****

 Date of Issue: 15th April 2016

 Closing Date: 29th April 2016

**INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE**

 **(Ref. No. UNDP/IC/2016/….)**

**Country: India**

**Description of the assignment: National Consultant for TERMINAL Evaluation (TE) *(Refer Annex.A for details)***

**Project name: Improving Energy Efficiency in the Indian Railways System**

**Location: Home based Consultancy. Travel to be done as per assignment.**

**Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 25 working days**

**Important Note-Applications without financial proposal would not be considered.**

Proposals should be submitted on line latest by29th April 2016. Please do not send proposals directly through email and strictly apply on line.

Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the e-mail sandeep.sharma@undp.org strictly mentioning **TE- Energy Efficiency in Indian Railways System** in the subject line. The Procurement unit will respond by standard electronic mail. **Submission of technical and financial proposal is requested instead of resume; the technical and financial proposal must be clubbed in one file.**

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

**1. BACKGROUND**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of **the Improving Energy Efficiency in the Indian Railways System Project.**

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

Please refer to Annex A - Terms of Reference.

**3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

Refer to item no. 13 – Team Composition under Annex A - Terms of Reference

**4. 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 they are the most suitable candidate for the work (max. 4 pages)

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work (if applicable) (max. 1 pages)

**2. Financial proposal**

(i) Professional rate per day, total days and the total professional cost

(ii) Travel costs (includes travel, lodging, and per diem) for a total of 12 days. Please do not include Airfare and taxi fare for domestic travel. Domestic travel will be arranged by UNDP as per UNDP rules.

(iii)**.** P 11 form which can be downloaded from “Apply now” page.

**5. Special instructions for completing the 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 on 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 professional rate, travel, per diem, and miscellaneous in the 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.

**6. EVALUATION**

IC proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

***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:

1. Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. 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**  |
| Technical |  |
| * Qualification of the Consultant
 | 20 |
| * Relevant work Experience
 | 30 |
| * Proposed Work Plan for undertaking the task
 | 10 |
| * Time Line for completion of the Task
 | 10 |
| Financial | 30 |

Annex A: TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference for – INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

(NATIONAL)

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **Improving Energy Efficiency in the Indian Railways System Project.**

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

1. Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 3554 (GEF PMIS#) |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 4044 (UNDP PIMS#)00076108 (Atlas ID#) | GEF financing:  | $5,200,000 |  |
| Country: | India | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | Asia and Pacific | Government: | $20,000,000 |  |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change  | Other (Financing Institutions & Promoters): | $1,000,000 |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |  | Total co-financing: |  |  |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | $26,200,000 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | N/A | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | Sep 02, 2011 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: Oct 30, 2014 | Actual: Dec 31, 2016 |

1. Objective and Scope

In order to achieve the project objective, the project key Components and Outcomes are as follows.

*Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities*

Indian Railways (IR) has developed a long-term Energy Efficiency and Conservation Program (EECP) (2010-2032). The Program aims at progressively introducing a number of energy efficiency technologies and measures in the railways system. The objective of this Program is to save 10% of the electricity consumption in absolute terms by 2032, in line with the targets of national initiatives on energy conservation and climate change.

This project aims at improving energy efficiency in the Indian Railways system (and thereby reducing GHG emissions) by removing some of the key barriers that prevent the wide adoption of energy efficiency technologies and measures in the IR system. Specifically, this project aims at achieving the stated objective by

(1) Institutional capacity development and technical training on EE,

(2) Implementation of proven EE technologies and measures to build capacity and confidence on EE;

(3) Pilot demonstration of EE technologies and measures to prove their applicability in the Indian environment; and

(4) Information and knowledge sharing.

