

**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference –INTERNATional consultant**

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 *Energy Efficiency Improvements in the Indian Brick Industry* (PIMS 3465)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | | **Energy Efficiency Improvements in the Indian Brick Industry** | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 2844 (GEF PMIS ID) | |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 3465 (UNDP PIMS ID)  00057405 (Atlas ID) | | GEF financing: | 696,448 | | 696,448 |
| Country: | India | | IA/EA own: |  | | 144,000  (TERI in kind) |
| Region: | Asia Pacific | | Government: |  | |  |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | | Other: | 1,999,000 | | 1,854,000  (Brick kiln units) |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | OP-5 | | Total co-financing: | 1,999,000 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | MOEF THROUGH The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) | | Total Project Cost: | 2,695,448 | | 2,694,448 |
| Other Partners involved: |  | | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | June 2009 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  Dec 2012 | Actual:  Dec 2016 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed with the goal to reduce energy consumption, and restrict GHG emissions by creating appropriate infrastructure for sustained adoption of new and improved technologies for production and use of resource efficient bricks in India.

The objectives of the project are:

* To demonstrate REB technologies and develop technology models (supply side)
* To build awareness and develop sustainable markets for REBs among various stakeholders such as builders, architects, individual end-users (demand side)
* To influence government organizations, financial institutions and policy and decision makers

Project’s envisaged outcomes are:

1. Enhancing public sector awareness on resource-efficient products.
2. Access to finance for brick kiln entrepreneurs
3. Improved knowledge on technology, including marketing
4. Availability of resource efficient technology models in 5 clusters through Local Resource Centres
5. Improved capacity of brick kiln entrepreneurs

**Component 1: Enhancing public sector awareness on resource-efficient products**

Presently, the awareness level of specifications and codes amongst relevant public agencies at State and Central Government such as Central Public Works Department (CPWD), state public works departments, Military Engineering Services (MES), etc. is very low. For example, most of them are not aware that the energy efficient burnt clay hollow brick (for walls and partition), meets the building code. In fact this brick type not only fully complies with the specifications, it also contributes to improved structural stability and better looks. Furthermore, lack of awareness about specifications and codes among government agencies has led to non-inclusion of resource efficient and energy efficient products in their bill of materials to be used in public construction contracts.

*(i) Public construction contracts*

Inclusion of energy-efficient bricks in public construction contracts will be a focus under this component. This will improve confidence level of builders and end-users resulting in a wider of use of these products. It will have direct impact on the market and stimulate production of resource efficient bricks.

*(ii) Policy advocacy*

PFC would make a special effort to obtain the support of state and local governments in the promotion of resource efficient bricks. Various state and central Government agencies (e.g. CPWD, PWD, MES, BIS, etc.) will be invited to workshops at the national level conducted by LRCs, which would help in enhancing their knowledge and understanding on resource efficient bricks. It is planned to conduct at least three “National level meetings” to which all stakeholders, including policy makers, will be invited.

**Component 2: Access to finance for brick kiln entrepreneurs**

One of the important activities during project implementation would be to establish access to funds from various financial institutions for demonstration units and assist financial institutions in developing tailor-made financial packages for the brick industry. The activity would address the barrier being faced by the brick manufacturers in accessing loans from financial institutions.

*(i) Identification of national and regional financial institutions (FIs)*

The project has interacted with various financial institutions and banks e.g. Small Industries Development Bank of India (SIDBI) to share knowledge on the Indian brick sector and the proposed interventions under the UNDP-GEF project, which would help in transformation of the Indian brick sector. The response from SIDBI is positive.

In the initial phase of the project, PFC and LRCs will interact extensively with various financial institutions and local banks, which would help in enhancing understanding of FIs on the brick sector and the project objectives. The interactions will assist the project in identifying the interested national and regional financial institutions for providing finance to brick making units.

*(ii) DPR preparation for 12 demonstration projects*

Individual brick kiln entrepreneurs lack the capacity to prepare detailed project reports for project implementation and for approaching banks for loans. The LRCs would prepare detailed project reports (DPRs) for the new projects (12 no.) with the guidance of PFC. It would also prepare user-friendly guidelines and model DPRs which would help other brick kiln units to prepare DPRs on their own.

