

# International Consultant - Terminal Evaluation - Market Transformation and Removal of Barriers for Effective Implementation of the State-Level Climate Change Action Plans - Home Based, INDIA

## Evaluation Terms of Reference

### 1. Background and context

In accordance with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the titled project “**Market Transformation and Removal of Barriers for Effective Implementation of the State Level Climate Change Action Plans<sup>1</sup>**” (PIMS #4606).

The proposed project aimed at transforming the market and removing the barriers towards effective implementation of the State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCC) with an overall goal to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions achieved through implementation of Renewable Energy (RE) and Energy Efficiency (EE) solutions at the state level as identified in the SAPCCs of the two states of **Jharkhand and Manipur**. The development objective of the project is to stimulate implementation of climate change mitigation actions, maximize the benefits through exploring inter-state cooperation, showcase the actual implementation of the SAPCCs, demonstrate institutional mechanisms for inter-state networking and cross-learning, including information sharing and technology dissemination, as well as develop and implement a common monitoring system to assess progress on the SAPCCs in the two states. The project is in conformity with the GEF-5 climate change mitigation focal area strategic objective, CCM-2 (promote market transformation for energy efficiency in major sectors) and CCM-3 (promote investment in renewable energy technologies).

The project was approved during GEF 5 programming cycle and comprises of three components with Component 1 dealing with the development of framework for the effective implementation of climate change mitigation options of the SAPCCs including implementation of MRV framework. Component 2 focusing on catalysing of investments for the implementation of feasible climate change mitigation measures. Component 3 relating to capacity building of relevant state government institutions in selected states (Jharkhand and Manipur). The total resources committed to the project for implementation of said activities at inception was US\$ 28,744,500 including GEF project grant of US\$ 3,744,500 and expected parallel financing of US\$ 25,000,000.

By EoP, the project was instrumental in removing the barriers and facilitating implementation of RE and EE interventions proposed under State-Level Climate Change Action Plans in Jharkhand and Manipur. Not only has the project resulted in reduction of GHG emission but also resulted in reducing of energy demand.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2008, the Government of India (GoI) launched the National Action Plan for Climate Change (NAPCC), which represents a multi-pronged, long-term and integrated strategy for achieving key climate change goals. The NAPCC encourages planning and coordination at different levels, especially state (sub-national) level. This has assumed the shape of formulation of State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCC) as a method to decentralize the NAPCC approach to achieve low carbon pathway.

PROJECT INFORMATION			
<b>Project title</b>	Market Transformation and Removal of Barriers for Effective Implementation of the State-Level Climate Change Action Plans		
<b>Atlas ID</b>	85842		
<b>Corporate outcome and output</b>	<p><b>CPD Outcome 3: By 2022, environmental and natural resource management is strengthened, and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks.</b></p> <p><b>Indicator: Number of state governments adopt and implement climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai</b></p>		
<b>Country</b>	India		
<b>Date project document signed</b>	20 January 2016		
<b>Project dates</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>Planned end</b>	
	20 January 2016	31 December 2019	
<b>Project budget</b>		<b>Revised End</b>	
		30th March 2021	
	GEF Financing	US\$ 3,744,500	
	IA/EA own:	US\$ 500,000	
	Government	US\$ 24,500,000	
	<b>Total Allocated Resources</b>	<b>US\$ 28,744,500</b>	
	Funding to be leveraged -Private sector	US\$ 25,000,000	
<b>Project expenditure at the time of evaluation</b>	GEF Financing	US\$ 3,526,178	
	IA/EA own:	US\$ 800,000	
	Government	US\$ 30,400,000	
	Other partners (private sector)	US\$ 9,010,000	
		<b>Total Allocated Resources</b>	<b>US\$ 43,736,178</b>
		Total Co-financing	US\$ 31,200,000
<b>Funding source</b>	<b>GEF</b>		
<b>Implementing party<sup>2</sup></b>	<p><b>Implementing Partner:</b> Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India (MOEFCC)</p> <p><b>Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners:</b> Department of Forest, Environment and Climate Change, Government of Jharkhand; Department of Environment, Government of Manipur; Jharkhand Renewable Energy Development Agency, Government of Jharkhand; Manipur Renewable Energy Development Agency, Government of Manipur;</p>		

## 2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

<sup>2</sup> It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

### 2.1. Purpose

The purpose of the undertaking terminal evaluations (TEs) of the titled project “Market Transformation and Removal of Barriers for Effective Implementation of the State-Level Climate Change Action Plans” is to

- a. Promote accountability and transparency by providing project partners with an independent assessment and comparison of planned vis-à-vis actually achieved outputs and outcomes
- b. Draw lessons learnt that can help to improve the design and implementation of future UNDP-supported GEF-financed initiatives.
- c. Assess and document project output and outcome, and its contribution towards achieving GEF strategic objective, UNDP strategic plan, and Country Programme outcome.
- d. To assess the extent of project convergence with other priorities within the UNDP country programme including expanded access to clean energy.

