**ToR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT**

**1. BACKGROUND**

## Country Programme Action Plan

In Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), UNDP amongst other targets pledges to support the management of the environment and natural resources. UNDP tackles environment at two levels, one at the local level and second to respond to the global environmental challenges. UNDP-Pakistan's environment programme supports upstream policy advice at the federal and provincial levels and also keeping in view the devolved nature of development issues, on-ground activities are carried out through local institutions and communities.

As part of the result oriented monitoring & evaluation activity, UNDP Pakistan is planning to undertake an in-depth final evaluation of “Promotion of Energy Efficient Cooking and Heating project” which is under implementation since 2009. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide impartially derived first hand information on the achievements of the project against intended targets and its effectiveness specially pertaining to the overall objective of the project as stated in the project document. The findings of the evaluation will be shared with the members of the Project Advisory Committee and other stakeholders.

To conduct the evaluation process the consultant will perform, but not limited to, the activities summarized in the following sections.

1. ***Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation Policy in UNDP***

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP has four objectives:

1. to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
2. to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
3. to promote accountability for resource use; and
4. to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators - or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

The purpose of terminal or final evaluation is two-fold: The first aim is transparency – to let all stakeholders know how the project went and provide accountability for the achievement (or potential achievement) of project objectives. The second aim is to provide insights and lessons learned to contribute to the effective design and implementation of future projects (and related decision-making) to be implemented in Pakistan.

**3. Promotion of Energy Efficient Cooking and Heating Project (PEECH)**

 Promotion of Energy-Efficient Cooking, Heating and Housing Technologies (PEECH) Project IS implemented by Aga Khan Planning and Building Service, Pakistan (AKPBS, P) in selected districts of the Gilgit-Baltistan and Chitral region of Pakistan. PEECH is jointly funded by Global Environment Facility (GEF) and UNDP. The Project built upon previous and ongoing research & development work under the Building and Construction Improvement Program (BACIP) of AKPBS-P.

The Project aimed to reduce GHG emissions from unsustainable uses of wood for building and energy purposes in the Project area by:

1. Improving local awareness and capacity for installing energy efficient cooking, heating and housing products and technologies;
2. Building institutional capacity and supporting to mainstream energy efficient products and technologies into local and national level building codes and standards, together with relevant support measures, as well as rural and regional development plans, strategies and programs; and
3. Enhancing the growth of rural enterprise and income generation from community service providers through the replication of integrated energy efficient products and technology application packages

The project was meant to bring the initial research and development experience towards a push for full market development. This was planned by addressing key remaining barriers i.e. low level of awareness, limited local entrepreneurial capacities, access to micro-finance, the absence of an enabling environment conducive to investments in energy efficient cooking, heating and housing construction and technology, the lack of a comprehensive supply-demand structure-related to the development of supply chain structures essential to ensure the provision of energy efficient products and technologies in residential units and finally the lack of an easily accessible information and technical repository for reference.

***2. Objectives of Evaluation:***

 The Promotion of Energy Efficient Cooking and Heating Technologies project is scheduled for completion on 30 June 2013. UNDP policy requires that an independent final evaluation take place prior to the final Project Advisory Committee meeting. The terminal evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project’s results as initially planned. The terminal evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The main stakeholders of the evaluation include: Ministry of Climate Change, local communities at the project sites, local governments in Gilgit- Baltistan and Chitral, Economic Affairs Division, and other relevant organizations.

**3. SCOPE OF Evaluation:**

The terminal evaluation of the Promotion of Energy Efficient Cooking and Heating (PEECH) project should properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. The following areas should be covered in the terminal evaluation report:

1. ***General Information about the Evaluation***

 The terminal evaluation report should include information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. The terminal evaluation report will also include the evaluation team’s TOR and any response from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report.

1. ***Assessment of Project Results***

 The terminal evaluation will assess achievement of the project’s objective, outcomes and outputs and will provide ratings for the targeted objective and outcomes. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or was expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term and positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project’s results, the terminal evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project’s objective as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established.

 Assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behaviour), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. An assessment of impact is encouraged when appropriate. The evaluator should assess project results using indicators and relevant tracking tools.

