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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| International Consultant for the Evaluation of UNDP GEF Lighting Project in Russia

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference:** | PIMS 4160 |
| **Country:** | Russia |
| **Type of Contract****Description of the Assignment:** | Individual Contract (IC)International Consultant to conduct the Terminal Evaluation of Transforming Market for Efficient Lighting Project in Russia |
| **Project:** | Transforming the Market for Efficient Lighting in Russia |
| **Period of Assignment/Services:** | 25 working days over the period from 1 November 2016 to 28 February 2017 |
| **Duty Station:** | Home Based (15 working days) with two missions (7 and 3 working days) to Moscow, Russian Federation  |

 |

Introduction

The lighting sector consumes significant amounts of energy, whereas substantial savings, from 75% to 90% compared with conventional practices, can be achieved through the use of new energy efficient technologies. At the national level, a number of OECD and developing countries prepared and enacted Energy-Efficient Lighting programs aimed at phasing-out incandescent lamps and other inefficient technologies. Such programs reduce energy use by 30% within 5 to 7 years, while quality and even quantity of lighting is enhanced. Representatives of the leading lighting manufacturers announced their support for this ambitious market transformation calling for a coordinated effort among all countries worldwide.

Russia offers one of the world’s greatest potentials for energy savings in the lighting sector (over 40% or 57 bln KWh per year) with corresponding greenhouse gas emissions reductions. However, before the endorsement of the Project “Transforming the Market for Efficient Lighting” the country stayed outside of the global market transformation efforts in this field.

The implementation of the full-scale Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation Project “Transforming the Market for Efficient Lighting” supported by UNDP with GEF financing started in 2010. Initially the Project had been planned for 5 years but later received a no-cost extension for two more years. The expected Project’s closing date is April 2017.

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP- GEF projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation of the Project “Transforming the Market for Efficient Lighting”(PIMS #4160).

Objective and scope

This Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Mid Term Review

The Project mid-term evaluation (MTE) took place in late 2012 (final report submitted in early 2013) and its main concerns regarding the achievement of project objectives were related to “Testing Laboratories” component within Activity 1 and “Moscow pilot projects in public building” component within Activity 3. The final evaluation should assess the extent to which the recommendations of the mid-term review have been taken into account by the project.

Final Review – Terminal Evaluation

The terminal evaluation will explore in detail five major criteria:

(i) Relevance: the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.

(ii) Effectiveness: the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.

(iii) Efficiency: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

(iv) Results: the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer-term impacts including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects.

(v) Sustainability: the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

Project Goal:to reduce GHG emissions in Russia by improving energy efficiency related to lighting.

Project Objective:to transform the lighting market in Russia through promotion of energy-efficient lighting technologies and systems, and phasing-out inefficient lighting with a goal of a reduction in energy consumption of 4 TWh/yr (includes direct and indirect savings) or approximately 2 Mtn CO2 less per year.

The Project was designed with four outcomes, as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|    | (1) | Improved standards and policy framework for promotion of energy efficient technologies. At the federal level, instruments and policy frameworks will be introduced to initiate and facilitate a market transformation, including establishing the Federal Energy Efficient Lighting Council, designing and introducing standards for lighting products, and updating existing regulations (SNiPs) to include specific minimum energy performance requirements of lighting systems in commercial and new residential buildings, in street and industrial lighting; |
|     | (2) | Chain for manufacturing and supply of efficient lighting products is strengthened**.** This support will consider different options, including international joint ventures and improved domestic production; |
|     | (3) | Efficiency of lighting is increased in Moscow residential and public buildings, including hospitals and schools. This kind of demonstration projects will be actively replicated elsewhere in Russia; |
|     | (4) | Energy efficient street lighting demonstration projectswill be implemented and further replicated elsewhere in Russia. |

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf>) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation will be carried out by a lead international consultant and supported by a national consultant. The final evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of the evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Project Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to project sites jointly identified with the Project Manager*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations at a minimum: UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, UNDP-Russia Projects Support Office, Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation, Government Office of the Russian Federation, Russian Energy Agency, Ministry of Energy of the Moscow Region, local governments of the Volga Federal District municipalities, state and private test laboratories (Rostest, Archilight, etc.), Association of Manufacturers of Electric Appliances RATEK, Russian Association of Energy Service Companies RAESCO, Non-Commercial Partnership of Manufacturers of LEDs and LED-Based Systems, Non-Commercial Partnership “Energoeffectivny gorod” [Energy efficient city], main research and education institutions (All-Russia Research Institute of Lighting VNISI, Moscow Power Engineering Institute, Nizhny Novgorod State Technical University, etc.), UNDP supported projects on lighting in Kazakhstan and Armenia.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation criteria & ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria:

