Terms of Reference for International Consultant (Team Leader)

**CONSULTANT: FOR FINAL EVALUATION OF UNDP/GEF PROJECT “GEORGIA – PROMOTING THE USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES FOR LOCAL ENERGY SUPPLY”**

(Project Code: 00034741)

**Location:** Tbilisi, GEORGIA

**Application Deadline: 11/07/2011**

**Additional Category:** Environment and Energy

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** Consultant

**Languages Required:** English and Georgian

**Starting Date:** 4/08/2011

(date when the selected candidate is expected to start)

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 20 days

# **Introduction**

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

The final evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early sign of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of the national policy as a follow-up to the UNDP/GEF project initiatives.

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy”(see <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>).

Evaluations in the GEF explore five major criteria:

1. Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
2. Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved which includes the extent to which the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation have been taken into account.
3. Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible and the extent to which activities have been carried out in a timely manner.
4. Results and Lessons Learned – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
5. Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. The project should aim to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

Since 2004, UNDP Georgia has been implementing the UNDP/GEF full-sized project entitled “Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply”. Project consists of two components: financial component and technical assistance (TA) component. UNDP/GEF is implementing TA component of the project, the implementing partner for which is the Ministry of Environment Protection of Georgia. The day-to-day management of the project is implemented by the Project Management Unit (PMU) consisting of Project Manager, Technical/Procurement Specialist, Financial/Administrative and Technical Assistant.

The duration of the project was five years, which was extended and the project is now scheduled to close December 2011 which means that by the time it will have closed, the project will have run for seven and a half years , exceeding the normal maximum length of projects, which is seven years. The objective of the project has been to remove the key barriers to the increased utilization of renewable energy (RE) for local energy supply. The initial focus is on promoting the use of geothermal resources for heating and hot water supply and the use of small hydro power for local electricity production. The project has four immediate objectives: (i) Creating a supportive institutional, legal and regulatory framework for the long term development of Georgia’s renewable energy resources; (ii) Raising public awareness on the possibilities for commercial development of the local renewable energy resources in Georgia and building the capacity of the local entrepreneurs to develop “bankable” investment proposals, to structure financing for the projects and to manage the development and the implementation of the projects otherwise; (iii) Gaining experience for and demonstrating the feasibility of financing renewable energy investments in Georgia, building the local capacity to manage these operations leveraging additional financing for the capitalization of the Fund or for the renewable energy investments otherwise; and (iv) Documenting and disseminating the results, experiences and lessons learned and promoting the replication of the project activities at the national as well as the regional level. These objectives are to be achieved among others through the implementation of the pilot projects (rehabilitation of the small hydropower plants and geothermal heat and hot water supply systems).

The project (its financial component) is co-financed by the Government of Germany through KfW, the financial resources of which are used for establishing the Renewable Energy Fund (REF), which will have the revolving nature. According to the project document (Prodoc), UNDP also had to contribute to the REF by USD 2.0 M.

The total GEF project budget is US$ 4,300,000 USD.

A mid-term evaluation was carried out in May 2008 when a number of recommendations were made by the experts (Annex 2. Recommendations from the mid-term evaluation).

## Evaluation Audience

This Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project “*Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply*” is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to provide UNDP, and government GEF with important lessons learned which can be applied to future projects. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

## Objectives of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the project objective and logframe matrix. The evaluators are also expected to evaluate the Project’s contribution to the *implementation of UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in Georgia and in particular to the promotion of renewable energy in Georgia*. The evaluation is expected to produce possible recommendations on:

* Further steps to be taken for the Georgian Government on promoting the use of renewables;
* Best practices or lessons learned from the UNDP Georgia project which could be beneficial to other UNDP-implemented projects on renewables.

As this is the final evaluation, the emphasis of this evaluation should be the following:

Project indicators

The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project. *The evaluator is to take into account the project revisions conducted, especially the substantive revision of December 2010 which introduced changes in the Project’s logical framework.*

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation. The evaluator should consider the recommendations made in the MTE (mid-term evaluation) and the management responses made to address these recommendations in the further stages of the Project. The effectiveness of the Project Manager in implementing activities in a timely manner should be evaluated as part of the project.

