Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference:** | PIMS 3550 |
| **Country:** | Russian Federation |
| **Description of the Assignment:** | International consultant for terminal evaluation of UNDP GEF Energy efficiency standards and labels project in Russian Federation |
| **Project:** | PIMS 3550: Standards and labels for promoting energy efficiency in Russia (PIMS 3550) |
| **Period of Assignment/Services:** | 25 working days over the period from November 2016 to February 2017 |
| **Duty Station:** | Home based (with 1 mission of 10 working days to Moscow, Russian Federation, and 15 home-based days) |

Introduction

The full-size UNDP/GEF project «Standards and labels for promoting energy efficiency in Russia» aims to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in the Russian Federation through the facilitation of wide-scale market transformation towards energy efficient technical building equipment and household appliances. In the scale of Russia this target had to be approached through a phased introduction of energy efficiency standards and labeling.

The project has been in implementation since 2010, and is in the position to produce concrete outputs including mandatory adoption and enforcement of minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) and energy labeling regulations, establishment of market surveillance (MV&E) system in the country and upgrading the conformity assessment infrastructure in Russian Federation for the selected product categories.

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 “Standard and labels for promoting energy-efficiency in Russia” (PIMS 3550).

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.

The terminal evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant supported by a national consultant.

The project started in June 2010 and was scheduled to finish in June 2015. However, the project was extended by two years and is now scheduled to finish no later than June 2017. The total project budget is $7.81 million USD.

Project goal: The project objective is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the residential, commercial and public sector in the Russian Federation through the implementation of energy efficiency standards and labeling for key household appliances and technical building equipment, along with complementary measures. The stated targets of the project are expected to contribute to the reduction of CO2 emissions by 29.9 Mt until 2020 and by 123.6 Mt until 2030.

Project objective: Market transformation in Russia towards energy efficient household appliances and engineering equipment of buildings.

The project was designed with four outcomes, as follows:

Outcome 1: An institutional, legal and regulatory basis established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project.

Outcome 2: National S&L schemes for selected power consuming products designed and proposed and the required verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation in place based on international best practices.

Outcome 3: Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and, as applicable, other supply chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficient models into the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices.

Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency and other relevant characteristics of the targeted appliances and equipment from the life-cycle costs and environmental perspective.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf>).

According to the project document, tasks to be performed by the terminal evaluator are:

• Determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and identify course correction if needed, focusing on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;

• Present lessons learned about project design, implementation and management;

• Access project impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals;

• Provide recommendations for follow-up activities;

• Develop evaluation report, discuss the draft with the project team, government and UNDP, and as necessary participate in discussions to extract lessons for UNDP and GEF.

The 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 will be in contact with all project staff, contractors, UNDP project support office, UNDP Istanbul regional hub regional technical advisor, government counterparts, mid-term review consultant as well as the consultant who designed and wrote the project document.

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 an 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 support office, project team, UNDP GEF technical adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Russian Federation to visit the project sites jointly identified with the project manager*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations at a minimum: UNDP Istanbul regional hub, UNDP project support office, ministry of education and science of the Russian Federation, ministry of energy of the Russian Federation, ministry of economic development of the Russian Federation, federal agency for technical regulation and metrology of the ministry of industry and trade of the Russian Federation, government office of the Russian Federation, Russian energy agency of ministry of energy of the Russian Federation, independent test laboratories (Rostest-Moscow, Test-S.Peterburg, CSM (center of standardization and metrology) of Bashkortastan Republic, CSM of Krasnoyarsk region, CSM of Samara region, CSM of Nizshny Novgorod region, association of manufacturers of electric appliances (RATEK), Russian association of energy service companies (RAESCO), association of European business (AEB), technical committee TK39 «Energy saving, energy efficiency and energy management» of Rosstandard, etc.), non-commercial partnership - association of engineers for heat supply, HVAC and building thermophysics (AVOK), Ernst&Young company (E&Y Russia), GFK company, UNDP supported projects on S&L in Kazakhstan and Turkey.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, national strategic and legal documents, letters of support of national ministries, project files 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:).

Evaluation criteria & ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based on 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 will receive assistance from the project support 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 in 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 over a period of 4 months ( November – 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 (beginning of November 2016);
* Evaluation Mission - 10 days (by the end of November 2016);
* Draft Evaluation Report - 7 days (by the end of December 2016);
* Final Report - 5 days (by the end of February 2017).

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

* Inception Report – the 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 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 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 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.

Evaluator 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 modalities and specifications

10% - upon submission of a detailed workplan prior to the mission to the Russian Federation;

40% - upon submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report;

50% - upon submission and approval (UNDP PSO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report.

Competencies and required skills

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, energy engineering or other closely related field; PhD will be considered as an advantage.

Relevant experience:

* Minimum 10years of relevant professional experience in climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, experience with standards and labels for household appliances and market transformation programmes for energy efficiency in household appliances is an advantage;
* Experience in results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation procedures is an advantage;
* Work experience in Europe and the CIS region on energy efficiency related issues.

Language skills:

Excellent English; 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 the total evaluation (max 70 points):

* A Master’s degree in environmental sciences, climate change mitigation, energy efficiency or other closely related field; PhD will be considered as an advantage (max 5 points);
* Minimum 10years of relevant professional experience in climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, experience with standards and labels for household appliances and market transformation programmes for energy efficiency in household appliances is an advantage (max 15 points);
* Experience in results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation procedures is an advantage (max 10 points);
* Work experience in Europe and the CIS region on energy efficiency related issues (max 6 points);
* Excellent English; Russian language will be considered as an advantage (max 4 points);
* Interview (max 30 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.