*(iii) Development of resource efficient brick production project profiles*

The experience gained during the planning and implementation of the demonstration will be collated and detailed project profiles relevant for a particular cluster/ region will be prepared.

*(iv) Arranging finance for the demonstration projects*

The project will be setting up 12 (twelve) resource efficient brick kiln units in 5 (five) different clusters. PFC and LRCs would prepare DPRs for approaching the banks. It would also facilitate interaction between individual entrepreneurs and banks for provision of loans based on DPRs and fulfillment of bank’s criteria in providing loans. These activities would also help in developing suitable financial package for brick industry.

**Component 3: Improved knowledge on technology, including marketing**

While other components have mainly focused on strengthening the supply of resource-efficient bricks, Component 3 focuses on creating markets for such products.

*(i) Market research and strategies for market development*

A marketing professional will help each LRC in studying market and demands for the resource efficient bricks in the cluster. The marketing professionals will interact with demonstration units, LRC and end-users and would develop the strategies for market development. He will also provide assistance to the demonstration units in marketing of the resource efficient bricks. LRC would also facilitate testing of resource efficient bricks (e.g. compressive strengths of bricks). These results will be used to provide comprehensive product details to the end-users so that they can make an informed choice.

*(ii) Sensitizing and educating end-users*

LRCs and PFC would sensitize and educate end-users such as builders, architects, masons and house builders regarding the advantages of resource efficient bricks. Posters will be exhibited and brochures will be distributed during various interactive meets (training programs and awareness programs). LRC would also distribute these promotional materials to various end-users during one-to-one meetings and also through post & email. The posters and brochures will also be distributed to various government and non-governmental agencies for display and distribution specifically during national and international exhibitions on building materials and construction.

**Component 4: Availability of resource efficient technology models in 5 clusters through Local Resource Centers**

The project has short-listed five brick making clusters in India. The parameters chosen for short-listing of these clusters are:

* Major brick production centers located close to high growth centers
* Higher demands for bricks due to vibrant construction activities
* Availability of forward looking entrepreneurs willing to adopt technology modernization.
* Covering different geographical locations

The project would set up 12 (twelve) demonstration projects in 5 (five) different brick kiln clusters regions, and thereby allowing new/ existing entrepreneurs to take up production of resource–efficient products. The clusters identified for setting up demonstration units and the types of interventions proposed are given below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S No | Cluster | State/ Region | Number of demonstration units | Proposed interventions |
| 1 | Ghaziabad/Gurgaon | NCR | 2 | Perforated bricks |
| 2 | Ludhiana | Punjab | 2 | Perforated bricks/  Flyash-Clay bricks |
| 3 | Varanasi | East Uttar Pradesh | 2 | Perforated bricks/  Hollow blocks |
| 4 | Pune | Maharashtra | 3 | Perforated bricks/  Hollow blocks |
| 5 | Bangalore | Karnataka | 3 | Perforated bricks/  Hollow blocks |

*(i) Identification of brick kiln units and signing MoUs*

The project, during the PDF-A phase interacted with individual brick kiln entrepreneurs in all the five clusters. Letters from individual brick kiln entrepreneurs interested in adoption of technologies for production of resource efficient bricks are given. The project also interacted with brick industry association at national level national (All India Bricks and Tiles Manufacturers’ Federation – AIBTMF) as well as at regional levels (e.g. Int Nirmata Parishad – INP, Varanasi). The letters of cooperation from brick industry associations at national and regional level are given. During implementation, the project will shortlist the brick kiln units, based on a well defined ‘selection criteria’ for up-gradation of technology. The next step would be finalization of MoUs with each of the brick kiln units. The project will work closely with the local industry associations during this phase, so as to ensure the involvement of the entire brick industry in the cluster in the demonstration projects

(ii) Technology sourcing

During the PDF-A phase, interactions with a number of technology suppliers involved in supplying machineries to brick industry have been initiated. These interactions had helped in developing project profiles by matching available equipment specifications with the needs of the industry, such as, production capacity, investments capacity of the entrepreneurs, quality and reliability of the machinery. During implementation phase, the project would extensively interact with technology/ machinery suppliers and prepare a list of potential technology suppliers to be made available to the project developers. The project through the PFC & LRCs will facilitate sourcing of plant and machinery for individual demonstration units.