Project Outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

The Final Evaluation will also cover the following aspects:

## Progress Towards End of Project Results

* Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for development of RE resources (legal and regulatory frameworks, assessment of financing, existence of the similar programs, existence of the RE strategy, etc.) to the baseline one with a focus on those indicators which were defined in the mid-term evaluation of the project;

Changes in development conditions*.* Address the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

* Can there be identified changes (or activities in progress) that indicate improvement in knowledge capacity and awareness addressing importance of the use of renewable, esp. hydropower and geothermal energy?
* Is there an increased ability for project developers to be able to invest in renewable energy projects in Georgia, as influenced by this project?

Measurement of change*:* Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after the project intervention. To what extent was the project able to carry out successfully project management. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions in the project site to conditions in similar unmanaged sites.

Project strategy: how and why outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results:

* Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

Sustainability: Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms which will continue beyond the life of the project, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy. In the context of this project, sustainability can be defined in terms of the contribution of this project towards reducing barriers to create a market for renewable energy projects (in particular small hydro and geothermal energy) in Georgia after the end of the project;

Gender perspective: Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How are gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions? . Advice on measures to strengthen gender-sensitive approach for consideration in future interventions in the area

2. Project’s Adaptive Management Framework

1. Monitoring Systems
* Assess the monitoring tools used:
	+ - Do they provide the necessary information?
		- Do they involve key partners?
		- Are they efficient?
* Reconstruct baseline data if necessary[[1]](#footnote-1). Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements[[3]](#footnote-3). Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
* Apply the GEF Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.
1. Risk Management
* Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified
* Assess the project’s risk identification and management systems:
	+ Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System[[4]](#footnote-4) appropriately applied?
1. Work Planning
* Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
	+ - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content
		- What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management?
* Assess the use of routinely updated workplans.
* Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities
* Are work planning processes result-based[[5]](#footnote-5)?
* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.
1. Reporting
* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported and implemented by the project management
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

3. Underlying Factors

* Assess the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project’s management strategies for these factors.
* Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made
* Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project

4. UNDP Contribution

* Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
	+ - Field visits
		- Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
		- PIR preparation and follow-up
		- GEF guidance
* Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide[[6]](#footnote-6), especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework
* Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance.

5. Partnership Strategy

* Assess how partners are involved in the project’s adaptive management framework:
	+ - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
		- Using already existing data and statistics
		- Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
* Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships;
* Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making.
* Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project.
* Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

***Scope of the evaluation***

In the last year of the project, namely in March 2011, there have been changes in the governance of energy and natural resource issues, whereby the Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources has been reorganized and is now the Ministry of Environment, with the Natural Resources aspect being transferred under the responsibility of the previous Ministry of Energy (now – Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources). The Municipal Development Fund, which is a manager of the Renewable Energy Fund, is now under the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure while before it was under the Ministry of Finance, which is the beneficiary of the KfW grant. Due to these changes the composition of the Project Supervisory Committee (PSC) has to be renewed and the renewed PSC will have only about 6 months for overall project coordination. This needs to be taken into account when conducting the evaluation and the evaluation should discuss the institutional set-up to support renewable energy in Georgia.

Due to the length of the project (some seven and a half years), the scope of the evaluation should be focused on the project period after the MTE until the end. For example, following the mid-term evaluation, it was agreed not to focus on areas such as Outcome 1 where the project had originally has aimed to change legislation and regulations to further promote renewable energy in Georgia. The final evaluation should focus equally on the effectiveness of efforts to implement the Mid-Term evaluation and on efforts to promote small hydro energy in Georgia and geothermal energy in Georgia should both be discussed separately.

In a later stage of the Project, an agreement was reached between the Government and UNDP, for the Project to be involved in supporting the development of the small hydro sector in Georgia though programmatic CDM (PoA) and later through regular CDM working closely with the Norwegian Government and Norsk Energi. This activity of support for CDM will likely continue beyond the lifetime of the project. The evaluation should also look at this activity and evaluate the contribution of the UNDP project to the development of CDM project activities for small hydro in Georgia.

Since the next programme period (2011-2015) for the UNDP CO in Georgia has particular focus on climate change issues in the environment and energy portfolio, the evaluation should include recommendations on any barriers which need to be further address related to renewable energy and which could be useful in the context of new projects in this area that UNDP is planning; what are some of the lessons learned by the project in its seven and a half years.

Ownership of the project processes and outcomes by the key stakeholders will be one of the key factors in project success to achieve project sustainability and thus the evaluators are asked to make an objective assessment of the ownership of the project outcomes/results by the key stakeholders.

