

National Consultant - Terminal Evaluation - Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC - Home Based, INDIA

Evaluation Terms of Reference

Individual Consultancy- Terminal Evaluation Coordinator

Number of Days – 14 days

Duration 15th December to 10th January 2022

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) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the titled project “**Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC**” (PIMS #4603).

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) recognizes common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities of parties to the Convention towards achieving the sustainable development goals. Being a Party to the UNFCCC, India submitted its Initial National Communication (INC) to the UNFCCC on June 22, 2004 and Second National Communication (SNC) on May 04, 2012 prepared according to the guidelines provided by the Conference of Parties for non-Annex 1 countries (10/CP.2 and 17/CP.8). Both INC and SNC identified many technical, scientific, financial and policy-related capacity constraints.

The proposed project aims to support Govt of India to undertake activities towards **preparing its Third National Communication to the UNFCCC** in line with India’s commitments to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The activities proposed in the Third National Communication are envisaged to make climate change assessments more policy relevant and enhance India’s capacity to incorporate climate change in its development processes which is in line with the GEF’s climate change mitigation focal area objective (CCM-6) under GEF-5: Enabling Activities: Support enabling activities and capacity building under the Convention. The outcome of the project includes: “Adequate resources allocated to support enabling activities under the Convention” and the Outputs are “Countries receiving GEF support for national communication, etc.” & “National communications, etc. completed and submitted to the UNFCCC as appropriate”. The project would specifically address the gaps identified in the INC and SNC, particularly on capacity building needs, sector-specific data, developing and refining country specific emission/sequestration factors, and developing integrated vulnerability and adaptation frameworks for identified hotspots that are vulnerable to climate change. This project will also strengthen institutional and technical capacities related to climate change science, policy and developmental aspects in India.

The project encompasses seven components **(a) Component 1:** India’s National Circumstances (This component would involve the updating of the information on the prevailing conditions and situations at the national and state levels regarding development priorities and objectives that serve as the basis for addressing issues relating to climate change. Such information provided on national circumstances is critical for understanding India’s vulnerability, its capacity and options for adapting to the adverse effects of climate change, as well as options for addressing its GHG emissions within the broader context of sustainable development. **(b) Component 2:** National GHG Inventory **(c) Component 3:**

Impacts and Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Measures (This component would involve improved climate change projections, impact assessment using the latest scientific models and methods, development of vulnerability profiles at decentralized level, assessment of adaptation options and development of strategy for mainstreaming adaptation) **(d) Component 4:** Measures to Mitigate Climate Change (Under this component, work on mitigation actions and information on mitigation related activities will be presented) **(e) Component 5:** Other information relevant for the preparation of the TNC **(f) Component 6:** Third National Communication report preparation (Published TNC of India to UNFCCC and Periodic Technical reports, such as the GHG inventories, V&A adaptation assessments at the sectoral level, brief summaries of key policy issues relevant for decision making, and brief summaries of the key climate changes issues and findings at the regional level) **(g) Component 7:** Other new information required under the aegis of the Convention.

The total resources allocated to the project for implementation of said activities was US\$ 35,250,604 including GEF project grant of US\$ 9,010,604, Government of India (grant) of US\$ 10,302,200, Government of India (In-kind) of US\$ 15,787,800 and UNDP of US\$ 150,000.

The coordinator will liaise with all the expert consultants, prepare the draft TE report and incorporate changes as per the consultations. The coordinator will have additional responsibility of coordinator along with expert inputs to the TE process.

PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project title	Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC	
Atlas ID	70193	
Corporate outcome and output	Expected CP Outcome(s): Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion. Expected CPAP Output (s): Management and preparation for climate change and disasters.	
Country	India	
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	2013	2021
Project budget	GEF (grant)	US\$ 9,010,604
	Government of India (grant)	US\$ 10,302,200
	Government of India (In-kind)	US\$ 15,787,800
	UNDP	US\$ 150,000
	Total Allocated Resources	US\$ 35,250,604
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	GEF (grant)	USD 7,379,677
	Government of India (grant)	
	Government of India (In-kind)	USD 12,050,000
	UNDP	USD 100,000
	Total Allocated Resources	19,529,677

Funding source	GEF	
Implementing party¹	Implementing Partner: Ministry of Environment and Forests Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners: Ministry of Environment and Forests/Project Management Unit.	