### 2.2. Objective of the evaluation

The key objective of the evaluation is to:

- a. assess the overall achievement of the project results since the programme inception in January 2016 and its contribution to the UNSDF/CPD outcomes
- b. to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The sub-objective of the Terminal evaluation includes

- a. Determining relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, coherence and sustainability of the project interventions within the country context.
- b. Assess Programme design in terms of project theory of change / result framework
- c. Assess innovative practices across output areas for wider scale up and replication.
- d. Assess cross cutting issues including climate change mitigation
- e. Synthesise Lessons learned, Challenges, Opportunities
- f. Present and overall recommendations to enhance the programme implementation and sustainability

### 2.3. Timing of Terminal Evaluation

The terminal evaluation is to be carried out for the following period;

Start of the project	Closure Date
January 2016	March 2021

Note: The terminal evaluation is timed in a manner to allow the mission to proceed while interventions/activities under the project have been concluded and the project is close enough to completion, for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, coherence and project sustainability while the Project Team is still in place.

### 2.4 Utilisation

The terminal evaluation should essentially assess the expenditure of the GEF grant and comparison of planned and actual co-financing by source of co-financing committed at inception.

### 2.5 Scope of the Evaluation

- a. Programmatic scope

The programmatic scope of evaluation is to include:

- I. Assessment of degree to which sustainable access to energy is being mainstreamed, adoption of clean energy technology is being enabled and adoption of improved energy efficiency measures/practice is being institutionalised resulting in reduction of greenhouse gas emission.
- II. Status of enhanced institutional capacity at the subnational level towards identification, design, planning, and implementation of selected climate change mitigation action from SAPCCs including identification of financing.
- III. Status of integration of climate change concerns within state sectoral development plans and budgets

**b. Geographical scope**

The evaluation is to be carried out for activities carried out across the geographical boundary of

- I. Indian State of Jharkhand,
- II. Indian State of Manipur

**c. Operational**

The evaluation will assess the key aspects of the project including

- I. Reduction of Greenhouse gas emission through implementation of renewable energy technology and energy efficiency measures

The evaluation will assess the key aspect of reduction in emission of greenhouse gas due to implementation of the renewable energy technology and energy efficiency measures. Estimation of greenhouse gas emission reduction due to the project activity is to be assessed based on the quantum of fossil fuel usage reduced or quantum of grid-based electricity usage reduced because of the project interventions.

- II. Reduction in energy consumption due to implementation of project interventions  
The evaluation will assess the reduction in energy consumption (fossil fuel and grid electricity) through adoption of energy efficiency and renewable energy technology measures and the project intervention that have facilitated the reduction in energy consumption.
- III. Increase in installed capacity of renewable energy technology  
The evaluation will assess the cumulative capacity of grid interactive and stand-alone renewable energy capacity added and the project interventions that have facilitated in the capacity addition of renewable energy technology.

**IV. Project Finance / Co-Finance mobilised**

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 Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								

• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

### 3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, 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. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

#### Evaluation Ratings:

1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

#### Rating Scale

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
<p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe</p>	<p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) Impact</p> <p>Ratings: 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>

shortcomings		
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

### Project Evaluation Questions

#### Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
  - National Developmental priorities -reducing emission intensity
  - UNDAF Outcome(s): Sustainable Development and Inclusive Growth
  - UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Sustainable access to energy and improved energy efficiency
  - UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: Planning at sub-national levels to help connect national priorities with action on the ground
  - Expected CP Outcome(s): Expanded access to clean energy
  - Expected CPAP Output: Support for initiatives that increase access to clean energy for productive uses in off-grid, underserved rural regions
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design including but not limited to Country Programme (CP) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- 

