

Closing Date: **19 March 2012**

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE
(Ref. No. UNDP/IC/2012/09)

Country: INDIA

Description of the assignment: International Consultant for TERMINAL Evaluation

Project name: Achieving Reduction in GHG Emissions Through Advanced Energy Efficiency Technology in Electric Motors

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 21 working days

Important Note- Submission of financial proposal is mandatory.

Proposals should be submitted on line by 19th March 2012

Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the e-mail sandeep.sharma@undp.org . The Procurement unit will respond by standard electronic mail. **CV, Technical and Financial proposal can be clubbed** in one file for uploading on the website.

1. BACKGROUND

The Energy & Environment unit, UNDP works in the key areas of climate change (mitigation and adaptation), natural resource management (conserving biodiversity and addressing land degradation) and integrated chemical management (phasing out ozone depleting substances and reducing persistent organic pollutants). Under the Climate Change portfolio, towards enhancing energy efficiency in the industrial sector (including the small & medium enterprises), the project "***Achieving Reduction in GHG Emissions Through Advanced Energy Efficiency Technology in Electric Motors***" was implemented to showcase improving efficiency in electric motors in a cost effective manner.

The International Copper Association (ICA) offered a new technology for manufacturing copper die cast rotors known as CMR technology that promised to be cost effective and hence bring down the cost of efficient electric motors. This project was conceptualized for implementation under the UNDP-GEF banner with the intention of promoting adoption of

CMR technology in the manufacture of electric motor rotors, leading subsequently to the adoption of efficient electric motors with embedded copper die cast rotors in industry as well as agriculture and the consequent environmental benefits thereof.

For more details on the project, please go to the following webpage:

<http://www.undp.org.in/sites/default/files/6-00057449-Copper-Project-Document.pdf>

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

Please refer to paragraph II – “Functions & Key Results expected”, under Annex I – Terms Of Reference (ToR)

3. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Please refer to paragraph VI – “Implementation Arrangements”, under Annex I – ToR

4. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS [International Consultant]

Please refer to paragraph VII – “Educational Qualification & Years of Experience” under Annex I - ToR

5. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

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

1. Technical Proposal:

- i. Explaining why individual consultant (IC) is most suitable for the work
- ii. Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work

2. Financial proposal

- i. Professional rate per day, working days [as given] and the total professional cost
- ii. Travel costs [include per diem]:
 - a. Travel to Delhi (one no.)
 - b. Travel within Delhi: 3 working days
 - c. Travel for field visits in India
 1. Visit to Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh: 2 to 3 working days
 2. Visit to Surat, Gujarat: 2 working days

3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references – MOST RECENT (with their full contact details, including e-mail, phone numbers). Indicate projects that were foreclosed and reasons for the same.

4. P 11 form which can be downloaded from below given link .

6. 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.

7. EVALUATION

IC will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

1. Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the IC whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; [70%]

* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Criteria	Weight
<u>Technical</u>	
• Qualification of the Consultant	25
• Relevant work experience	30
• Proposed Work Plan for undertaking the task	10
• Time Line for completion of the Task	05
<u>Financial</u>	30

ANNEX I - TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

Post Title: : International Consultant to conduct Terminal Evaluation (TE) as per the UNDP-GEF guidelines for the project “**Project 00047661 Achieving Reduction in GHG Emissions Through Advanced Energy Efficiency Technology in Electric Motors**”

Organization : GEF-UNDP “**Project 00047661 Achieving Reduction in GHG Emissions Through Advanced Energy Efficiency Technology in Electric Motors**”

Supervisor : Head/Programme Analyst of Energy and Environment Unit, UNDP, New Delhi

Duration : Maximum of 21 working days (over a period of 45 days)

Duty Station : Home based consultancy and travel to New Delhi, as part of the assignment.

UNDP strives to have a workforce which reflects diversity and gender balance, and applies an equal opportunities approach. UNDP does not solicit or screen for information in respect of HIV or AIDS status. All selection is on merit.

I. Background

Chronic electricity shortages have become a common feature in India. Planners and administrators have been working overtime to do the needful in easing the energy situation in more ways than one. While enhancement of installed capacity is definitely one supply-side option, several issues need to be addressed when it comes to capacity addition such as long gestation periods, fuel availability, water availability, high capital costs, substantial running costs, environmental degradation and pollution. Against this backdrop, demand side interventions that effectively curtail energy demand seem also need to be emphasized not only because of lucrative return for investment but also for their shorter gestation periods and reduced emission levels.

One major segment on the demand side that has a major share in the overall energy consumption in industrial as well as agricultural sectors is electric motors. Most of the excessive energy consumption in these sectors is due to low voltage electric motors of sizes up to 37.5 kW. It is estimated that almost 35% of the energy consumption of India goes into electric motors. It is quite natural therefore, that this segment holds a substantial and significant potential for energy conservation.

The design of electric motors has been upgraded several times over the years in different ways to make them more efficient but the efficient motors have always been prohibitively costly leading to low sales volumes. Later, it was established that the efficiency of electric motors can be substantially improved by using copper die case rotors instead of the traditional aluminum die cast rotors. Usage of copper rotors also leads to an overall size reduction of the motors bringing its cost down further.

