|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LOCAL EVALUATION CONSULTANT FOR ‘CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND SECURITY IN JAMAICA’ PROJECT (FINAL EVALUATION) | | |
| **Location :** | Kingston, Jamaica | |
| **Application Deadline :** | | 30 November-2015 |
| **Type of Contract :** | Individual Contract | |
| **Post Level :** | National Consultant | |
| **Languages Required :** | English | |
| **Starting Date :** (date when the selected candidate is expected to start) | | 14-December-2015 |
| **Duration of Initial Contract :** | | 21 working days |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Background and Context |

Stimulating economic growth is critical in a country like Jamaica that carries a heavy debt burden. Within the energy sector the cost of energy production from fossil fuels continues to increase. As Jamaica continues to make political and socio-economic progress, its energy demands and cost have increased significantly over the years. Since 1970, Jamaica's energy consumption rates have doubled and it has been estimated that the country's energy demand continues to grow between 3-4% annually. As a result the country has one of the highest per capita consumption and energy intensity rates in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Independent investment in renewable energy and energy diversification has been identified as a national priority and is being sought by the Ministry of Science, Technology, Energy and Mining (MSTEM). Following on from previous UNDP supported stakeholder consultation to inform the completion of the five sub-policies, MSTEM articulated a need to continue work in renewable energy.

Assisting the GoJ to achieve its commitments to renewable energy generation and energy diversification, efficiency and conservation was in line with UNDP's Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) (2007-2011) and builds on UNDP's previous work within the sector and the MSTEM. The project continued to be relevant in the current CPAP period (2012-2016). Given this and UNDP's commitment to assist the Government and people of Jamaica to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Vision 2030 and building on UNDP's expertise and work within the energy sector, the Country Office (CO) supported MSTEM in the areas of capacity development, options for renewable energy applications and continuing stakeholder dialogue. UNDP Jamaica developed a project titled, ‘*Capacity development for energy efficiency and security in Jamaica*’ with the following objectives:

1. To increase the national capacity for energy efficiency and energy conservation within the public sector, by highlighting the importance of monitoring and maintenance to achieve sustainable savings and the teaching of new performance contract concepts which should result in a decrease in public sector energy usage and costs;
2. To provide technical assistance for small scale renewable sources of energy through the preparation and /or validation of a wind map and a feasibility study for small scale applications, as well as the construction of small scale wind turbines, and
3. To establish a platform for dialogue between the public sector (particularly the Ministry of

Energy and Mining) and the private sector to ensure information sharing from both sides and targeting resolutions for relevant significant issues faced by the private sector.

UNDP is seeking to hire a qualified and experienced consultant to conduct the evaluation of the ‘*Capacity development for energy efficiency and security in Jamaica*’ project.

1. Evaluation Purpose

This evaluation will assess the ‘*Capacity development for energy efficiency and security in Jamaica*’ project in order to determine its contribution towards improving land, coastal zones, water and energy management[[1]](#footnote-2). This evaluation will also determine:

* The extent to which the project has improved increasing energy efficiency in the public sector [[2]](#footnote-3)
* Whether the project achieved its objectives and whether outcomes were relevant, efficient, effective and sustainable.
* The quality of implementation and management arrangements of the project and make recommendations/suggestions for future implementation of Nationally Implemented Projects (NIM) based on lessons learned and/or best practices

1. **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

The evaluation will address the entire length of the project (July 2011- March 2015) and should embody a strong results-based orientation. The scope of the evaluation includes the main areas of the project and has the following criteria:

1. *Relevance:*The Consultant will assess the degree to which the project takes into account the local context and development problems. The evaluation will also review the extent to which the project design was logical and coherent, and it will assess the link between activities and expected results, and between results and objectives to be achieved.
2. *Effectiveness:* The evaluation will assess the extent to which the Project's objectives have been achieved, compared to the overall project purpose. In evaluating effectiveness it is useful to consider: I) if the planning activities were consistent with the overall objectives and project purpose; 2) the analysis of principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives.
3. *Impact:* The evaluation will assess any credible evidence and the main impact effectively achieved by the Project in the context of reference.
4. *Sustainability:* The evaluation will assess the project capacity to produce and to reproduce benefits over time. In evaluating the project sustainability it is useful to consider to what extent intervention benefits will continue even after the project is concluded and the principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project sustainability.

**Key questions to be answered by the evaluation**

***Relevance:***

* Are the project outputs relevant to the purpose/objectives of the project intervention?
* How does the project relate to the main objectives, mandates and priorities of the CPAP?
* Does the project address needs of policy makers, state or/and non-state practitioners active in the field of energy efficiency?
* Does the project respond to key needs of primary/secondary beneficiaries? Does it differ for sexes?
* Were the project indicators relevant to the designed outputs?
* Were the intended results (outputs and outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable?