1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E design at entry, M&E Plan Implementation, Overall quality of M&E);

2. IA& EA Execution (Quality of UNDP Implementation, Quality of Execution - Executing Agency, Overall quality of Implementation / Execution);

3. Assessment of Outcomes (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating)

4. Sustainability (Financial resources, Socio-political, Institutional framework and governance, Environmental, Overall likelihood of sustainability).

The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

Project finance/Co-finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Project Office and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons. Conclusions should build on findings and be based on evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days during the calendar period of 4 months (1 November – 28 February 2017). The following tentative timetable is recommended for the evaluation, however, the final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of the assignment:

* Preparation - 3 days in November 2016;
* 1st Evaluation Mission - 7 days in November/December 2016;
* Draft Evaluation Report - 7 days, completed by the end of December 2016;
* 2nd Evaluation Mission - 3 days in January/February 2017;
* Final Report - 5 days, completed by the end of February 2017.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

* Inception Report - Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission and submits the report to the UNDP PSO;
* Presentation - Initial findings at the end of the 1st evaluation mission presented to the project management, UNDP PSO and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor;
* Draft Final Report - Full report (per annexed template) with annexes within 3 weeks of the 1st evaluation mission sent to UNDP PSO, reviewed by RTA, PSO and Project team;
* Final Report - Revised report within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft and upon completion of the 2nd evaluation mission sent to PSO for uploading to UNDP ERC. When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Evaluation ethics

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment installments:

10% Following submission of a detailed workplan/inception report prior to the 1st mission;

55% Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report;

35% Following submission and approval (UNDP-PSO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report.

Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional competencies:

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication skills and ability to work in a team;
* Ability to plan and organize work, efficiency in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations;
* Strong analytical, research, reporting and writing abilities.

Qualification requirements

Education

A Master’s degree in environmental sciences, climate change mitigation, lighting engineering or other closely related field; PhD will be considered as an advantage.

Relevant experience:

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in climate change mitigation and energy efficiency;
* Experience in results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation procedures is an advantage;
* Work experience in Europe & CIS region and/or Russian Federation is an advantage.

Language skills

Excellent English (both oral and written); Russian language will be considered as an advantage.

Evaluation procedure

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* Responsive, compliant, acceptable;
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical criteria - 70% of total evaluation (max 70 points):

* A Master’s degree in environmental sciences, climate change mitigation, lighting engineering or other closely related field; PhD will be considered as an advantage (max 10 points);
* Minimum 10years of relevant professional experience in climate change mitigation and energy efficiency (max 10 points);
* Experience in results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (max 15 points);
* Knowledge of UNDP and of GEF evaluation procedures is an advantage (max 15 points);
* Work experience in Europe & CIS region and/or Russian Federation is an advantage (max 15 points);
* Excellent English; Russian language will be considered as an advantage (max 5 points).

Financial criteria - 30% of total evaluation (max 30 points).

Only candidates passing the 70% threshold for the technical proposal will be considered for the financial evaluation.

The candidate with the highest score from technical criteria + financial criteria will be selected with the maximum score possible being 100 points.

Application process

Recommended presentation of offer:

1. Completed letter of confirmation of interest and availability. Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application;
2. CV or a UNDP Personal History form (P11)available athttp://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11\_modified\_for\_SCs\_and\_ICs.doc, indicating all past experience, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and three professional references;
3. Financial proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by the breakdown of costs. The breakdown should contain: professional fee for home-based work (number of working days), professional fee for work on mission (number of working days), travel costs (international/local travel and per diems). Per diems cannot exceed maximum UN daily allowance rates (http://icsc.un.org) and consultants are encouraged to bid lower amount to make their offers more competitive.

Please note that the professional fee is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of service, etc.). All envisaged international travel costs must be included in the financial proposal.

If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under reimbursable loan agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

General terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs

Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.