*(iii) Facilitating commissioning of demonstration projects*

The Project Facilitation Cell (PFC) would facilitate the implementation of the project through the local resource centers (LRCs) identified in the short-listed clusters (given in following table). It would also coordinate with local offices of SISI/ NSIC for synergizing various activities planned under project implementation. During the PDF-A stage, detailed discussions were organized with the Ministry of Small Scale industries (MoSSI) and the concerned officials of the ministry have assured cooperation in the proposed project through the involvement of SISI/ NSIC branches in the selected clusters. LRC would facilitate adoption of technologies for production of resource efficient bricks by individual brick kiln units in the short-listed clusters. This would require effective coordination between all the stakeholders such as entrepreneur, technology supplier, financial institutions, local brick industry associations etc.

During the commissioning of demonstration projects in the cluster, LRC would assist in the commissioning on a regular basis. It would also interact with the technology supplier and the technical experts in troubleshooting operations wherever required and ensure smooth functioning of the resource efficient brick kiln unit.

(iv) Monitoring and evaluation of projects

PFC will prepare a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework for the monitoring of individual brick kiln units. It would help the LRC in carrying out the evaluation by experts in the field. For each brick kiln unit, a baseline report and a post-commissioning report will be prepared. These reports would cover performance evaluation of energy consumption, environmental emissions and resource efficiency (e.g. reduction in soil consumption level) along with other operational parameters (production, breakage, production costs and sale of bricks). LRC would also help individual brick kiln units in preparation of suitable formats to document various operating parameters and carrying out energy & environmental monitoring of the plants of the plants, which would help in the evaluation process.

**Component 5: Improved capacity of brick kiln entrepreneurs**

Component 5 will focus on ‘capacity development in the private sector’, addressing the needs of local brick industry and institutions such as brick kiln associations.

*(i) Development of training module for energy efficiency improvements*

The LRCs and PFC would assess the specific needs of the brick sector and develop suitable training modules for conducting training programs in different clusters. The training program would cover ‘Best Operating Practices’ (BOP) on brick firing, green brick making and financial management. Suitable modifications in the training modules will be incorporated based on the feedback received from the participants.

*(ii) Organization of training programs*

It is proposed to conduct 2 training programs per year per cluster. The total programs planned are 40 and estimated numbers of beneficiaries are 2000 brick kiln units. The LRC along with technical experts will be organizing these training programs jointly with local brick manufacturers associations. These training programs would help in adopting BOP in individual brick kiln units and are expected to result in energy savings of 5–10%. LRC would obtain feedback from each training programs that would help PFC in continuously upgrading the contents and the overall quality of the training programmes.

*(iii) Exposure visits/ Study tours within India*

The project would undertake exposure visit/ study tour for members of PFC and LRCs and short-listed group of entrepreneurs for in-depth understanding on the technological options available.

*(iv) Conducting awareness seminars*

LRC would conduct a total of 5 (five) regional level awareness seminars during the execution of the project. These awareness seminars would bring together the brick kiln entrepreneurs (around 500), construction sector experts and the technology suppliers to a common platform to share their experiences and requirements. Awareness seminars will be accompanied by organisation of technical exhibition to exhibit resource-efficient brick making processes and machineries as well as resource efficient brick products. This is expected to help in developing business for the technology supplier as well as avenues for the demonstration units in finding market for their bricks.