#### Effectiveness

- To what extent were the project objectives and outcomes of the project being achieved as agreed in the Results Framework?
  - Objective: Support effective implementation of specific climate change mitigation actions (energy efficiency and renewable energy measures) identified in the State Action Plans on Climate Change for Jharkhand and Manipur
  - Outcome: The approved results framework consists of 3 substantive Components/Outcomes and total of 14 substantive Outputs. Outcome 1 is focused around successful and sustainable implementation of priority CCM actions on energy generation and application of EE & RE technologies in the major energy end-use sectors in selected states as optioned in the selected in the selected states SAPCCs. Outcome 2 focuses on enhanced states capability and capacity for identifying, designing, planning, financing and implementing selected RE and EE actions from respective SAPCC. Outcome 3 focuses on enhanced technical capability of state government in integrating climate change concerns within state sectoral development plans and budgets and undertaking MRVs efficiently for SAPCC actions, facilitated inter-state learning and coordination for SAPCCs.
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
  - Country program Outcomes (as defined in CPD) includes implementation of SAPCC
  - Country program Output including support for actions that assist in effective implementation of SAPCCs
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?

- In terms of establishing close cooperation between the project and the national/sub-national governments
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
  - The key areas include (a) Cumulative CO2 emission reduced from start of project to End-Of-Project (b) Total energy savings achieved from implemented RE and EE mitigation actions by EOP
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

#### **Efficiency**

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results assessed in terms of
  - Leveraging partnership at the national and subnational level
  - Facilitate adoption of policy, legal and regulatory frameworks
  - Mobilisation of public and private sector finance including operationalisation of sustainable financing and delivery mechanisms
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective measured in terms of
  - Ensure scalability and replicability of the project beyond EoP (End of Project) through private and public sector investment mobilisation
  - Adoption of risk mitigation measures and adaptive measures
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

#### **Sustainability**

- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits including but not limited to
  - Strengthening of institutional structure and framework for implementation of state action plan for climate change at subnational level including establishment of mechanism for interdepartmental coordination towards implementation of cross cutting activities
  - Facilitate financial convergence and partnership between public sector agencies as well between public and private sector towards ensuring financial mobilisation
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?

- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?

### Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

#### Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

#### Gender equality

- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

### 4. Methodology

An overall approach and method<sup>3</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. 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 in the section above. 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.

Methodological approaches may include the following:

Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments and will broadly encompass the following steps

Step 1: Briefing to TE team	Briefing the TE team, once they are contracted, on the purpose and scope of the TE and expectations of UNDP and stakeholders in terms of the required standards for the quality of the TE process and TE deliverables.
Step 2: Desk Review	<p>The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports including Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.</p> <p>List of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document (contribution agreement) including theory of change and results framework</li> <li>• Inception Workshop Report</li> <li>• Annual Work and Financial Plans</li> <li>• Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) 2016-2019.</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the tracking tool.</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings</li> <li>• Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any)</li> <li>• Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc.</li> <li>• Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)</li> <li>• GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)</li> <li>• Sample of project communications materials</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
Step 3: TE inception	The step will include development and presentation of the TE Inception Report and approach.
Step 4 : Semi structured interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Semi-structured interviews</b> with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.</li> <li>○ Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.</li> <li>○ All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Note: Considering the COVID outbreak semi-structured interview will be conducted in virtual mode .</b></p> <p>Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Joint Secretary, MoEFCC</li> <li>2. Director, MoEFCC</li> <li>3. Director/ Project Director of Jharkhand Renewable Energy Development Agency</li> <li>4. PCCF/APCCF Forest Department, Jharkhand</li> <li>5. Director of Manipur Renewable Energy Development Agency</li> <li>6. Director, Directorate of Environment and Climate Change, Manipur</li> </ol>
Step 5- Onsite validation	<p>Virtual meetings for on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.</p> <p>The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.</p>
Step 6 – Output and outcome mapping	Outcome mapping, and observation of project functioning through virtual meeting including group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries for the particular project activities.
Step 7 – Analysis	Data review and analysis - : of monitoring and other data sources and methods. Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

## 5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

### Evaluation product to include:

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators. The inception report should essentially comprise off
  - i. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
  - ii. Evaluation objective, purpose and scope. A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
  - iii. Description of the Cross-cutting issues: Provide details of how cross-cutting issues (including gender equality, capacity development, climate change mitigation will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation.
  - iv. Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
  - v. Detailed mission plan - with dates and locations for virtual interview, schedule of interviews and meetings, draft interview questions, list of stakeholders to be interviewed etc.
  - vi. A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting)
  - vii. Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables presented in the workplan.
  - viii. Outline of the draft/final report as detailed in the TE Guidance for UNDP-supported GEF financed projects.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings to the UNDP CO, Project Team, Implementation Partner, and other stakeholders, as relevant
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length)<sup>4</sup>.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** (if requested in the TOR).