¹ 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. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

2.1. Purpose

The purpose of the undertaking terminal evaluations (TEs) of the titled project “Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC” 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 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
2013	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:

Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information required to meet obligations under the UNFCCC Completed and submitted

b. Geographical scope

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

c. Operational

The evaluation will assess the key aspects of the project including

- I. Development of National GHG inventory according to IPCC guidelines for the sectors; (i)Energy, (ii)Industry, (iii)Agriculture, (iv)LULUCF and (v)Waste for 2011, 2013 and 2014
- II. Development of Climate projections and assessment of impacts and vulnerability and adaptation policies & measures to address climate variability, climate change and extreme events
- III. Assessment of policies and measures to mitigate climate change
- IV. Publication of Third National Communication
- V. Biennial Update Report for reference year 2014 (along with TNC)
- VI. 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 shortcomings</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>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant:</p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

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?
 - UNDAF Outcome(s): Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion.
 - UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environment and energy concerns in to national development plans.
 - UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: Countries develop and use market mechanisms to support environmental management.
 - Expected CP Outcome(s): Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion.
 - Expected CPAP Output: Management and preparation for climate change and disasters

- 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?
 - Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Enabling Activities (CCM-6): Support enabling activities and capacity building under the Convention
 - Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Adequate resources allocated to support enabling activities under the Convention
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
 - Country program Outcomes (as defined in CPD): Management and preparation for climate change and disasters
 - Country program Output
- 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?
- 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?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ 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 method² 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	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,

² For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

	<p>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"> • Project Document (contribution agreement) including theory of change and results framework • Inception Workshop Report • Annual Work and Financial Plans • Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) 2016-2019. • Review the tracking tool. • Quarterly Reports • Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings • Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any) • Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc. • Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) • GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) • Sample of project communications materials
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"> • Semi-structured interviews 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"> ○ Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed. ○ Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders. ○ All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals. <p><i>Note: Considering the COVID outbreak semi-structured interview will be conducted in virtual mode.</i></p> <p>Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MoEFCC 2. Stakeholders' institutions for TNC 3. Stakeholders' institutions for BUR
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).

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)**³. 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 **five expert consultants and one coordinator**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. Coordinator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible

³ A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested

for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The coordinator will liaise with all the expert consultants, prepare the draft TE report and incorporate changes as per the consultations. The coordinator will have additional responsibility of coordinator along with expert inputs to the TE process.

Educational Qualification & Experience of Expert Consultants

Educational Qualification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post graduate degree in engineering/ environment/ climate change/ management/ Environment/Social Science or related field domain. • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to climate change • Excellent communication skills including fluency in written and spoken English • Demonstrable analytical skills • Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 6 years of relevant professional experience • Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies. • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; • Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal area

7. Evaluation ethics

“This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultants 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 consultants 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
Phase One: Inception report				
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
Phase Two: Presentation				
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders on initial Findings	5 days	End of evaluation mission	Remote	To project management, UNDP CO
Phase Three: Draft Final Report				
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
Phase Four: Final Report				
Revised report based on input	2	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Remote	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC
	14			

*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

Payment Terms

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities	Payment
Inception Report	The coordinator liaises with all the expert consultants and prepare the inception report.	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO	20%
Presentation	Develop the initial presentation coordinating inputs from all experts	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO	20%
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes incorporating comments from all experts	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs	20%
Final Report*	Revised report incorporating comments from all experts	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.	40%

10. TOR annexes

Annex: Project Log frame

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Management and preparation for climate change and disasters
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Enabling Activities (CCM-6): Support enabling activities and capacity building under the Convention
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Adequate resources allocated to support enabling activities under the Convention (Outcome 6.1)
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Completed and submitted Third National Communication (TNC) and Biennial Update Report (BUR)