# **Products expected from the evaluation**

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

Please note that some of the categories in the findings and conclusions need to be rated in conformity with the GEF guidelines for final evaluations.

**1. Executive summary**

* Brief description of project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

**2. Introduction**

* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation

**3. The project(s) and its development context**

* Project start and its duration
* Problems that the project seek to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected

**4. Findings and Conclusions**

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (R) should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

* 1. **Project Formulation**
* Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
* Country-ownership/Driveness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
* Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
* Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
* Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

**4.2. Project Implementation**

* Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.

(ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.

(iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.

(v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

* Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.
* Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

(i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.

(ii)Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.

(iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.

(iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

* Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

(iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

(iv) Co-financing [[7]](#footnote-7)

* Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.
* Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and GoC and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

**4.3. Results**

* Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R*):* Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental ) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.
* This section should also include reviews of the following:
* Sustainability*:* Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
* Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

**5. Recommendations**

1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

**6. Lessons learned**

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

**7. Evaluation report Annexes**

* Evaluation TORs

The length of the final evaluation report shall not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

***Evaluation team***

A team of independent consultants will conduct the evaluation. The evaluators selected should not have participated in any of the stages of the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluation team will be composed of one international Consultant (Team leader) and one National Consultant. The consultants, at least the International Consultant, shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former experience with GEF project evaluations is an advantage.

Team Qualities:

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
2. Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
3. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
4. Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
5. Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
6. Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to natural resource management projects;
7. Recognized expertise in the management and sustainable use of land;
8. Familiarity with land management policies and coordination structures in Latvia;
9. Demonstrable analytical skills;
10. Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
11. Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported projects on SLM;
12. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
13. Excellent English communication skills.

**Specifically, the International Consultant (Team Leader) will perform the following tasks:**

* **Lead and manage the evaluation mission;**
* **Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);**
* **Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;**
* **Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);**
* **Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and**
* **Finalize the whole evaluation report.**

***Skills and Qualifications:***

* **Master’s or higher university degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields**
* **Experience in consultancy in energy field**
* **Experience in evaluating energy programmes for UN or other international development agencies is a strong asset**
* **Experience in RE in particular, small hydropower and/or geothermal resources project development and/or evaluation**
* **Knowledge of the Georgia’s energy sector including small hydropower and geothermal sectors**
* **Strong analytical skills**
* **Excellent communications and writing skills**
* **Excellent team working skills**
* **Fluency in English and Georgian**

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for a position.

Joint proposals from two independent evaluators (one International and one National) are welcome. Or alternatively, proposals will be accepted from recognized consulting firms to field a complete team (one international and one national expert) . In this case the CVs of the offered consultants will be evaluated.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles[[8]](#footnote-8):

* Independence
* Impartiality
* Transparency
* Disclosure
* Ethical
* Partnership
* Competencies and Capacities
* Credibility
* Utility

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Ministry of Environment, UNDP-Georgia or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

If the Joint Proposal is submitted, the International Consultant (Team Leader) will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.

## Methodology or evaluation approach

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group[[9]](#footnote-9)). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation review (desk study) - the list of documentation to be reviewed is included in the Annex 3 to the Terms of Reference);
* *Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP Georgia, UNDP/GEF RTA, UNFCC national focal point, project team, Project Supervisory Committee representatives: Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of Finance, KfW, representatives from pilot projects;*
* Field visits to pilot sites;
* Questionnaires;
* Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

***Implementation Arrangements***

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Georgia. UNDP Georgia is the main operational point for the evaluation responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with the Executing Agency and other counterparts. UNDP Georgia will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project implementation unit will be responsible for to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements.

Timeframe for submission of first draft of the report: 7 weeks upon signing the contract. The evaluation should be completed by **Friday 28th October 2011**.

The report shall be submitted to UNDP Georgia office and to UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre.

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts and project management: The National Project Director and members of the Project Supervisory Committee representing the following institutions:

* Ministry of Environment;
* Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources;
* Ministry of Finance;
* KfW

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

The activity and timeframe are broken down as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe and responsible party** |
| desk review | 5 days  |
| briefings for evaluators | 1 day  |
| visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings | 9 days  |
| Preparation of draft Final Evaluation Report | 2 days  |
| validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of initial reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms | 1 days  |
| Finalization of the Evaluation Report (incorporating comments received on first draft) | 2 days  |

*Working Days:*

 20 working days

The proposed working dates shall be agreed with Team Leader. The assignment is to commence no later than **4 August 2011**.