The process of manufacturing copper die cast rotors was difficult, time consuming and costly. However, the International Copper Association (ICA) offered a new technology for manufacturing copper die cast rotors known as CMR technology that promised to be cost effective and hence bring down the cost of efficient electric motors. This project was conceptualized for implementation under the UNDP-GEF banner with the intention of promoting adoption of CMR technology in the manufacture of electric motor rotors, leading subsequently to the adoption of efficient electric motors with embedded copper die cast rotors in industry as well as agriculture and the consequent environmental benefits thereof.

For more details on the project, please go to the following webpage:

<http://www.undp.org.in/sites/default/files/6-00057449-Copper-Project-Document.pdf>

This is a medium sized project with a total intended duration of four years. The project was under implementation from 22 August 2008 to 31 July 2011. In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, it is mandatory for all regular projects supported by the GEF to undergo a Mid-Term Review mid-way through the implementation phase and a Terminal Evaluation at the time of closing the project. Both, the Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation are to be conducted by an independent party. In case of the above mentioned project, it is intended to commission a Terminal Evaluation since the implementation phase of the project has ended. The terminal evaluation is expected to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It could also look at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals, if any. It will also identify/document lessons learnt and provide recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects. ***The review team will comprise of an International and a National consultant.***

II. Functions and key results expected:

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The National Consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation / language support, etc.

- A. The review team is expected to prepare an Evaluation Report based on the outline listed in Annex II while specifically including the following aspects:
1. Adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon.
 2. Extent of progress achieved against the overall Project Objective disaggregated by each of the individual Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (including sub-activities); as against the Impact Indicators identified and listed in the project document. Extent of the incremental value added with project implementation.

3. Performance in terms of in-time achievement of individual project activities as well as overall project in terms of adherence to planned timelines.
 4. Relevance and adequacy of mid-course changes in implementation strategy with PSC approval, if any and the consequent variations in achievements, if any.
 5. Degree of effectiveness of the Enabling Technology Centre while identifying gaps, if any with lessons learned and alternative scenarios, if any
 6. Extent to which CMR technology has been upgraded and customized to the local situation. Identify gaps, if any, and provide alternative scenarios
 7. Extent of effectiveness of technology transfer and commercialization achieved as a direct consequence of the project and the extent to which the envisaged benefits (including avoidance of emissions) have been achieved
 8. Evaluate the impact of the project activities on the various government departments and ministries such as Ministry of Small & Medium Enterprises (MSME)
 9. Extent of effectiveness of awareness generation activities by way of quality of promotional packages / awareness material, number of Awareness Programmes, Trainings undertaken and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like quarterly newsletter, project website, brochure, etc. should also be considered
 10. Pattern, in which funds have been leveraged, budgeted, spent and accounted for in the project.
- B. The team should also focus their assessments on project impacts as listed:
- a) Perceptions on the "Situation at the end of the Project" as it seems to the review team at the terminal review stage
 - b) Nature and scale of the policy impact made by the project, if any, on relevant line departments of the Government or other policy making bodies
 - c) Extent of effectiveness of capacity building initiatives undertaken under the aegis of the project
 - d) Assessment of Greenhouse Gases Emission reduction achieved during the life of the project and an estimate of likely emission reductions possible in the future through continued adoption and spread of efficient electric motors based on high pressure die cast copper rotor technology
 - e) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the institutional arrangement deployed in the project with alternative scenarios, if any
 - f) Details of co-funding, if any, leveraged by the project and its impact on the project achievements (a "Financial Planning Co-financing" format is enclosed in Annex II for reporting);
 - g) The effectiveness of current monitoring and overseeing systems such as Project Steering Committee and suggestion on improvements if any

Annex II contains guidance on the GEF Project review criteria and explanation of terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Evaluations.

III. Cross Cutting Issues:

Considering that UNDP is concerned about poverty reduction, local governance and promotion of gender equity, the team may look at these cross-cutting issues and comment if the project had any linkages and any achievement on these objectives has been through.

At its discretion, the team is free to include any other additional comments that are felt worth reporting.

IV. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE REVIEW:

The total duration of the review and the finalization of report is 45 days, in which the Team Leader (IC) is expected to put in a level of effort equivalent to 21 days of professional inputs, including eight working day visits to New Delhi, Hyderabad & Surat. Subsequent to completion of the field visits, the Team Leader will submit and present, his/her preliminary findings in the form of a presentation, to a group of select officials from UNDP, BEE (MoP), Implementing / Partnering Agencies and/or other members of the Project Executive Committee / Project Steering Committee and incorporate their comments in the draft report. Thereafter, the draft report will be submitted by the deadline set by the UNDP after sharing of the preliminary findings. This draft report will also be shared with UNDP's Regional Coordinating Unit, GEF M&E office, in addition to UNDP for comments. After incorporating the comments from all avenues, the team leader will submit the final report to UNDP, New Delhi (including an electronic copy). The length of the main report should not exceed 50 pages, in total. In no case should the formal submission of the final report take place after expiry of 45 day deadline from the start date of the assignment. Report should be submitted as (i) 5 hard copies each signed by the TR team, (ii) soft copy of the report and of all documents reviewed for the TR by the team in CD – 5 copies.