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
Project objective: To prepare the Third National Communication and other new information required to meet obligations under the UNFCCC	(A) National GHG inventory according to IPCC guidelines for the sectors; (i)Energy, (ii)Industry, (iii)Agriculture, (iv)LULUCF and (v)Waste for 2011, 2013 and 2014;	(A) SNC	(A) TNC	Project evaluation and official reports to the UNFCCC	Risks: No major risks have visualized in the successful implementation of this project as government of India is fully committed to meeting the obligation towards the UNFCCC especially in the context of submission of National communication Assumptions: Government of India maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC.
	(B) Climate projections and assessment of impacts and vulnerability and adaptation policies & measures to address climate variability, climate change and extreme events	(B) SNC	(B)TNC		
	(C) Assessment of policies and measures to mitigate climate change	(C) SNC	(C)TNC		
	(D) Publication of Third National Communication	(D) N/A	(D)TNC		
	(E) Biennial Update Report for reference year 2014 (along with TNC)	(E) N/A	(E) BUR-2018		
Outcome 1: Updated report on India's national circumstances prepared	(A) Report on national and state level developmental priorities in the context of climate change	(A) SNC	(A) TNC	Project reports, information contained in third NC	Risks: No risks have been identified Assumptions: (A) All the data, information required is accessible (B) TNC will benefit from the experience gained in preparing INC & SNC
	(B) Report on the national actions to reduce GHG emissions	(B) SNC	(B) TNC		
	(C) Report on the status of the environment, natural resources and energy use	(C) SNC	(C)TNC		
	(D) Description of the status of the national missions under NAPCC	(D) SNC	(D)TNC		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
Outcome 2: National GHG inventory prepared for the years 2011, 2013 & 2014	(A) National GHG inventory for the sectors; (i)Energy, (ii)Industry, (iii)Agriculture, (iv)LULUCF and (v)Waste for 2011, 2013 & 2014;	(A) GHG inventory available for the period 1994, 2000 & 2007 from INC, SNC and INCCA report respectively	(A) GHG inventory prepared for the 2011, 2013 & 2014	Reports on status of preparation of inventory and supporting documents	Risks: A large number of institutions from different parts of India will be involved in the preparation of GHG inventory and emission factor database. Co-ordination of the efforts and the periodic delivery of the data may cause delays. Assumptions: (1) India has a large number of experts who are authors for the IPCC, GHG inventory reports (2003, 2006); (2) Indian experts are also GHG inventory review experts for UNFCCC for Annex1 countries inventory review; (3) TNC will benefit from experience in preparing inventory for SNC & INCCA; (4) Government of India maintains its support to implement UNFCCC
	(B) IPCC 2006 guidelines, AFLOU approach adopted	(B) IPCC 2003, LULUCF, guidelines, methods used in SNC	(B) Activity data on emission factors generated for all sectors including AFLOU		
	(C) Uncertainty of the GHG inventory estimation using Approach-2 methods and reduction	(C) Uncertainty estimated using Tier 1 methods in SNC	(C) Uncertainty estimates provided in third NC		
	(D) Emission factor database and activity database prepared	(D) Book published on emission factors	(D) Emission factors and activity database available		
	(E) QA/QC procedures established	(E) No previous experience	(E) QA/QC systems established and operational		
	(F) National inventory management system for different sectors	(F) No previous experience	(F) Institutional arrangements for sustained inventory established and operational		
Outcome 3: Impacts and vulnerability assessments, and adaptation measures	(A) Climate variability profiles & trends prepared at national & state level	(A) No state level climate variability profiles available	(A) Climate variability profiles and maps prepared at state level	- Project reports - Technical reports -TNC	Risks: (1) Delay in availability in RCM (Regional Climate Model projections) from multiple GCMs; (2) Data limitations for impact assessment in different sectors such as agriculture, forest and water resources; (3) Complex coordination between large number of institutions making impact modeling and vulnerability profile development Assumptions: (1) Impact, vulnerability & adaptation assessments will benefit from INCCA studies and SNC. (2) TNC will benefit from participation of several IPCC authors of working group I & II. (3) Government of India maintains its support to implement UNFCCC; (4) Statistically downscaled GCM outputs are available that can reasonably substitute RCM outputs from multiple GCMs.
	(B) Climate change projections using latest CIMIP5 multiple GCM based outputs for different RCP scenarios at national & state level	(B) Climate change projections are available only for SRES A2, B2 & A1B scenarios	(B) Climate change projections and maps prepared based on multiple model ensemble based on CIMIP5 & RCP scenarios at GCM & RCM grid scales. Projections of extreme events made available		
	(C) Quantitative impacts of climate change using latest models for different sectors such as (Water resource, agriculture, forest ecosystems, health, coastal zones etc.)	(C) SNC presents climate impacts based on SRES scenarios	(C) Impacts of climate change on key sectors assessed using latest climate change projections for RCP		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
			scenarios and improved impact models		
	(D) Climate change vulnerability profiles developed at national & state level for different sectors	(D) Vulnerability profiles are not available for all the key sectors at national & state level	(D) Vulnerability profiles based on climatic, bio-physical & socio-economic factors developed		
	(E) Adaptation matrix for coping with climate impacts for different sectors and different regions	(E) Preliminary adaptation practices presented in SNC for only agriculture and forest sectors	(E) Adaptation matrix developed for projected climate change impacts for different sectors at regional level and updated information for agriculture and forest sectors		
	(F) Adaptation framework and policies for mainstreaming developed	(F) No adaptation framework presented in SNC and no national & state level adaptation framework & policies exist for mainstreaming adaptation in different sectors	(F) Policy framework developed for mainstreaming adaptation		
Outcome 4: Measures to mitigate climate change	(A) Documentation and synthesis of national climate change policies.	(A) No such analysis is available, except a book published in 2004	(A) Climate change policy synthesis, analysis and implications described	Project reports, information contained in the TNC	Risks: (1) Lack of data for state level mitigation assessments (2) Limited participations of some states (3) Delay in decisions on selection of scenarios (4) Involvement of multiple stakeholders may lead to delays in agreement of mitigation strategies (5) Coordination of the large number of institutions could lead the delays in preparation of GHG emission scenarios, mitigation plans and TNA Assumptions: (1) TNC will benefit from experience gained during preparation for SNC, INCCA reports on GHG emissions projections and low carbon strategy from the Planning Commission (2) Capacity building at national and particularly
	(B) GHG emissions scenarios for 2020 and 2030	(B) Ministry of Environment has published GHG emissions for 2030, which is outdated	(B) Improved model based GHG emissions projections developed		
	(C) Mitigation potential of Energy and Land use sectors and projections for 2020 and 2030 based on modelling	(C) Mitigation potential not reported in SNC, but a few published papers available, which are based on limited information	(C) Model based mitigation potential estimates for energy and land use sectors along with marginal abatement cost curves developed		
	(D) Mitigation action plans at national and state levels	(D) No national mitigation plan available apart from a Low Carbon strategy	(D) Sectoral mitigation options developed at national & state level		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
		prepared by the Planning Commission. State level preliminary mitigation plans available for some states	along implications for GDP, employment, etc.		at state level (3) Multiple institutions will be involved and networks created for different sectors (4) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(E) Constraints, gaps and related technical, financial and capacity needs	(E) SNC	(E) Gaps and constraints analyzed and barriers are ranked using AHP methods		
	(F) TNA and technology transfer and financial needs	(F) SNC	(F) Detailed TNA and technology transfer and financial needs assessed		
Outcome 5: Other information relevant for the preparation of the TNC – Comprehensive description of climate change research, strategies for sustainable National Communication process and communicating climate change to public	(A) Climate change research status and needs	(A) SNC information until 2010	(A) Systematic and comprehensive plan for research and climate change along with estimation of financial resources	Project reports, TNC	Risks: (1) Limited public interest in climate change issues (2) Delay in agreements on institutional arrangements for sustained national communication process Assumptions: (1) TNC will benefit from experience gained in the preparation of SNC (2) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(B) Financial and technical support for climate change related activities received from national and international sources	(B) No quantitative estimates available in SNC	(B) Report on the financial flows into climate change activities from national and international sources		
	(C) Institutional arrangements for sustained National Communication process	(C) No institutional arrangement for long term and sustained preparation of national communication process presented in SNC	(C) Institutional arrangements with roles and responsibilities and financial and technical resource needs assessed and made available		
	(D) Stakeholder consultation and communicating climate change to different stakeholders	(D) Limited stakeholder consultation during SNC and no programs for communicating climate change	(D) Mechanisms and institutional arrangements made and implemented for communicating climate change to stakeholder and public		
Outcome 6: Third National Communication Report Preparation	(A) Reporting of the outcomes of the National Communication process on the NATCOM website, along with GHG inventories, climate change projection and impact and vulnerability maps	(A) SNC reported on the website	(A) All information relevant to preparation of TNC published on the NATCOM website	(1) Periodic technical reports, books and journal articles (2) Third NC report	Risks: (1) Delays in submission of technical reports, project reports and submission of information to PMU by large diversity and number of institutions (2) Difficulties in coordination with large