**Institutional capacity development and technical training on EE:**

This component has below mentioned outputs –

* Documented energy efficiency (EE) best practices (measures and technologies) and define EE benchmarks for railway systems
* Established and supported Centre of Excellence (COE)
* Trained and qualified staff members of the relevant IR departments capable of implementing EE technologies, measures, and best practices

**Implementation of proven EE technologies and measures to build capacity and confidence on EE:**

This component has below mentioned outputs –

* Documented detailed information on available EE technologies and measures
* Developed and implemented energy audit procedures
* Completed implementation of ready and proven technologies and measures
* Developed and implemented incentive schemes

**Pilot demonstration of EE technologies and measures to prove their applicability in the Indian environment**

This component has below mentioned outputs –

* Completed demonstration of EE technologies and measures

**Information and knowledge sharing**

* Collected lessons learned and developed knowledge sharing products
* Developed post-project action plan for COE

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

1. Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. The international consultant will be the team leader and coordinate the evaluation process to ensure quality of the report and its timely submission. The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, translation etc. The evaluation team is expected to become well versed as to the project objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, activities and status of accomplishments. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex D). The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, Project Management Unit, and other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission as indicated in section 4 of this Procurement Notice i.e. Financial Proposal (page 2)*.* Interviews will be held with the following individuals and organizations at a minimum, but not limited to:

* Relevant personnel at UNDP Country Office in New Delhi, India and Program Officer in-charge of the Project
* National Project Director (NPD)
* National Project Coordinator (NPC)
* Project Management Unit (PMU)
* Relevant project stakeholders

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, inception workshop report, annual work and financial plans, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR (until 2015), project budget revisions, quarterly reports, Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings, Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any), Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc., midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment such as terms of reference for past consultants’ assignments and summary of the results; past audit reports (if any). A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex C of this Terms of Reference.

1. Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex B), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex E.

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

1. Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co-financing****(type/source)** | **UNDP own financing (mill. US$)** | **Government****(mill. US$)** | **Partner Agency****(mill. US$)** | **Partner Agency****(mill. US$)** | **Total****(mill. US$)** |
| **Planned** | **Actual**  | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** |
| Grants  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project successfully mainstreamed other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The evaluation will examine this project’s contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

1. Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

1. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in New Delhi, India. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Throughout the period of evaluation, the evaluation team will liaise closely with the Programme Officer/ Adviser/Project Manager, 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 fulfil its task, the team, however, is not authorized to make any commitments to any part on behalf of UNDP/GEF or the Government.

***Logistics***

The team will conduct a mission visit to New Delhi and selected project sites, to meet with relevant project stakeholders. This visit will also include meetings with the officials of UNDP, the Implementing Partner, stakeholders from other institutions and ministries related to the project.

After the initial briefing by UNDP CO, the review team will meet with the National Project Director (NPD), National Project Coordinator (NPC) and the GEF Operational Focal Point as required.

1. Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 working days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Working Days | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 5 days  | *1st June, 2016* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 10 days  | *20th June, 2016* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 7 days  | *6th July, 2016* |
| **Final Report** | 3 days | *20th July, 2016* |

1. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report including TT sheet calculations, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 7 days of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 3 days of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See Annex I for an audit trail template.

1. Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluator[[3]](#footnote-3). The individual experts in the team need to have good technical knowledge of energy efficiency in railways sector and its national context, and program/project implementation in India, possess good evaluation experience, and writing skills to carry out the assignment. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. International evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for quality and timely submission of the report. The allocation of tasks in the execution of this TOR shall be decided mutually between the International and National consultants. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The national consultant must present the following qualifications and professional background:

* Minimum of eight years accumulated and recognized professional experience in energy efficiency and climate change projects, and knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
* Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management in climate change projects and community development
* Knowledge of energy efficiency policies/conditions in India and abroad through implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of donor funded projects
* Post-Graduate degree in Engineering, Management or Business administration;
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly, distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
* Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported energy efficiency projects;
* Very good report writing skills in English.

The evaluation team shall conduct debriefing for the UNDP Country Office, NPD, NPC, Project Management Unit, in India towards the end of the evaluation mission. The international consultant shall lead presentation of the draft review findings and creating the recommendations, and shall lead the drafting and finalization of the terminal evaluation report.

1. Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex F) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

1. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Following submission and approval of the TE inception report |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *60%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Annex B: Project Logical Framework

| **Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Removal of key barriers that prevent the wide adoption of energy efficiency technologies and measures in the IRS |  |  |  |
| **Component 1**: Institutional capacity development and technical training |
| Outcome 1.1: Strengthened IR institutional capacity | Status report of targeted EE technologies / measures, its availability in India/abroad and gap analysis for its implementation | 0 | 1 |
| Established and functioning of EE Centre of Excellence (COE) in IRS by EOP | 0 | 1 |
| TIRFAD established and functioning by EOP | 0 | 1 |
| COE website established and operational by EOP | 0 | 1 |
| Number of training and testing institutes with capacity to provide trainings and test EE measures/equipment respectively by year 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Number of training courses conducted by the training institutes each year starting from year 3 | 0 | 64 |
| Outcome 1.2: Improved EE management & technical capacity of IR staff | Number of managers and staff members trained on EE best practices and technologies by EOP | 0 | At least 325 managers and 675 staff |
| Number of successful EE projects implemented by the trained managers and staff members by EOP | 0 | 45 |
| **Component 2**: Implementation of proven energy efficiency technologies and measures |
| Outcome 2Proven EE technologies and measures in traction and non-traction operations are implemented and energy savings realized. | Potential energy savings from the implementation of EE technologies and/or measures by EoP, million kWh/yr | 0 | • 1.58 (for traction)• 110.40 (for non-traction) |
| Percentage of savings derived from EE measures implemented allocated as incentives to EE implementers by EOP | NA | At least 10% |
| Number of project proposals (technical and financial) prepared by EOP for EE technology / measure application projects | 0 | 45 |
| **Component 3**: Pilot demonstration of energy efficiency technologies and measures |
| Outcome 3Increased confidence in the application of piloted EE technologies and practices in the IRS | Number of energy audits conducted in IRS units above 0.5 MW load by year 3 | NA | 50 |
| Number of pilot demonstrations designed and implemented by year 3 | NA | At least 8 |
| Total energy savings achieved from pilot projects by EOP, million kWh | 0 | 30.40 |
| Percentage of successful pilot demonstrations adopted by IRS for replication by EOP, % | NA | At least 25% |
| Based on energy audits, number of EE technologies and measures identified as feasible for implementation (planned and budgeted) by year 3 | NA | At lest 5 |
| **Component 4**: Information and knowledge sharing |
| Outcome 4Information and knowledge on EE technologies and measures are widely available and accessible for IRS divisions and their affiliates | Average number of visitors visiting the web portal each year starting year 2 | NA | 24,000 |
|  | Number of sets of knowledge sharing products (KSPs) developed and disseminated by EOP | NA | 13 |
|  | Number of IRS divisions that are actively participating in IRS EE programs by EOP | 0 | 68 |
|  | Number of vendors registering with TIRFAD each year starting year 3 | NA | About 3 |
|  | Cumulative number of vendors attending TIRFAD campaigns by the EOP | 0 | 39 |

Annex C: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

* Project Document
* Inception Workshop Report
* Annual Work and Financial Plans
* Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) reports until 2012;
* GEF Focal Area tracking tools at baseline, midterm, and terminal points of the project
* Midterm Review (MTR)
* Quarterly Reports
* Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings
* Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any)
* Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc.
* Baseline reports, consultancy inputs for implementation, post commissioning measurement studies, etc.
* Knowledge products
* UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
* UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
* UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
* GEF focal area strategic program objectives