If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and any of the stakeholders of the project, these should be explained in a separate sheet to be attached to the final report.

The Evaluation Report Outline should be structured along the following lines:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. The project and its development context
4. Findings and Conclusions
 - 4.1 Project formulation
 - 4.2 Implementation
 - 4.3 Results
5. Completed tracking tool
6. Recommendations
7. Lessons learned
8. Annexes

V. METHODOLOGY OR REVIEW APPROACH:

The review approach will combine methods such as documentation review (desk study); interviews; and field visits. All relevant project documentation will be made available by the project management team, facilitated by UNDP. After studying the documentation the team will conduct interviews with all relevant partners including the beneficiaries. Validation of preliminary findings/reports with stakeholders will happen through circulation of initial reports for comments or other types of feedback mechanisms.

The consultants should provide details in respect of:

- Documents reviewed and brief summary of them in an annexure;
- Interviews and brief summary wherever relevant;
- Field visits and brief summary in annexure or where relevant;
- Questionnaires, if any;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data; and
- Participation of stakeholders and/or partners.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

Management arrangements:

Throughout the period of the review, the review team will liaise closely with the UNDP Country Director/ACD/Programme Analyst, the concerned agencies of the Government, any members of the international team of experts under the project and the counterpart staff assigned to the project. The team can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfill its task, the team, however, is not authorized to make any commitments to any part on behalf of UNDP/GEF or the Government.

Time-frame: As already described.

The team shall include eight days of site visits, the details of which can be worked out with the mission in due course. This visit will also include meetings with the officials of the Implementing Agency (BEE) and other stakeholders (ICPCI, NFTDC, etc.) to the project and UNDP officials.

After the initial briefing by UNDP Country Director/ACD/Programme Analyst, the review team will meet with the National Project Director, the officials of ICPCI and NFTDC and GEF Focal Point as required.

VII. Educational Qualification & Years of Experience:

Essential: Graduate in engineering with a minimum of 10 years of relevant experience in industrial / academic/ policy experience in project management/ monitoring and

evaluation/ energy efficiency. *Desirable:* Post graduate/doctorate in engineering/ certification in energy auditing/ management.

Competencies:

1. Demonstrated skills and knowledge in participatory monitoring, review and evaluation processes;
2. Extensive experience in monitoring, review and evaluation of technology transfer projects, supported by major donor agencies;
3. Familiarity with GEF rules, regulations, project reviews and evaluations;
4. Proficiency in energy efficiency in small & medium sectors (SME)
5. Knowledge of energy efficiency policies/conditions in India and abroad through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of donor funded projects.
6. Proficient in writing and communicating in English. The consultant to bring his/her own computer/laptop and related equipment.

ANNEX II - Guidance on the GEF Project review criteria and explanation of terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Evaluations

This Annex providing more detailed guidance on the GEF Project review criteria and explanation of terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Evaluations is an integral part of the attached ToR.

I. Project Review Criteria

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 review/evaluation
- Main conclusions, ratings, recommendations and lessons learned

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the review/evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the review/evaluation
- Structure of the review/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, Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.

4.1 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 monitoring and evaluation (M&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 review/evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and review/evaluation reports where applicable.

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 ¹

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, environmental 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 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 reviewers/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:

¹ Please see guidelines at the end of Annex 2, Part II “Financial Planning Co-financing” of these TORs for reporting of co-financing

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.

Specific Results

The positive and negative results, 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. Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and review/evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- 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. Review/Evaluation report Annexes

Review/Evaluation TORs

Itinerary

List of persons interviewed

Summary of field visits

List of documents reviewed

Questionnaire used and summary of results

Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

II. Explanation of Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Reviews/Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region

- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Country Ownership/Drivenness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/drivenness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/drivenness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and review/evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives)
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.)
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc)
- Expansion of demonstration projects
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions

- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing².
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits

Co financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, Other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to GEF Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding) and securing co-funding and associated funding
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

² Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

Monitoring, Review & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring, Review and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

Financial Planning Co-financing

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (million USD)		Government (million USD)		Other* (million USD)		Total (million USD)		Total Disbursement (million USD)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
Totals										

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

Leveraged Resources -

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

ANNEX 3 - List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

INTERNAL:

1. Project Document;
2. Project Implementation Review Report for the period 01 July 2010 to 30 June 2011;
3. Minutes of National Steering Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings;
4. Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff and PMC staff (if any);
5. Terminology in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluation and the Project Review Criteria – part II, Annex II of this TOR.
6. Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc.
7. Any other documents the evaluators feel necessary for conducting the evaluation.

EXTERNAL:

1. Developments relating to development and adoption of CMR technology for die cast copper rotor production in USA and Europe
2. GEF/World Bank guidelines on GHG emission reduction calculations;
3. Any other documents essential for the successful conduct of the above evaluation.