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
	(B) Publication / printing of the TNC	(B) SNC published and shared with the public and stakeholders	(B) TNC finalized and presented to Government of India and report published after approval	(3) Final evaluation report	number of institutions spread all over the country Assumptions: (1) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(C) Summary Report of the National Communication translated in major languages of India	(C) So far no summaries has been published in major Indian languages	(C) Summary and key findings of the TNC published in major India languages		
	(D) Periodic technical reports on climate change projections, impacts and vulnerability assessments\	(D) A few technical reports published during the preparation of SNC	(D) Periodic technical reports, book and journal articles published		
	(E) Final evaluation report	(E) Final evaluation report of SNC completed	(E) Final evaluation report completed and submitted		
Outcome 7: Enhanced understanding of domestic mitigation actions and preparation of Biennial Update Reports for submission during 2014 and 2016	(A) Biennial update of GHG inventory for the years 2010 and 2012	(A) No previous reports other than SNC reporting GHG inventory for year 2000	(A) BUR for 2014 and 2016	BUR 2014 and 2016 project reports	Risks: (1) Delay in compilation of GHG inventory for year 2010 and 2012 by 2014 and 2016, respectively due to limited time Assumptions: (1) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(B) Update of the national circumstances and institutional arrangements from BUR perspective for 2014 and 2016	(B) Only SNC report	(B) BUR for 2014 and 2016		
	(C) Mitigation actions and their effects until 2020, including associated assumptions, methodologies and modeling	(C) No previous reports	(C) BUR for 2014 and 2016		
	(D) Update on the technical, financial capacity needs and support received for implementing these mitigation actions	(D) Only SNC	(D) BUR for 2014 and 2016		
	(E) Biennial Update Reports (BUR) submitted in 2014 and 2016	(E) Only SNC	(E) BUR for 2014 and 2016		

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 Outline⁴

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 rated⁵)

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)

⁴ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ 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

National Consultant - Terminal Evaluation - Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC - Home Based, INDIA

Evaluation Terms of Reference

Individual Consultancy

Number of Days – 14 days

Duration 15th December to 10th January 2022

11. 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) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the titled project “**Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC**” (PIMS #4603).