***Evaluation of Applicants:***

UNDP applies the ‘Best value for money’ approach - the final selection will be based on the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. Maximum obtainable score is 100, out of which the total score for technical criteria equals to 70 and for financial criteria – to 30.

The evaluation of applied candidates is to be performed through the two-stage evaluation process. Stage 1.1: Applicants will be screened against qualifications and the competencies specified above. Stage 1.2: Applicants will be evaluated against technical qualification criteria. Stage 1.3: Interviewing of the short-listed candidates. Stage 2: Evaluation of financial proposals and cumulative evaluation.

  **Evaluation Criteria**

Stage 1.1: Screening against qualifications and competencies

* Relevant educational background (yes/no)
* Experience in development and/or evaluation of energy projects (yes/no)
* Knowledge of energy sector of Georgia (yes/no)
* Fluency in both Georgian and English (yes/no)

Only those candidates will be further evaluated which satisfies all criteria

Stage 1.2: Technical qualification

1. General Qualification

Relevant educational background

*Master’s degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields - 5 points; Higher degree - additional 2 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for education: 7points*

Consultancy in energy field

*Consultancy in energy general but not in renewable energy – 3 points; Consultancy in renewable energy – additional 2 points; Consultancy outside Georgia – additional 3 points), i.e. maximum obtainable for consultancy in energy field: 8 points*

1. Relevant Experience

Experience in energy project development

Less than 5-year experience – 0 point; 5-6-year experience – 2 points; 7-8-year experience – 3 points; 9-10-year experience – 4 points; 11-14-year experience – 5 points; 15-year and more experience – 6 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for experience in energy project development: 6 points

Experience in small hydropower or/and geothermal project implementation or/and evaluation

*Less than 5-year experience in implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or geothermal projects – 0 point;*

*5-6-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 5 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 8 points;*

*7-8-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 5 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 8 points;*

*9-10-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 5 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 8 points;*

*11-14-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 6 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 9 points;*

*15-year and more experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 7 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 10 points;*

*i.e. maximum obtainable for experience in small hydropower or/and geothermal project implementation or/and evaluation: 10 points*

Experience in implementation of international donor founded renewable energy projects

*Experience in implementation of 1 project financed by the international donors – 2 points; 2 projects – 3 points; 3 and more projects – 4 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for experience in implementation of international donor founded renewable energy projects: 4 points*

1. Knowledge of Georgia’s context with regard to energy sector of Georgia including small hydropower and geothermal sectors

*Knowledge of the energy sector of Georgia (score from 0 to 5); knowledge of small hydropower sector – up to 3 additional points; knowledge of geothermal sector – up to additional 2 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for knowledge of Georgia’s energy sector: 10 points*

1. Language Qualifications

 *English language qualification (score from 0 to 2.5)*

*Georgian language qualification (score from 0 to 2.5)*

Total for technical qualification: 50 points. Candidates who will obtain 70% or more out of maximum obtainable (i.e. 50 x 70% = 35) points will be considered as qualified.

Stage 1.3: Interviewing of the short-listed candidates.

*Up to top 5 qualified applicants will be short-listed and interviewed. Maximum obtainable for interview for National Consultant: 20 points*

Stage 2: Evaluation of financial proposals and cumulative evaluation

Only short-listed applicants will be requested to submit financial proposals – Lump Sum amount that should include remuneration, daily fee x 20 (number of total days), travel costs to project sites (ticket cost and Daily Subsistence Allowances (DSA, which includes accommodation, meals and in-town travel) x number of total days to visit project sites) and, other associated costs, if such. Daily rates shall not exceed UNDP maximum reference rates for national consultants; DSAs should not exceed UN DSA rates for Georgia.

A maximum of 30 points will be assigned to the lowest price offer. All other price offers will receive points in inverse proportion, using the formula: Financial score offer X = 30 x (lowest price/ price offer X)

Applicant with maximum combined scores calculated as (Scores technical qualification + Scores interview + Scores financial proposal ) will be granted a contract.