*(v) Development of promotional materials and web site*

PFC would develop promotional materials such as website, brochures and posters to promote resource efficient bricks. PFC would develop a website with inputs from LRCs. The website would provide information on alternate products available in different regions, list of brick kiln units who produce alternate bricks, quality of these products (e.g. compressive strength of perforated bricks, hollow blocks and fly ash bricks) and technology suppliers. The website will also provide linkages with other relevant websites. PFC will maintain the website and update information regularly. The project will prepare brochure which will be distributed to all relevant stakeholders. The brochure would provide information pertaining to resource efficient technologies, resource efficient bricks, their physical parameters (dimensions and compressive strengths), usage and availability in the market.

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.

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 is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. 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 C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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 team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to various project stakeholder locations viz. Delhi, Bangalore, Chandigarh, Varanasi, etc*,* including the following project field sites viz. Amritsar-Jallandhar, Chandigarh, Malur, etc*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals 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)
* Local Resource Centers (LRCs)
* Relevant project stakeholders like brick industry association, brick kiln entrepreneurs, financial institutions, technology suppliers etc.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, mid-term review (MTR) report, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, 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. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

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 A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), 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 D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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: |  |

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$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 was successfully mainstreamed with 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).

Impact

The evaluator 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)

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.

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 the timely provision of per diems and 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 fulfill 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 evaluation 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.

Evaluation timeframe

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *2* days | *8 Dec 2016* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 6 days | *12-17 December 2016* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *12* days | *30 December 2016* |
| **Final Report** | 5 days | *25 January 2017* |

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, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week 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.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 2 consultants *(1 international /1 national evaluators).* The international consultant will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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 International Consultant (Team Leader) must present the following qualifications and professional background:

Education:

Post Graduate Degree in Science / Engineering.

Years of experience

* Professional background in project evaluations of renewable energy, energy efficiency and climate change mitigation projects is essential. Experience in evaluating projects on small scale industries, energy efficiency, specifically in the brick or construction sector is desirable. A minimum of 15 years of relevant experience in monitoring and evaluating donor driven projects (preferably GEF, World Bank, or UN);

*Competencies:*

* Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring, review and evaluation processes, and experience in review and evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
* Familiar with energy efficiency policies / conditions in India and abroad through management and / or implementation or through consultancies in review and evaluation of donor funded projects.
* Understanding of CO2 emission reduction calculations (including IPCC, GEF procedure), especially from the energy audit and implementation of its recommendations, that contribute to global benefits;
* Familiar with GEF rules, regulations and project reviews and evaluations;
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly, distil 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.
* Writing and communication will be in English, and he/she must have excellent communication skills in English. The consultant must bring his/her own computer/ laptop and related equipment.

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

Note: Candidates meeting minimum qualification and experience as stated above will get 70% marks, additional marks will be awarded for additional expertise.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) 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)

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 and GHG Tracking Tool |

Evaluation Criteria

**Cumulative analysis**

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* Responsive.

Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

* Technical Criteria weight - 70%;
* Financial Criteria weight - 30%.

**Evaluation Criteria**:

* Qualification of the Consultant: 20 Marks;
* Relevant work Experience: 30 Marks;
* Proposed Work Plan for undertaking the task: 15 Marks;
* Time Line for completion of the Task: 5 Marks.

**Annexes to the TOR**

* Annex 1: Offeror’s Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor Assignment
* Annex 2: General Terms and Conditions for ICs (in separate document)
* Annex 3: P-11 form for ICs (in separate document)

Above documents can be found ‘Forms and Documentation for Individual Contractor’ column in career section. Please find link below:

<http://www.in.undp.org/content/india/en/home/operations/careers/>

**Documents to be submitted by Consultants**

* Offeror’s Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor Assignment
* Updated and signed P-11 form for ICs
* Proposed work methodology with timeline
* Updated CV with contact details of three references.

Please note following components have to be covered while giving financial proposal:

* Per day consultancy fee;
* Rates for one flight ticket for Home Station-New Delhi-Home station, please note it has to be economy class only.

NOTE: UNDP will reimburse or pay for all local travel, accommodation and food costs during the mission as per actuals.