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) recognizes common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities of parties to the Convention towards achieving the sustainable development goals. Being a Party to the UNFCCC, India submitted its Initial National Communication (INC) to the UNFCCC on June 22, 2004 and Second National Communication (SNC) on May 04, 2012 prepared according to the guidelines provided by the Conference of Parties for non-Annex 1 countries (10/CP.2 and 17/CP.8). Both INC and SNC identified many technical, scientific, financial and policy-related capacity constraints.

The proposed project aims to support Govt of India to undertake activities towards **preparing its Third National Communication to the UNFCCC** in line with India’s commitments to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The activities proposed in the Third National Communication are envisaged to make climate change assessments more policy relevant and enhance India’s capacity to incorporate climate change in its development processes which is in line with the GEF’s climate change mitigation focal area objective (CCM-6) under GEF-5: Enabling Activities: Support enabling activities and capacity building under the Convention. The outcome of the project includes: “Adequate resources allocated to support enabling activities under the Convention” and the Outputs are “Countries receiving GEF support for national communication, etc.” & “National communications, etc. completed and submitted to the UNFCCC as appropriate”. The project would specifically address the gaps identified in the INC and SNC, particularly on capacity building needs, sector-specific data, developing and refining country specific emission/sequestration factors, and developing integrated vulnerability and adaptation frameworks for identified hotspots that are vulnerable to climate change. This project will also strengthen institutional and technical capacities related to climate change science, policy and developmental aspects in India.

The project encompasses seven components **(a) Component 1:** India’s National Circumstances (This component would involve the updating of the information on the prevailing conditions and situations at the national and state levels regarding development priorities and objectives that serve as the basis for addressing issues relating to climate change. Such information provided on national circumstances is critical for understanding India’s vulnerability, its capacity and options for adapting to the adverse effects of climate change, as well as options for addressing its GHG emissions within the broader context of sustainable development. **(b) Component 2:** National GHG Inventory **(c) Component 3:**

Impacts and Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Measures (This component would involve improved climate change projections, impact assessment using the latest scientific models and methods, development of vulnerability profiles at decentralized level, assessment of adaptation options and development of strategy for mainstreaming adaptation) **(d) Component 4:** Measures to Mitigate Climate Change (Under this component, work on mitigation actions and information on mitigation related activities will be presented) **(e) Component 5:** Other information relevant for the preparation of the TNC **(f) Component 6:** Third National Communication report preparation (Published TNC of India to UNFCCC and Periodic Technical reports, such as the GHG inventories, V&A adaptation assessments at the sectoral level, brief summaries of key policy issues relevant for decision making, and brief summaries of the key climate changes issues and findings at the regional level) **(g) Component 7:** Other new information required under the aegis of the Convention.

The total resources allocated to the project for implementation of said activities was US\$ 35,250,604 including GEF project grant of US\$ 9,010,604, Government of India (grant) of US\$ 10,302,200, Government of India (In-kind) of US\$ 15,787,800 and UNDP of US\$ 150,000.

PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project title	Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC	
Atlas ID	70193	
Corporate outcome and output	Expected CP Outcome(s): Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion. Expected CPAP Output (s): Management and preparation for climate change and disasters.	
Country	India	
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	2013	2021
Project budget	GEF (grant)	US\$ 9,010,604
	Government of India (grant)	US\$ 10,302,200
	Government of India (In-kind)	US\$ 15,787,800
	UNDP	US\$ 150,000
	Total Allocated Resources	US\$ 35,250,604
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	GEF (grant)	USD 7,379,677
	Government of India (grant)	
	Government of India (In-kind)	USD 12,050,000
	UNDP	USD 100,000
	Total Allocated Resources	19,529,677
Funding source	GEF	

Implementing party⁶

Implementing Partner: Ministry of Environment and Forests

Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners: Ministry of Environment and Forests/Project Management Unit.

⁶ 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.

12. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

12.1. Purpose

The purpose of the undertaking terminal evaluations (TEs) of the titled project “Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information to the UNFCCC” is to

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

12.2. Objective of the evaluation

The key objective of the evaluation is to:

- c. assess the overall achievement of the project results since the programme inception and its contribution to the UNSDF/CPD outcomes
- d. 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

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

12.3. Timing of Terminal Evaluation

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

Start of the project	Closure Date
2013	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.

2.6 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.