Annex D: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

| **Evaluative Criteria**  | **Questions**  | **Indicators**  | **Sources[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Methodology[[5]](#footnote-5)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |  |
| * Is the project relevant to National priorities and commitment under international conventions?
 | * Is the project country-driven?
 |  |  |  |
| * Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?
 |  |  |  |
| * How effective is the project in terms of supporting and facilitating energy efficiency policies and programmes in the Indian Railways?
 |  |  |  |
| * What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design and ownership in project implementation?
 |  |  |  |
| * Is the project internally coherent in its design?
 | * Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?
 |  |  |  |
| * Even after one extension, does the project achieve its expected outcomes?
 |  |  |  |
| * Did the project made satisfactory accomplishment in achieving project outputs vis-à-vis the targets and related delivery of inputs and activities?
 |  |  |  |
| * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?
 | * Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?
 |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved?  |  |
| * Does the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?
 | * Whether the performance measurement indicators and targets used in the project monitoring system are accomplished and able to achieve desired project outcomes within 31st December 2015?
 |  | See indicators in logframe listed in project document (or Annex B) |  |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?
 | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?
 |  |  |  |
| * What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?
 |  |  |  |
| * Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?
 |  |  |  |
| * Consideration of recommendations and reporting of information
 | * Did the project consider Midterm Review recommendations conducted on time and reflected in the subsequent project activities
* Reporting of the petroleum fuels and the power reduction in each of the model units from implementing eco- tech options and the corresponding carbon emission reductions.
 |  |  |  |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?
 | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?
 |  |  |  |
| * What changes could have been made (if any) to the project design in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results?
 |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards and delivered results with the least costly resources possible? |  |
| * Was project support provided in an efficient way?
 | * How does the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system were operating as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making?
 |  |  |  |
| * How effective was the adaptive management practiced under the project and lessons learnt?
 |  |  |  |
| * Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?
 |  |  |  |
| * Utilization of resources (including human and financial) towards producing the outputs and adjustments made to the project strategies and scope.
 |  |  |  |
| * Details of co-funding provided and its impact on the activities (Refer to Table in section 6. Project Finance / Co-Finance).
 |  |  |  |
| * How does the APR/PIR process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?
 |  |  |  |
| * How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?
 | * Appropriateness of the institutional arrangement and whether there was adequate commitment to the project?
 |  |  |  |
| * Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?
 |  |  |  |
| * Is technical assistance and support received from project partners and stakeholders appropriate, adequate and timely specifically for project PMU?
 |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |  |
| * Will the project be sustainable on its conclusion and stimulate replications and its potential?
 | * How effective is the project in terms of strengthening the capacity of railway professionals
 |  |  |  |
| * Was an exit strategy prepared and implemented by the project? What is the “Expected situation at the end of the Project” as envisioned at the time of terminal evaluation?
 |  |  |  |
| * Appropriateness of the institutional arrangement and whether there was adequate commitment to the project.
 |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress towards maximizing environmental benefits?  |  |
| * What was the project impact under different components
 | To what extent has the project contributed to the following?:* + 1. Institutional Arrangements Strengthened
		2. Effective Information Dissemination Program Developed
		3. Stakeholders capacity enhanced
 |  | Use key indicators in logframe listed in project document (or Annex B) |  |
| * What are the indirect benefits that can be attributed to the project?
 | * Were there spinoffs created by the project, if any, as a result of the various workshops held nationwide, toolkits, case studies developed?
 |  |  |  |
| * Impacts due to information dissemination under the project
 | * To what extent did the dissemination activities facilitate the progress towards project impacts?
 |  |  |  |

Annex E: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A) |

Annex F: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex G: Evaluation Report Outline[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project ID#s
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings[[9]](#footnote-9) (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[10]](#footnote-10))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Completed tracking tool
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
* Report Clearance Form
* *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* GEF Focal Area Terminal Tracking Tool
 |

Annex H: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Annex I: TE Report audit trail TEMPLATE

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Also called consultant [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Various sources, but not limited to project document, project reports, national policies & strategies, key project partners & stakeholders, needs assessment studies, data collected throughout monitoring and evaluation, data reported in project annual & quarterly reports etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Various methodologies, but not limited to Data analysis, Documents analysis, Interviews with project team, Interviews with relevant stakeholders etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. At its discretion, the evaluation team is free to include any other additional information that is felt worth reporting. 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. This may also include contribution to “development dividends”, which may refer to ways in which a project contributes towards: (a) Achievement of the MDGs, (b) Improvements to people’s livelihoods, (c) Inter-generational poverty reduction, and (d) Improvements in the quality of life. Such development dividends can be accrued either locally or nationally. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See Annex E for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)