## 6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation team will be composed of **one international and one national evaluator**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. International evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the

---

<sup>4</sup> A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested

project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

#### **Educational Qualification & Experience of International Consultant**

<b>Educational Qualification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post graduate degree in engineering/ environment/ management or related filed domain.</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of Renewable Energy Technology including solar PV system, Energy Efficiency measures/options and rural livelihood .</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change</li> <li>• Excellent communication skills including fluency in written and spoken English</li> <li>• Demonstrable analytical skills</li> <li>• Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;</li> </ul>
<b>Experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience</li> <li>• Previous experience of carrying out mid-term review/ terminal evaluation of GEF projects:</li> <li>• Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.</li> <li>• Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;</li> <li>• Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal area</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

#### **7. Evaluation ethics**

“This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.”

#### **8. Implementation arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO ( Project Manager , National Project Management Unit and UNP CO Focal Point) in India. Due to COVID pandemic evaluation is proposed to be carried out through virtual meetings.

#### **9. Time frame for the evaluation process**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 14 days according to the following plan (outlined in the sub:

**Working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation**

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
<b>Phase One: Inception report</b>				
Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	4 days (recommended 2-4 days)	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Remote	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Phase Two: Presentation</b>				
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders on initial Findings	5 days	End of evaluation mission	Remote	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Phase Three: Draft Final Report</b>				
Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	5 days	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Remote	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Phase Four: Final Report</b>				
Revised report based on input	2	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Remote	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC
	<b>14</b>			

\*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.

Activity	Number of working days
Preparation	4 days
Evaluation Mission (Virtual)	5 days
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days
Final Report	2 days

## **10. Application submission process and criteria for selection**

### **Application submission process and criteria for selection**

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Only shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/ skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Technically qualified consultants will be requested to submit their daily fee rate i.e. consultants who score more than 70% i.e. 49 marks with respect to the above-mentioned evaluation criteria.

**Consultant should not specify their consultancy fee on their CV or with the submission. The CV will not be evaluated further in case the consultant submits the same.**

The Consultant is required to submit the following documents, in a single combined PDF file, as the system has provision for uploading only one attachment:

1. Personal CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form) with relevant experience to the TOR; and at least 3 professional references
2. Short technical proposal (max 2-pages) including methodology, approach & assessment criteria, process followed, data collection and analytical tools.
3. No Financials (Daily Fee) to be submitted at this stage.

Important Note: Please ensure that all the documents to be uploaded should be combined in a single PDF file before uploading as the system has provision of uploading only one document

The following documents can be accessed by clicking the link:

General Conditions for Individual Contract-

<http://www.in.undp.org/content/dam/india/docs/procurement/UNDP%20General%20Conditions%20for%20Individual%20Contracts.pdf>

Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

[http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Technical Criteria</b>	<b>Marking (70)</b>
1	Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience with post graduate degree in engineering/ environment/ management or related filed domain	10 Marks
2	Previous experience of carrying out mid-term review/ terminal evaluation of GEF projects:	20 Marks

S. No.	Technical Criteria	Marking (70)
	5 marks for each experience maximum up to 20 marks	
3	Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.	20 Marks
4	Proven technical knowledge of solar PV system, rural livelihood and climate change and mitigation activities	20 Marks

#### Payment Terms

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities	Payment
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO	20%
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO	20%
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs	20%
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.	40%

#### 11. TOR annexes

**Annex: Project Log frame**

<p><b>The project will contribute to achieve following country program Outcomes (as defined in CPD):</b></p> <p><b>Project:</b> Market Transformation and Removal of Barriers for Effective Implementation of the State-Level Climate Change Action Plans</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Implementation of SAPCC</p> <p><b>Output:</b> support for actions that assist in effective implementation of SAPCCs</p> <p><b>Output indicators:</b> number of CCM investment projects implemented and plan prepared for scale up.</p>
<p><b>Country program outcome indicators:</b></p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Progress towards meeting national commitments under multilateral environmental agreements</p> <p><b>Output:</b> Supporting national development objectives with co-benefits of mitigating climate change</p> <p><b>Output indicators:</b> (a) Annual reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in India; (b) million USD flowing annually to India from GEF through UNDP for this programme; (c) number of additional UNDP initiatives for achieving global and national targets under multilateral environmental agreements.</p>
<p><b>Primary applicable key environment and sustainable development result area:</b></p> <p>Increased capacity at sub-national level to implement climate change mitigation actions and incorporation of CCM actions in state budgets and development plans.</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF strategic objective and program:</b></p> <p><b>Strategic Objective: Objective 1:</b> Promote the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies. <b>Objective 2:</b> Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector. <b>Objective 3:</b> Promote investment in renewable energy technologies</p> <p><b>Strategic Program:</b> Climate Change Mitigation</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF expected outcomes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Appropriate policy, legal and regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced</li> <li>2. Sustainable financing and delivery mechanisms established and operational</li> <li>3. GHG emissions avoided</li> </ol>
<p><b>Applicable GEF outcome indicators:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extent to which EE policies and regulations are adopted and enforced</li> <li>2. Volume of investment mobilized</li> <li>3. Tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>eq avoided</li> </ol>