2.7 Scope of the Evaluation

d. Programmatic scope

The programmatic scope of evaluation is to include:

Third National Communication (TNC) and other new information required to meet obligations under the UNFCCC Completed and submitted

e. Geographical scope

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

f. Operational

The evaluation will assess the key aspects of the project including

- VII. Development of National GHG inventory according to IPCC guidelines for the sectors; (i)Energy, (ii)Industry, (iii)Agriculture, (iv)LULUCF and (v)Waste for 2011, 2013 and 2014
- VIII. Development of Climate projections and assessment of impacts and vulnerability and adaptation policies & measures to address climate variability, climate change and extreme events
- IX. Assessment of policies and measures to mitigate climate change
- X. Publication of Third National Communication
- XI. Biennial Update Report for reference year 2014 (along with TNC)
- XII. 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								

13. 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 shortcomings</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>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant:</p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

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?
 - UNDAF Outcome(s): Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion.
 - UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environment and energy concerns in to national development plans.
 - UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: Countries develop and use market mechanisms to support environmental management.
 - Expected CP Outcome(s): Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion.
 - Expected CPAP Output: Management and preparation for climate change and disasters

- 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?
 - Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Enabling Activities (CCM-6): Support enabling activities and capacity building under the Convention
 - Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Adequate resources allocated to support enabling activities under the Convention
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
 - Country program Outcomes (as defined in CPD): Management and preparation for climate change and disasters
 - Country program Output
- 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?
- 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?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ 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?

14. Methodology

An overall approach and method⁷ 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	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,

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

	<p>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"> • Project Document (contribution agreement) including theory of change and results framework • Inception Workshop Report • Annual Work and Financial Plans • Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) 2016-2019. • Review the tracking tool. • Quarterly Reports • Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings • Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any) • Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc. • Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) • GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) • Sample of project communications materials
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"> • Semi-structured interviews 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"> ○ Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed. ○ Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders. ○ All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals. <p>Note: Considering the COVID outbreak semi-structured interview will be conducted in virtual mode.</p> <p>Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. MoEFCC 5. Stakeholders' institutions for TNC 6. Stakeholders' institutions for BUR
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.

15. 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).

The inception report should essentially comprise off

- ix. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
 - x. 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.
 - xi. 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.
 - xii. 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.
 - xiii. 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.
 - xiv. A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting)
 - xv. Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables presented in the workplan.
 - xvi. 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)⁸.** 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).

16. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation team will be composed of **five expert consultants and one coordinator**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. Coordinator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible

⁸ A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested

for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

Educational Qualification & Experience of Expert Consultants

Educational Qualification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post graduate degree in engineering/ environment/ climate change/ management/ Environment/Social Science or related filed domain. • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to climate change • Excellent communication skills including fluency in written and spoken English • Demonstrable analytical skills • Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience • Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies. • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; • Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal area

17. Evaluation ethics

“This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultants 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 consultants 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.”

18. 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.

19. 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
Phase One: Inception report				
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
Phase Two: Presentation				
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders on initial Findings	5 days	End of evaluation mission	Remote	To project management, UNDP CO
Phase Three: Draft Final Report				
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
Phase Four: Final Report				
Revised report based on input	2	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Remote	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC
	14			

*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

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%

20. [TOR annexes](#)

Annex: Project Log frame

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Management and preparation for climate change and disasters
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote more environmentally sustainable development and resilience of communities is enhanced in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Enabling Activities (CCM-6): Support enabling activities and capacity building under the Convention
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Adequate resources allocated to support enabling activities under the Convention (Outcome 6.1)
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Completed and submitted Third National Communication (TNC) and Biennial Update Report (BUR)