***Payment Modality:***

The payment of a Lump Sum will be done in 2 installments:

* After submitting Draft Evaluation Report – 50%;
* After submitting and clearing by UNDP CO relevant Programme Analyst and Bratislava Regional Center Technical Advisor – 50%

Terms of Reference for National consultant

**CONSULTANT: FOR FINAL EVALUATION OF UNDP/GEF PROJECT “GEORGIA – PROMOTING THE USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES FOR LOCAL ENERGY SUPPLY”**

(Project Code: 00034741)

**Location:** Tbilisi, GEORGIA

**Application Deadline: 11/07/2011**

**Additional Category:** Environment and Energy

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** Consultant

**Languages Required:** English and Georgian

**Starting Date:** 4/08/2011

(date when the selected candidate is expected to start)

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 20 days

# **Introduction**

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

The final evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early sign of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of the national policy as a follow-up to the UNDP/GEF project initiatives.

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy”(see <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>).

Evaluations in the GEF explore five major criteria:

1. Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
2. Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved which includes the extent to which the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation have been taken into account.
3. Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible and the extent to which activities have been carried out in a timely manner.
4. Results and Lessons Learned – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
5. Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. The project should aim to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

Since 2004, UNDP Georgia has been implementing the UNDP/GEF full-sized project entitled “Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply”. Project consists of two components: financial component and technical assistance (TA) component. UNDP/GEF is implementing TA component of the project, the implementing partner for which is the Ministry of Environment Protection of Georgia. The day-to-day management of the project is implemented by the Project Management Unit (PMU) consisting of Project Manager, Technical/Procurement Specialist, Financial/Administrative and Technical Assistant.

The duration of the project was five years, which was extended and the project is now scheduled to close December 2011 which means that by the time it will have closed, the project will have run for seven and a half years , exceeding the normal maximum length of projects, which is seven years. The objective of the project has been to remove the key barriers to the increased utilization of renewable energy (RE) for local energy supply. The initial focus is on promoting the use of geothermal resources for heating and hot water supply and the use of small hydro power for local electricity production. The project has four immediate objectives: (i) Creating a supportive institutional, legal and regulatory framework for the long term development of Georgia’s renewable energy resources; (ii) Raising public awareness on the possibilities for commercial development of the local renewable energy resources in Georgia and building the capacity of the local entrepreneurs to develop “bankable” investment proposals, to structure financing for the projects and to manage the development and the implementation of the projects otherwise; (iii) Gaining experience for and demonstrating the feasibility of financing renewable energy investments in Georgia, building the local capacity to manage these operations leveraging additional financing for the capitalization of the Fund or for the renewable energy investments otherwise; and (iv) Documenting and disseminating the results, experiences and lessons learned and promoting the replication of the project activities at the national as well as the regional level. These objectives are to be achieved among others through the implementation of the pilot projects (rehabilitation of the small hydropower plants and geothermal heat and hot water supply systems).

The project (its financial component) is co-financed by the Government of Germany through KfW, the financial resources of which are used for establishing the Renewable Energy Fund (REF), which will have the revolving nature. According to the project document (Prodoc), UNDP also had to contribute to the REF by USD 2.0 M.

The total GEF project budget is US$ 4,300,000 USD.

A mid-term evaluation was carried out in May 2008 when a number of recommendations were made by the experts (Annex 2. Recommendations from the mid-term evaluation).

## Evaluation Audience

This Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project “*Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply*” is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to provide UNDP, and government GEF with important lessons learned which can be applied to future projects. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

## Objectives of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the project objective and logframe matrix. The evaluators are also expected to evaluate the Project’s contribution to the *implementation of UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in Georgia and in particular to the promotion of renewable energy in Georgia*. The evaluation is expected to produce possible recommendations on:

* *Further steps to be taken for the Georgian Government on promoting the use of renewables;*
* *Best practices or lessons learned from the UNDP Georgia project which could be beneficial to other UNDP-implemented projects on renewables.*

As this is the final evaluation, the emphasis of this evaluation should be the following:

Project indicators

The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project. *The evaluator is to take into account the project revisions conducted, especially the substantive revision of December 2010 which introduced changes in the Project’s logical framework.*

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation. The evaluator should consider the recommendations made in the MTE (mid-term evaluation) and the management responses made to address these recommendations in the further stages of the Project. The effectiveness of the Project Manager in implementing activities in a timely manner should be evaluated as part of the project.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

The Final Evaluation will also cover the following aspects:

## Progress Towards End of Project Results

* *Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for development of RE resources (legal and regulatory frameworks, assessment of financing, existence of the similar programs, existence of the RE strategy, etc.) to the baseline one with a focus on those indicators which were defined in the mid-term evaluation of the project;*

Changes in development conditions*.* Address the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

* *Can there be identified changes (or activities in progress) that indicate improvement in knowledge capacity and awareness addressing importance of the use of renewable, esp. hydropower and geothermal energy?*
* *Is there an increased ability for project developers to be able to invest in renewable energy projects in Georgia, as influenced by this project?*

Measurement of change*:* Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after the project intervention. To what extent was the project able to carry out successfully project management. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions in the project site to conditions in similar unmanaged sites.

