levels?*

Suggested guiding questions:

- *To what extent has the DHE adapted its approach to align with market conditions, beneficiary needs and priorities in its pilot countries?*
- *To what extent has engagement with ETPs, humanitarian actors, governments, private sector, and other key stakeholders been effective and well-coordinated, globally and at the country level?*
- *To what extent does the DHE’s governance and implementation arrangements reflect balanced stakeholder representation?*
- *In what ways might the approach be adjusted to enhance the inclusion of national, regional, and humanitarian actors in project design, decision-making, and implementation?*

► **Effectiveness, Efficiency and Likelihood of Impact**

- *To what extent has the DHE been planned and implemented in an effective and efficient manner, and delivered expected outputs? Based on this, what is the likelihood it will lead to tangible and measurable impact?*

Suggested guiding questions:

- *To what extent have the inception phase and first year of implementation enabled the DHE’s offer to be fully developed and operationalized? What gaps, if any, remain?*
- *What structural, operational, systemic or other factors have influenced the implementation and efficiency of the DHE?*
- *What are the key lessons from the inception phase and early implementation?*
 - *If challenges were encountered, what were the underlying causes? How might they be addressed or mitigated?*
 - *Which elements of the DHE have proven successful? How can these be leveraged or expanded upon?*
- *To what extent has the CCES model, in practice, contributed to operational efficiency and demonstrated value for money and cost-effectiveness? How does it compare to other approaches within the humanitarian context?*
- *Could a more flexible approach with diverse implementation pathways potentially enhance the efficiency of the DHE as a fund?*