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
Project objective: To prepare the Third National Communication and other new information required to meet obligations under the UNFCCC	(A) National GHG inventory according to IPCC guidelines for the sectors; (i)Energy, (ii)Industry, (iii)Agriculture, (iv)LULUCF and (v)Waste for 2011, 2013 and 2014;	(A) SNC	(A) TNC	Project evaluation and official reports to the UNFCCC	Risks: No major risks have visualized in the successful implementation of this project as government of India is fully committed to meeting the obligation towards the UNFCCC especially in the context of submission of National communication Assumptions: Government of India maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC.
	(B) Climate projections and assessment of impacts and vulnerability and adaptation policies & measures to address climate variability, climate change and extreme events	(B) SNC	(B)TNC		
	(C) Assessment of policies and measures to mitigate climate change	(C) SNC	(C)TNC		
	(D) Publication of Third National Communication	(D) N/A	(D)TNC		
	(E) Biennial Update Report for reference year 2014 (along with TNC)	(E) N/A	(E) BUR-2018		
Outcome 1: Updated report on India's national circumstances prepared	(A) Report on national and state level developmental priorities in the context of climate change	(A) SNC	(A) TNC	Project reports, information contained in third NC	Risks: No risks have been identified Assumptions: (A) All the data, information required is accessible (B) TNC will benefit from the experience gained in preparing INC & SNC
	(B) Report on the national actions to reduce GHG emissions	(B) SNC	(B) TNC		
	(C) Report on the status of the environment, natural resources and energy use	(C) SNC	(C)TNC		
	(D) Description of the status of the national missions under NAPCC	(D) SNC	(D)TNC		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
Outcome 2: National GHG inventory prepared for the years 2011, 2013 & 2014	(A) National GHG inventory for the sectors; (i)Energy, (ii)Industry, (iii)Agriculture, (iv)LULUCF and (v)Waste for 2011, 2013 & 2014;	(A) GHG inventory available for the period 1994, 2000 & 2007 from INC, SNC and INCCA report respectively	(A) GHG inventory prepared for the 2011, 2013 & 2014	Reports on status of preparation of inventory and supporting documents	Risks: A large number of institutions from different parts of India will be involved in the preparation of GHG inventory and emission factor database. Co-ordination of the efforts and the periodic delivery of the data may cause delays. Assumptions: (1) India has a large number of experts who are authors for the IPCC, GHG inventory reports (2003, 2006); (2) Indian experts are also GHG inventory review experts for UNFCCC for Annex1 countries inventory review; (3) TNC will benefit from experience in preparing inventory for SNC & INCCA; (4) Government of India maintains its support to implement UNFCCC
	(B) IPCC 2006 guidelines, AFLOU approach adopted	(B) IPCC 2003, LULUCF, guidelines, methods used in SNC	(B) Activity data on emission factors generated for all sectors including AFLOU		
	(C) Uncertainty of the GHG inventory estimation using Approach-2 methods and reduction	(C) Uncertainty estimated using Tier 1 methods in SNC	(C) Uncertainty estimates provided in third NC		
	(D) Emission factor database and activity database prepared	(D) Book published on emission factors	(D) Emission factors and activity database available		
	(E) QA/QC procedures established	(E) No previous experience	(E) QA/QC systems established and operational		
	(F) National inventory management system for different sectors	(F) No previous experience	(F) Institutional arrangements for sustained inventory established and operational		
Outcome 3: Impacts and vulnerability assessments, and adaptation measures	(A) Climate variability profiles & trends prepared at national & state level	(A) No state level climate variability profiles available	(A) Climate variability profiles and maps prepared at state level	- Project reports - Technical reports -TNC	Risks: (1) Delay in availability in RCM (Regional Climate Model projections) from multiple GCMs; (2) Data limitations for impact assessment in different sectors such as agriculture, forest and water resources; (3) Complex coordination between large number of institutions making impact modeling and vulnerability profile development Assumptions: (1) Impact, vulnerability & adaptation assessments will benefit from INCCA studies and SNC. (2) TNC will benefit from participation of several IPCC authors of working group I & II. (3) Government of India maintains its support to implement UNFCCC; (4) Statistically downscaled GCM outputs are available that can reasonably substitute RCM outputs from multiple GCMs.
	(B) Climate change projections using latest CIMIP5 multiple GCM based outputs for different RCP scenarios at national & state level	(B) Climate change projections are available only for SRES A2, B2 & A1B scenarios	(B) Climate change projections and maps prepared based on multiple model ensemble based on CIMIP5 & RCP scenarios at GCM & RCM grid scales. Projections of extreme events made available		
	(C) Quantitative impacts of climate change using latest models for different sectors such as (Water resource, agriculture, forest ecosystems, health, coastal zones etc.)	(C) SNC presents climate impacts based on SRES scenarios	(C) Impacts of climate change on key sectors assessed using latest climate change projections for RCP		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
			scenarios and improved impact models		
	(D) Climate change vulnerability profiles developed at national & state level for different sectors	(D) Vulnerability profiles are not available for all the key sectors at national & state level	(D) Vulnerability profiles based on climatic, bio-physical & socio-economic factors developed		
	(E) Adaptation matrix for coping with climate impacts for different sectors and different regions	(E) Preliminary adaptation practices presented in SNC for only agriculture and forest sectors	(E) Adaptation matrix developed for projected climate change impacts for different sectors at regional level and updated information for agriculture and forest sectors		
	(F) Adaptation framework and policies for mainstreaming developed	(F) No adaptation framework presented in SNC and no national & state level adaptation framework & policies exist for mainstreaming adaptation in different sectors	(F) Policy framework developed for mainstreaming adaptation		
Outcome 4: Measures to mitigate climate change	(A) Documentation and synthesis of national climate change policies.	(A) No such analysis is available, except a book published in 2004	(A) Climate change policy synthesis, analysis and implications described	Project reports, information contained in the TNC	Risks: (1) Lack of data for state level mitigation assessments (2) Limited participations of some states (3) Delay in decisions on selection of scenarios (4) Involvement of multiple stakeholders may lead to delays in agreement of mitigation strategies (5) Coordination of the large number of institutions could lead the delays in preparation of GHG emission scenarios, mitigation plans and TNA Assumptions: (1) TNC will benefit from experience gained during preparation for SNC, INCCA reports on GHG emissions projections and low carbon strategy from the Planning Commission (2) Capacity building at national and particularly
	(B) GHG emissions scenarios for 2020 and 2030	(B) Ministry of Environment has published GHG emissions for 2030, which is outdated	(B) Improved model based GHG emissions projections developed		
	(C) Mitigation potential of Energy and Land use sectors and projections for 2020 and 2030 based on modelling	(C) Mitigation potential not reported in SNC, but a few published papers available, which are based on limited information	(C) Model based mitigation potential estimates for energy and land use sectors along with marginal abatement cost curves developed		
	(D) Mitigation action plans at national and state levels	(D) No national mitigation plan available apart from a Low Carbon strategy	(D) Sectoral mitigation options developed at national & state level		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
		prepared by the Planning Commission. State level preliminary mitigation plans available for some states	along implications for GDP, employment, etc.		at state level (3) Multiple institutions will be involved and networks created for different sectors (4) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(E) Constraints, gaps and related technical, financial and capacity needs	(E) SNC	(E) Gaps and constraints analyzed and barriers are ranked using AHP methods		
	(F) TNA and technology transfer and financial needs	(F) SNC	(F) Detailed TNA and technology transfer and financial needs assessed		
Outcome 5: Other information relevant for the preparation of the TNC – Comprehensive description of climate change research, strategies for sustainable National Communication process and communicating climate change to public	(A) Climate change research status and needs	(A) SNC information until 2010	(A) Systematic and comprehensive plan for research and climate change along with estimation of financial resources	Project reports, TNC	Risks: (1) Limited public interest in climate change issues (2) Delay in agreements on institutional arrangements for sustained national communication process Assumptions: (1) TNC will benefit from experience gained in the preparation of SNC (2) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(B) Financial and technical support for climate change related activities received from national and international sources	(B) No quantitative estimates available in SNC	(B) Report on the financial flows into climate change activities from national and international sources		
	(C) Institutional arrangements for sustained National Communication process	(C) No institutional arrangement for long term and sustained preparation of national communication process presented in SNC	(C) Institutional arrangements with roles and responsibilities and financial and technical resource needs assessed and made available		
	(D) Stakeholder consultation and communicating climate change to different stakeholders	(D) Limited stakeholder consultation during SNC and no programs for communicating climate change	(D) Mechanisms and institutional arrangements made and implemented for communicating climate change to stakeholder and public		
Outcome 6: Third National Communication Report Preparation	(A) Reporting of the outcomes of the National Communication process on the NATCOM website, along with GHG inventories, climate change projection and impact and vulnerability maps	(A) SNC reported on the website	(A) All information relevant to preparation of TNC published on the NATCOM website	(1) Periodic technical reports, books and journal articles (2) Third NC report	Risks: (1) Delays in submission of technical reports, project reports and submission of information to PMU by large diversity and number of institutions (2) Difficulties in coordination with large