***Effectiveness***

* To what extent have the expected project objectives/outputs been achieved?
* What were the success factors for the achievement or reasons for non-achievement of project outputs?
* What were the major challenges, opportunities and obstacles encountered by the project generally?
* What are the potential intended and unintended, positive and negative, long term effects of the project on direct beneficiaries?
* What, if any, progress toward the outcomes has been made?

***Efficiency***

* Was project funding spent as planned? Were all activities addressed with the respective budget?
* Did the project M&E systems and practices allow for in-time corrective actions and tracking of the progress towards the expected results (outputs)? (As stated in the document, periodic reviews shall be conducted every quarter to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Quarterly Work Plan (QWP) for the following period. Of importance is also the fact that the management of the project, including all reporting, is in itself an output of the project. The time for the production of quarterly reports is the respective indicator).
* Were project risks identified during project development? Were other risks identified during the course of the project and were mitigation measures implemented?
* Has the project been cost-effective (i.e., cost per output or beneficiary; was the budget fully utilized?)
* Were management arrangements appropriate and to what extent did they support the efficiency of the project? What financial management barriers/challenges were experienced during the project period? Were any Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) recommendations implemented?

***Sustainability***

* Were any benefits from the project sustained after the end of the project?
* Was a sustainability plan developed? Is it expected to be implemented?
* Are the beneficiaries committed to continuing working towards project objectives after the project ended?
* Are services developed under the project likely to continue, be scaled up or replicated after the project funding ceases?

***Evidence of Impact/potential impact***

* Is there any evidence of project impact? If not, does the project have the future potential in impacting the relevant sector(s)? In what ways? How should it be measured?

***Gender responsiveness***

* Did the project identify gender issues in the design or implementation phase of the project? How did it deal with these issues?
* Could the project have been more gender- sensitive? In what ways?

***Partnerships***

* Were coordination mechanisms among the relevant partners successfully established?
* What were the opportunities, achievements and/or challenges of the partnerships?

1. **Methodology**

The project evaluation will be undertaken following the UN evaluation norms and guidelines including the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results and in particular the UNDP project-level evaluation, and the UN Standards and Norms for Evaluations. The overall evaluation approach and the selected methodology should be suitable to the evaluation questions and the feasibility of data collection, given the constraints of time and resources. The evaluation should include an analysis of source of information including desk review as well as interviews with project partners and beneficiaries.

1. Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation should be conducted in accordance with the principles laid out in the UNDP Evaluation Policy (http: //www. undp.org/evaluation, http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook) as well as in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[3]](#footnote-4). Evaluators must address evaluation ethics and enact safeguards to protect the rights and confidentiality of information providers, provisions to store and maintain security of collected information and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The evaluator will remain impartial and will not act as representative of any party throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation process will be managed by UNDP’s Monitoring and Evaluation Team and the evaluation reports will undergo the standard evaluation review process.

1. Duties and Responsibilities

**Planning and Implementation Arrangements**

The evaluation should be planned and conducted in close consultation with UNDP Jamaica CO. The evaluation tools and methodology must be also be agreed with the CO. Although the evaluator should be free to discuss all matters relevant to this assignment with the authorities concerned, the evaluator is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of UNDP. The evaluator reports directly to UNDP Jamaica CO. To the extent possible, the draft report will also be circulated to the relevant stakeholders for review. While considering the comments provided on the draft, the evaluators would use their independent judgment in preparing the final report. The final draft will be an independent and impartial evaluation of the project.

**Indicative timeframe for the evaluation process**

The evaluation is expected to start on 14 December 2015 and have an expected duration is 21 working days within 2 calendar months. The final work plan will be confirmed by the UNDP M&E/Programme Team.

**Evaluation Products (Expected Deliverables)**

Expected deliverables:

1. Evaluation inception report – This report allows the programme unit and the evaluator to have a shared understanding about the evaluation. This report should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of proposed methods, proposed sources of data, and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.

2. Draft evaluation report that include preliminary findings – the purpose of this report is to demonstrate progress on the assignment and adherence to the TOR and will identify any issues that may need further clarification before completion of the assignment.

3. Power point presentation with main evaluation findings and recommendations - The purpose of this session is to provide opportunity for initial validation and support fur­ther elaboration of the evaluators’ findings and recommendations. Consultant is responsible for organizing and presenting the findings to stakeholders.

4. Final evaluation report - within a week of receiving the consolidated comments from projects’ stakeholders, the Consultant will submit a final document and power point presentation that addresses relevant comments and provides comprehensive reporting on all elements of the assignment.