 To determine the level of achievement of the project’s objective and outcomes, the following three criteria will be assessed in the terminal evaluation:

* **Relevance**: Were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
* **Effectiveness**: Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objective?
* **Efficiency**: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of the project’s effectiveness and efficiency.

The evaluator will also assess other results of the project, including positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long-term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluator to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluator will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess long-term project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, global environment, replication effects and other local effects. Wherever possible, evaluator should indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to UNDP and GEF.

1. ***Assessment of Risks to Sustainability of Project Outcomes***

The terminal evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this. Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

* **Financial risks**: Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining the project’s outcomes)?
* **Socio-political risks:** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
* **Institutional framework and governance risks:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
* **Environmental risks:** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? The terminal evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.
1. ***Catalytic Role***

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

1. ***Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation System***

The terminal evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the project M&E plan. Project managers are expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project. Given the long duration of many UNDP interventions, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring provisions to measure mid-term and long-term results (such as global environmental effect, replication effects, and other local effects) after project completion. The terminal evaluation report will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project M&E plan and of implementation of the M&E plan.

**M&E design.** Projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

**M&E plan implementation.** The terminalevaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress towards the project objective and outcomes by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and, the project had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

**Budgeting and funding for M&E Activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluator will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for a the project planning stage and whether M&E was funded adequately and in a timely manner during implementation.

1. ***Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results***

When relevant, the evaluator should consider the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. Note that evaluator is not expected to provide ratings or separate assessments on these issues, but these could be considered in the performance and results sections of the report:

**Preparation and readiness.**

Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

**Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks that are in line with the project’s objectives?

**Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project’s design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents, of the processes properly involved?

**Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?

**Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability, and if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

1. ***Lessons and Recommendations***

The evaluator will present lessons and recommendations in the terminal evaluation report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. The evaluator will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered: attainment of project objective, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation.

Evaluator should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead they should seek to provide a few well formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to GEF’s overall portfolio. Terminal evaluations should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the terminal evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.

## Products expected from the evaluation

The key product expected from the evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report. The length of the terminal evaluation report shall not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes). The report shall be submitted to the UNDP Pakistan CO.

Following is the tentative timeline for the deliverables for the evaluation starting 1 June, 2013.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Timeline** |
| Completion of stakeholder consultations | 7 June, 2013 |
| Submission of first draft  | 14 June, 2013 |
| Submission of final report  | 24 June, 2013 |

1. **Evaluation Ethics:**
2. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions, evaluator should operate in accordance with international values.
3. Evaluator should be aware of differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction and gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting on evaluations.
4. Evaluator must ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process. Evaluations also have an overriding responsibility to ensure that evaluation activities are independent, impartial and accurate.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with UNDP principles:

* Independence
* Impartiality
* Transparency
* Disclosure
* Ethical
* Partnership
* Competencies and Capacities
* Credibility
* Utility
1. ***Reporting Arrangements***

The consultant will report to Assistant Country Director, Environment & Climate Change Unit. UNDP will maintain coordination with EAD, AKPBS-P/AKF, Ministry of Climate Change, project staff and other stakeholders.

***11. Requirements for Experience and Qualifications***

I. Academic Qualification:

University degree/Post–graduation in Environmental sciences/ Environment Management/ Project Management or other relevant field; Knowledge and experience of energy efficiency/energy conservation will be an advantage.

II. Years of experience:

The consultant shall possess at least 10-years of relevant project management experience with being fully aware of the environment/energy efficiency issues and sustainable development perspective in the context of Pakistan. He/she shall also have a clear understanding of UNDP’s policies on environment and energy.

III. Competencies:

* Knowledgeable and skills in the result-based management approach and UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* Familiarity with environment sector planning and policy issues, developments and management relevant to that of Pakistan;
* Comprehensive knowledge of international best practices in environmental information management systems; and
* Excellent interview and report writing skills in English.

***12. Documents to be Included when Submitting the Proposals.***

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal:

(i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work (if applicable)

2. Financial proposal: (Inclusive of Consultancy Fee, Living Allowance and Travel Cost)

3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

4. P-11 Form duly completed.

***13. Financial Proposal***

* **Lump sum contracts**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

**Travel;**

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.