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Description	Baseline	Target		
<b>Project goal:</b> Reduced GHG emissions achieved through implementation of RE and EE solutions at the state level as identified in the SAPCCs	Cumulative CO <sub>2</sub> emission reduced from start of project to End-Of-Project (EOP), (million tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	0	304,250	M&E reports of the demonstration and replication projects	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MoEFCC, MNRE, state nodal agencies, state renewable energy development agencies and other stakeholders
<b>Project Objective:</b> To support the effective implementation of specific energy efficiency and renewable energy climate change mitigation actions identified in the SAPCCs for Manipur and Jharkhand	Total energy savings achieved from implemented RE and EE mitigation actions by EOP, MWh	0	190,452	M&E reports of the demonstration and replication projects	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MoEFCC, MNRE, state nodal agencies, state renewable energy development agencies and other stakeholders
	Total installed capacity of RE systems (MW) by EOP	0	28		
	Number of people that benefitted directly or indirectly with improved energy access in the two states through the project interventions by the EOP (million). (This includes, improved job opportunity, quality of life and education.)	0	17.8		
<b>Component 1: Framework for the implementation of climate change mitigation options in the selected states SAPCCs</b>					



Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Description	Baseline	Target		
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Successful and sustainable implementation of priority CCM actions on energy generation and application of EE & RE technologies in the major energy end-use sectors in selected states	Number of CCM actions implemented by the project in the states by EOP.	0	9	Mitigation actions finalized and feasibility report prepared	Continued interest of stakeholders
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Regularly updated GHG abatement cost curves at state level	Number of abatement cost curves prepared by Year 1	0	4	Updated abatement cost curves prepared	State nodal agencies adopts the developed diligent data collection and MRV systems
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Selected prioritized RE and EE actions listed in Manipur and Jharkhand Action Plans on Climate Change for implementation	Number of prioritized RE and EE mitigation actions selected for implementation in the states by end of year 1	0	9	Minutes of the meeting held with stakeholders for ensuring buy in on the prioritized actions	Continued support from MoEFCC, MNRE, State agencies for implementing RE and EE actions
<b>Output 1.3:</b> Designed and implemented common monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) system for the selected RE and EE actions of the Manipur and Jharkhand APCC, in a way to feedback into the SAPCC process	No. of monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) systems designed and implemented in the states by Year 3	0	5	Report on designed monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) systems	Dedicated support from state agencies for design and implementation of MRV Systems
<b>Component 2: Catalyzing investments for implementation of selected RE and EE mitigation action</b>					

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Description	Baseline	Target		
<b>Outcome 2: Enhanced states capability and capacity for identifying, designing, planning, financing and implementing selected RE and EE actions from their SAPCC</b>	Number of locally designed, planned and financed RE and EE projects implemented in the states by EOP	0	9	Inception reports/assessment reports of RE and EE mitigation projects operating in the states	There is continued support and participation from state agencies and ministries at national level.
					Enough technical and financial capacity is available in the state for implementation of projects
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Completed evaluation of existing available loan mechanisms for projects developed as part of SAPCC targets	Number of loan mechanisms evaluated by Year 2	0	5	Evaluation reports for loan mechanisms	All state agencies are supportive of implementing the selected RE and EE actions
<b>Output 2.2:</b> Implemented non-grant financing instruments such as flexible debt finance (including long tenure low-interest loans)	Number of non-grant based financial instruments developed by Year 3	0	1	Evaluation reports for non -grant instruments developed	All state agencies are supportive of implementing the selected RE and EE actions
<b>Output 2.3:</b> Mobilized public and private sector funding	Amount of total funding mobilized for implementation (US\$) by Year 4	0	12,000,000	Letters of endorsement from funding sources	Continued interest in the selected RE and EE mitigation actions by co-financing institutions and public and private sector
<b>Output 2.4:</b> Established public private partnerships (PPP) for implementation and scaling up of selected RE and EE actions in Manipur and Jharkhand	Number of replication projects on the selected RE and EE mitigation actions implemented by EOP	0	32	Project assessment reports	Continued interest in the selected RE and EE mitigation actions by co-financing institutions and public and private sector
	No. of PPP business models developed by Year 3	0	9	Comparative assessment report	