Notes:

* Any kind of miscellaneous charges i.e. internet, phone etc. would not be reimbursed;
* Individuals working with institutions may also apply, contract would be issued in the name of institution for the specific services of individual;
* Please note proposals without financial proposal will not be considered;
* CV, Financial proposal and proposed work plan can be clubbed in one file for uploading;
* The consultants must bring his/her own computing equipment

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | | |
| **Goal** | To reduce energy consumption, and restrict GHG emissions by creating appropriate infrastructure for sustained adoption of new and improved technologies for production and use of resource efficient bricks in India | | | | |
|  | **Indicator**  (quantified and time-bound) | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Objective**  To make India’s five major brick producing clusters more energy efficient | Reduction of 187,840 tons of CO2 in five major brick making clusters in India over 15 years  Savings in energy consumption by the demonstration units. | Production of resource-efficient bricks will not increase resulting in continuation of high CO2 generation and high energy consumption in the sector (42 million tonnes of CO2 per annum) | Year 1: reduction of 10,099 tCO2  Year 5: reduction of 59,920 tCO2  Year 10: reduction of 123,880 tCO2  Year 15: reduction of 187,840 tCO2 | Project reports and files | Government agencies promoting new resource efficient product in construction sector |
| **Outcome 1:**  Enhancing public sector awareness on resource-efficient products | Usage of resource-efficient bricks by new public department building contracts increased by 20% by end of project. | No increase in usage of EE bricks in public buildings. | Year 2: increase by 3%  Year 3: increase by 10%  Year 4: increase by 20% | Contract documents of the public departments with inclusion of resource–efficient bricks specifications | Government policies conducive to modernization of Indian brick industry |
| **Outcome 2:** Access to finance for brick kiln entrepreneurs | # of loans from local banks/ financial institutions for technology upgradation tripled by end of project. | # of loans will not increase | Year 3: # of loans doubled compared to baseline year 2008.  Year 4: # of loans tripled compared to baseline year 2008 | Bank records and Industry association records | Bank lending policies are conducive to brick industry |
| **Outcome 3**: Improved knowledge on technology, including marketing | Resource-efficient bricks sold in the market and used for construction. | Market share of resource-efficient bricks remains low | Market share of resource-efficient bricks doubled by end of project | Market surveys and relevant reports and enquiries of entrepreneurs and end-users. | Small scale industry supporting the entire initiative in various clusters |
| **Outcome 4:** Availability of resource-efficient technology models in 5 clusters through Local Resource Centres | 12 EE brick kilns units established in 5 clusters by end of project | No EE brick kiln units established | Year 1: All 12 Units established by end of year 1. | Records of demonstration units on production and sale of resource-efficient bricks. | Adaptation of new product by Architects and builders specially around mega cities |
| **Outcome 5:** Improved capacity of brick kiln entrepreneurs | At least 5 Brick kiln entrepreneurs in each cluster invest in technology upgradation by end of project | No such investment will take place | Year 2: 1 entrepreneur in each cluster invests  Year 4: 5 entrepreneurs in each cluster invests | Market surveys reports | Government policies conducive to modernization of Indian brick industry |

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

* Project Document
* Inception Workshop Report
* Mid-term review (MTR) report of project
* Project Fact sheet
* Annual Work and Financial Plans
* Annual Project Report/ Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) till 2016
* Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings
* Quarterly Reports
* Annual financial audit reports
* 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.
* GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policy
* GEF Focal Area tracking tools at baseline, midterm, and terminal points of the project
* Knowledge products
* UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
* UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
* UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
* GEF focal area strategic program objectives
* Other publications prepared under the Project

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

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[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Methodology[[4]](#footnote-4)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 transport sector |  |  |  |
| * 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 (Ministry of Urban Development, GoI and Financing Units) 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 transport professionals |  |  |  |
| * Was an exit strategy prepared and implemented by the project? What is the “Expected situation at the end of the Project” |  |  |  |
| * 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 D: 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 shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. 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 risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: 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[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**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 F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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 and implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*) * Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project Implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issue |
| **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 * 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 G: 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. 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-3)
4. Various methodologies, but not limited to Data analysis, Documents analysis, Interviews with project team, Interviews with relevant stakeholders etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See Annex D for rating scales [↑](#footnote-ref-8)