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Mean of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
	(B) Publication / printing of the TNC	(B) SNC published and shared with the public and stakeholders	(B) TNC finalized and presented to Government of India and report published after approval	(3) Final evaluation report	number of institutions spread all over the country Assumptions: (1) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(C) Summary Report of the National Communication translated in major languages of India	(C) So far no summaries has been published in major Indian languages	(C) Summary and key findings of the TNC published in major India languages		
	(D) Periodic technical reports on climate change projections, impacts and vulnerability assessments\	(D) A few technical reports published during the preparation of SNC	(D) Periodic technical reports, book and journal articles published		
	(E) Final evaluation report	(E) Final evaluation report of SNC completed	(E) Final evaluation report completed and submitted		
Outcome 7: Enhanced understanding of domestic mitigation actions and preparation of Biennial Update Reports for submission during 2014 and 2016	(A) Biennial update of GHG inventory for the years 2010 and 2012	(A) No previous reports other than SNC reporting GHG inventory for year 2000	(A) BUR for 2014 and 2016	BUR 2014 and 2016 project reports	Risks: (1) Delay in compilation of GHG inventory for year 2010 and 2012 by 2014 and 2016, respectively due to limited time Assumptions: (1) Indian Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC
	(B) Update of the national circumstances and institutional arrangements from BUR perspective for 2014 and 2016	(B) Only SNC report	(B) BUR for 2014 and 2016		
	(C) Mitigation actions and their effects until 2020, including associated assumptions, methodologies and modeling	(C) No previous reports	(C) BUR for 2014 and 2016		
	(D) Update on the technical, financial capacity needs and support received for implementing these mitigation actions	(D) Only SNC	(D) BUR for 2014 and 2016		
	(E) Biennial Update Reports (BUR) submitted in 2014 and 2016	(E) Only SNC	(E) BUR for 2014 and 2016		

Annex: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluators:

8. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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 Outline⁹

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 rated¹⁰)

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)

⁹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹⁰ 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