Project strategy: how and why outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results:

* Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

Sustainability: Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms which will continue beyond the life of the project, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy. In the context of this project, sustainability can be defined in terms of the contribution of this project towards reducing barriers to create a market for renewable energy projects (in particular small hydro and geothermal energy) in Georgia after the end of the project;

Gender perspective: Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How are gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions? . Advice on measures to strengthen gender-sensitive approach for consideration in future interventions in the area

2. Project’s Adaptive Management Framework

1. Monitoring Systems
* Assess the monitoring tools used:
	+ - Do they provide the necessary information?
		- Do they involve key partners?
		- Are they efficient?
* Reconstruct baseline data if necessary[[10]](#footnote-10). Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise[[11]](#footnote-11)
* Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements[[12]](#footnote-12). Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
* Apply the GEF Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.
1. Risk Management
* Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified
* Assess the project’s risk identification and management systems:
	+ Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System[[13]](#footnote-13) appropriately applied?
1. Work Planning
* Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
	+ - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content
		- What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management?
* Assess the use of routinely updated workplans.
* Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities
* Are work planning processes result-based[[14]](#footnote-14)?
* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.
1. Reporting
* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported and implemented by the project management
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

3. Underlying Factors

* Assess the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project’s management strategies for these factors.
* Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made
* Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project

4. UNDP Contribution

* Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
	+ - Field visits
		- Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
		- PIR preparation and follow-up
		- GEF guidance
* Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide[[15]](#footnote-15), especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework
* Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance.

5. Partnership Strategy

* Assess how partners are involved in the project’s adaptive management framework:
	+ - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
		- Using already existing data and statistics
		- Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
* Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships;
* Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making.
* Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project.
* Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

***Scope of the evaluation***

In the last year of the project, namely in March 2011, there have been changes in the governance of energy and natural resource issues, whereby the Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources has been reorganized and is now the Ministry of Environment, with the Natural Resources aspect being transferred under the responsibility of the previous Ministry of Energy (now – Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources). The Municipal Development Fund, which is a manager of the Renewable Energy Fund, is now under the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure while before it was under the Ministry of Finance, which is the beneficiary of the KfW grant. Due to these changes the composition of the Project Supervisory Committee (PSC) has to be renewed and the renewed PSC will have only about 6 months for overall project coordination. This needs to be taken into account when conducting the evaluation and the evaluation should discuss the institutional set-up to support renewable energy in Georgia.

Due to the length of the project (some seven and a half years), the scope of the evaluation should be focused on the project period after the MTE until the end. For example, following the mid-term evaluation, it was agreed not to focus on areas such as Outcome 1 where the project had originally has aimed to change legislation and regulations to further promote renewable energy in Georgia. The final evaluation should focus equally on the effectiveness of efforts to implement the Mid-Term evaluation and on efforts to promote small hydro energy in Georgia and geothermal energy in Georgia should both be discussed separately.

In a later stage of the Project, an agreement was reached between the Government and UNDP, for the Project to be involved in supporting the development of the small hydro sector in Georgia though programmatic CDM (PoA) and later through regular CDM working closely with the Norwegian Government and Norsk Energi. This activity of support for CDM will likely continue beyond the lifetime of the project. The evaluation should also look at this activity and evaluate the contribution of the UNDP project to the development of CDM project activities for small hydro in Georgia.

Since the next programme period (2011-2015) for the UNDP CO in Georgia has particular focus on climate change issues in the environment and energy portfolio, the evaluation should include recommendations on any barriers which need to be further address related to renewable energy and which could be useful in the context of new projects in this area that UNDP is planning; what are some of the lessons learned by the project in its seven and a half years.

Ownership of the project processes and outcomes by the key stakeholders will be one of the key factors in project success to achieve project sustainability and thus the evaluators are asked to make an objective assessment of the ownership of the project outcomes/results by the key stakeholders.

# **Products expected from the evaluation**

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

Please note that some of the categories in the findings and conclusions need to be rated in conformity with the GEF guidelines for final evaluations.