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Description	Baseline	Target		
				of PPP business models for RE and EE implementation	
<b>Output 2.5:</b> Implemented nine RE and EE investment projects in Manipur and Jharkhand	No. of demonstration investment projects based on innovative financial models developed by end of year 1	0	9	Performance assessment reports of the investment projects	All state agencies are supportive of implementing the investment projects
	No. of demo investment projects implemented by EOP	0	5	M&E reports of the demonstration	All state agencies are supportive of implementing the investment projects
<b>Output 2.6:</b> Completed implementation manual and workshops for supporting the implementation of selected public private partnership models for RE and EE actions	No. of implementation manuals developed by Year 3 (one manual for each state)	0	2	Implementation manuals	Continued support and participation of the state governments and workshop proceedings are approved by state nodal agencies
	No. of workshops conducted on sensitizing the state agencies on proposed models by Year 4	0	2	Workshop proceedings	
<b>Component 3: Capacity development of concerned state level officials for implementation of respective SAPCC</b>					
<b>Outcome 3: Enhanced technical capability of state government in integrating climate change concerns within state sectoral development plans and budgets and undertaking MRVs efficiently for SAPCC actions,</b>	No. of sectoral state budgets for RE and EE activities that are aligned with the budgets proposed under SAPCCs by Year 2	0	2	Annual budgets for RE and EE activities in Jharkhand and Manipur	Increased interest of state level bodies in implementation of RE and EE mitigation actions

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Description	Baseline	Target		
<b>facilitated inter-state learning and coordination for SAPCCs</b>					
<b>Output 3.1:</b> Aligned state sectoral budgets for development plans to include climate change mitigation actions related expenses	Allotment of budget for climate change actions in departmental budgets by year 2	0	2	Review report	Continued support and participation from State agencies and sharing of state documents
<b>Output 3.2:</b> Completed training and capacity building programs on the developed MRV systems for the State officials	No. of handbooks and guidelines prepared for MRV system by year 3	0	2	Handbook and guidelines	Continued support and participation from the state agencies
	No. of training undertaken on the new MRV system by EOP	0	5	Training curricula and session reports	Continued support and participation of the state agencies
<b>Output 3.3:</b> Established institutional mechanism for inter-state exchange of information and technology dissemination for Manipur and Jharkhand for implementation of SAPCC mitigation actions	No. of joint CCM actions discussed and planned for implementation between states by EOP	0	4	Meetings report	Interested state agencies in both states for inter-state exchange of information and technology
<b>Output 3.4:</b> Conducted inter-state study trips and stakeholder interaction workshops	No. of study trips undertaken by EOP	0	4	Study trip reports	Continued support and participation from state nodal agencies
	No of workshops undertaken by EOP	0	4	Proceedings of the workshop	Interested state agencies in both states for attending the workshops on RE and EE

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Description	Baseline	Target		
					mitigation actions and market transformation strategies
<b>Output 3.5:</b> Established and operational information dissemination system on lessons learnt from investment projects undertaken on priority RE and EE actions.	No. of brochures, case study reports and other printed material published and disseminated by year 4	0	10	Printed brochures, case study reports and other printed material	Public and Private sector agencies take higher amount of interest in disseminating the learning's
	No of users of the system/year starting Year 4	0	2,500	Web portal Number of hits on the web site	Wide use of internet by various state level stakeholders  Interested public, private, research, education and voluntary agencies in both states and at national and international level visit the web portal of the project

Annex: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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.

Signed at *(place)* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## Annex: Evaluation Report Outline<sup>5</sup>

### i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report Region and countries included in the project GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

### ii. Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

### iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual)

#### 1. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

#### 2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

#### 3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>6</sup>)

##### 3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector Management arrangements

##### 3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

---

<sup>5</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>6</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory,

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) Relevance
- Effectiveness & Efficiency
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming Sustainability Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project  
Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form



Saba Kalam  
Programme Officer



Ruchi Pant  
Chief, Climate Change Resilience  
and Energy



Deepshri Mathur  
15-Jul-2021