**1. Executive summary**

* Brief description of project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

**2. Introduction**

* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation

**3. The project(s) and its development context**

* Project start and its duration
* Problems that the project seek to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected

**4. Findings and Conclusions**

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (R) should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

* 1. **Project Formulation**
* Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
* Country-ownership/Driveness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
* Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
* Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
* Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

**4.2. Project Implementation**

* Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.

(ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.

(iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.

(v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

* Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.
* Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

(i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.

(ii)Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.

(iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.

(iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

* Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

(iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

(iv) Co-financing [[16]](#footnote-16)

* Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.
* Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and GoC and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

**4.3. Results**

* Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R*):* Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental ) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.
* This section should also include reviews of the following:
* Sustainability*:* Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
* Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

**5. Recommendations**

1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

**6. Lessons learned**

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

**7. Evaluation report Annexes**

* Evaluation TORs

The length of the final evaluation report shall not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

***Evaluation team***

A team of independent consultants will conduct the evaluation. The evaluators selected should not have participated in any of the stages of the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluation team will be composed of one international Consultant (Team leader) and one National Consultant. The consultants, at least the International Consultant, shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former experience with GEF project evaluations is an advantage.

Team Qualities:

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
2. Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
3. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
4. Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
5. Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
6. Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to natural resource management projects;
7. Recognized expertise in the management and sustainable use of land;
8. Familiarity with land management policies and coordination structures in Latvia;
9. Demonstrable analytical skills;
10. Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
11. Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported projects on SLM;
12. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
13. Excellent English communication skills.

**Specifically, the International Consultant (Team Leader) will perform the following tasks:**

* **Lead and manage the evaluation mission;**
* **Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);**
* **Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;**
* **Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);**
* **Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and**
* **Finalize the whole evaluation report.**

***Skills and Qualifications:***

* **Master’s or higher university degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields**
* **Experience in consultancy in energy field**
* **Experience in evaluating energy programmes for UN or other international development agencies is a strong asset**
* **Experience in RE in particular, small hydropower and/or geothermal resources project development and/or evaluation**
* **Knowledge of the Georgia’s energy sector including small hydropower and geothermal sectors**
* **Strong analytical skills**
* **Excellent communications and writing skills**
* **Excellent team working skills**
* **Fluency in English and Georgian**

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for a position.

Joint proposals from two independent evaluators (one International and one National) are welcome. Or alternatively, proposals will be accepted from recognized consulting firms to field a complete team (one international and one national expert) . In this case the CVs of the offered consultants will be evaluated.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles[[17]](#footnote-17):

* Independence
* Impartiality
* Transparency
* Disclosure
* Ethical
* Partnership
* Competencies and Capacities
* Credibility
* Utility

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Ministry of Environment, UNDP-Georgia or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

If the Joint Proposal is submitted, the International Consultant (Team Leader) will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.

## Methodology or evaluation approach

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group[[18]](#footnote-18)). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation review (desk study) - the list of documentation to be reviewed is included in the Annex 3 to the Terms of Reference);
* *Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP Georgia, UNDP/GEF RTA, UNFCC national focal point, project team, Project Supervisory Committee representatives: Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of Finance, KfW, representatives from pilot projects;*
* Field visits to pilot sites;
* Questionnaires;
* Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

***Implementation Arrangements***

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Georgia. UNDP Georgia is the main operational point for the evaluation responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with the Executing Agency and other counterparts. UNDP Georgia will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project implementation unit will be responsible for to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements.

Timeframe for submission of first draft of the report: 7 weeks upon signing the contract. The evaluation should be completed by **Friday 28th October 2011**.

The report shall be submitted to UNDP Georgia office and to UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre.

*Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts and project management: The National Project Director and members of the Project Supervisory Committee representing the following institutions:*

* *Ministry of Environment;*
* *Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources;*
* *Ministry of Finance;*
* *KfW*

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

The activity and timeframe are broken down as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe and responsible party** |
| desk review | 5 days  |
| briefings for evaluators | 1 day  |
| visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings | 9 days  |
| Preparation of draft Final Evaluation Report | 2 days  |
| validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of initial reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms | 1 days  |
| Finalization of the Evaluation Report (incorporating comments received on first draft) | 2 days  |

*Working Days:*

 20 working days

The proposed working dates shall be agreed with Team Leader. The assignment is to commence no later than **4 August 2011**.

***Evaluation of Applicants:***

UNDP applies the ‘Best value for money’ approach - the final selection will be based on the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. Maximum obtainable score is 100, out of which the total score for technical criteria equals to 70 and for financial criteria – to 30.

The evaluation of applied candidates is to be performed through the two-stage evaluation process. Stage 1.1: Applicants will be screened against qualifications and the competencies specified above. Stage 1.2: Applicants will be evaluated against technical qualification criteria. Stage 1.3: Interviewing of the short-listed candidates. Stage 2: Evaluation of financial proposals and cumulative evaluation.

  **Evaluation Criteria**

Stage 1.1: Screening against qualifications and competencies

* Relevant educational background (yes/no)
* Experience in development and/or evaluation of energy projects (yes/no)
* Knowledge of energy sector of Georgia (yes/no)
* Fluency in both Georgian and English (yes/no)

Only those candidates will be further evaluated which satisfies all criteria

Stage 1.2: Technical qualification

1. General Qualification

Relevant educational background

*Master’s degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields - 5 points; Higher degree - additional 2 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for education: 7points*

Consultancy in energy field

*Consultancy in energy general but not in renewable energy – 3 points; Consultancy in renewable energy – additional 2 points; Consultancy outside Georgia – additional 3 points), i.e. maximum obtainable for consultancy in energy field: 8 points*

1. Relevant Experience

Experience in energy project development

Less than 5-year experience – 0 point; 5-6-year experience – 2 points; 7-8-year experience – 3 points; 9-10-year experience – 4 points; 11-14-year experience – 5 points; 15-year and more experience – 6 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for experience in energy project development: 6 points

Experience in small hydropower or/and geothermal project implementation or/and evaluation

*Less than 5-year experience in implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or geothermal projects – 0 point;*

*5-6-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 5 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 8 points;*

*7-8-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 5 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 8 points;*

*9-10-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 5 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 8 points;*

*11-14-year experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 6 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 9 points;*

*15-year and more experience in: implementation or evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 7 points; implementation and evaluation of small hydropower or/and geothermal projects – 10 points;*

*i.e. maximum obtainable for experience in small hydropower or/and geothermal project implementation or/and evaluation: 10 points*

Experience in implementation of international donor founded renewable energy projects

*Experience in implementation of 1 project financed by the international donors – 2 points; 2 projects – 3 points; 3 and more projects – 4 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for experience in implementation of international donor founded renewable energy projects: 4 points*

1. Knowledge of Georgia’s context with regard to energy sector of Georgia including small hydropower and geothermal sectors

*Knowledge of the energy sector of Georgia (score from 0 to 5); knowledge of small hydropower sector – up to 3 additional points; knowledge of geothermal sector – up to additional 2 points, i.e. maximum obtainable for knowledge of Georgia’s energy sector: 10 points*

1. Language Qualifications

 *English language qualification (score from 0 to 2.5)*

*Georgian language qualification (score from 0 to 2.5)*

Total for technical qualification: 50 points. Candidates who will obtain 70% or more out of maximum obtainable (i.e. 50 x 70% = 35) points will be considered as qualified.

Stage 1.3: Interviewing of the short-listed candidates.

*Up to top 5 qualified applicants will be short-listed and interviewed. Maximum obtainable for interview for National Consultant: 20 points*

Stage 2: Evaluation of financial proposals and cumulative evaluation

Only short-listed applicants will be requested to submit financial proposals – Lump Sum amount that should include remuneration, daily fee x 20 (number of total days), travel costs to project sites (ticket cost and Daily Subsistence Allowances (DSA, which includes accommodation, meals and in-town travel) x number of total days to visit project sites) and, other associated costs, if such. Daily rates shall not exceed UNDP maximum reference rates for national consultants; DSAs should not exceed UN DSA rates for Georgia.

A maximum of 30 points will be assigned to the lowest price offer. All other price offers will receive points in inverse proportion, using the formula: Financial score offer X = 30 x (lowest price/ price offer X)

Applicant with maximum combined scores calculated as (Scores technical qualification + Scores interview + Scores financial proposal ) will be granted a contract.

***Payment Modality:***

The payment of a Lump Sum will be done in 2 installments:

* After submitting Draft Evaluation Report – 50%;
* After submitting and clearing by UNDP CO relevant Programme Analyst and Bratislava Regional Center Technical Advisor – 50%
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