The Evaluation report should not be longer than 35 pages, excluding the annexes and the executive summary. The report should be developed with respect to the following chapters:

* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Table of Contents, including list of annexes
* Executive summary (maximum 4 pages)
* Introduction (including evaluation purpose, objectives and scope)
* Description of the Intervention
* Evaluation approach and methodology
* Evaluation findings (including limitations)
* Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
* Conclusions
* Recommendations, lessons learned and best practices (Recommendations should be related to the specific actions that might be used to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and impact and management arrangements of similar projects in the future).

In addition, the final report should contain the following annexes:

* Terms of reference for evaluation
* List of persons interviewed
* List of key reference documents
* Any other relevant material

**Outputs and Deliverables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Percentage of Payment** | **Estimated Duration** | **Target due date** |
| **Deliverable 1:** Inception report and work plan | 20% | 2 day | 17 December 2015 |
| Deliverable 2:  Draft evaluation report | 40% | 13 days | 12 February 2016 |
| Deliverable 3: Validation session and powerpoint presentation of findings (based on draft report) | 20% | 2 day | 29 February 2016 |
| Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report and presentation | 20% | 4 days | 11 March 2016 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **21 days** |  |

1. Competencies

The consultant should be familiar with and use the results based monitoring approach of UNDP.

* Strong evaluation skills and use of evaluation methodology (in-depth interviews, focus groups, data analysis/synthesis)
* Experience in the energy sector is an asset
* Excellent analytical skills
* Excellent communication and report writing skills

1. Required Skills and Experience

**Academic Qualifications/Education**

* University degree in Engineering, Physics, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences or other related profession
* Solid knowledge of the Results-Based Management, M&E methodologies (including quantitative, qualitative methods).
* Strong analytical and report-writing skills.
* Good oral and written communication skills

**Desirable Skills and Experience**

* Familiarity of UN programming and evaluation principles.
* Knowledge of energy sector and/or renewable energy issues preferably through country experience in Jamaica and/or Caribbean
* Experience with national stakeholder engagement using participatory M&E processes.

**Language skills**

* Excellent working knowledge of English

**Application procedure**

Qualified and interested candidates are requested to apply no later than 30 November 2015.

Please submit the following to demonstrate your interest and qualifications by explaining why you are the most suitable for the work:

* **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position.
* **Completed P11 form** (Personal History Form) for Service Contracts and Individual Contracts, including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees. A resume/CV should also be included.
* **Technical Proposal –** should include (a) detailed proposed strategy/methodology, work plan timeline; risks/limitations; consideration of a gender approach for assignment; (b) detailed profile of the expertise of the consultant, especially as it relates to experience in the evaluation;
* **Financial Proposal** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days and any other costs such as per diems, travel and incidental expenditures in project sites). This financial proposal should include costs to deliver the work plan.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested documents.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that would take into account both the technical qualification of Individual Consultants as well as their financial proposals. The contract will be awarded to the candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores. UNDP retains the right to contact references directly.  In cases where a large number of applications are received, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

**Evaluation of Applicants**

Individual consultant will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicant’s qualifications and financial proposal.

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

* Responsive/acceptable
* Having received the highest score out of a predetermined set of weighted technical and final criteria specific to the solicitation
* Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

1. *Technical Criteria* - 70% of total evaluation – max points: 70
2. *Financial Criteria* - 30% of total evaluation – max points: 30

|  |
| --- |
| **UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.** |

**Annex I: Key Stakeholders**

It is suggested that the Consultant conduct consultations with representatives of the following institutions:

**I) Government**

* Ministry of Science Technology Energy and Mining, Energy Division
* Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica (PCJ)
* Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ)

**II) Other**

* Professor Chen, University of the West Indies
* Jody Grizzle, Project Manager, MSTEM
* Caribbean Maritime Institute (CMI)
* GEF Small Grants Programme
* Project Steering Committee (PSC) members
* Nazareth All Age School
* Rose Hill Primary
* Elizabeth Emmanuel, Consultant who conducted the training
* Training workshop participants

**Annex 2. Preliminary List of key documents**

1. ‘Capacity development for energy efficiency and security in Jamaica’ project document
2. Annual Work Plan (2011-2015)
3. Quarterly Work Plans (2011-2015)
4. Quarterly Progress Reports (2011-2015)
5. Annual Progress Report 2011
6. Annual Progress Report 2012
7. Annual Progress Report 2013
8. UNDP Jamaica Country Programme Action Plan 2007-2011
9. UNDP Jamaica Country Programme Action Plan 2012-2016
10. Country Programme Document for Jamaica 2012-2016
11. Country Programme Document for Jamaica 2007-2011
12. Final Training Report: Energy Conservation, Efficiency and Management Programme (January 2013; November 2012)
13. Training Program to Support the Implementation of National Energy Policy, 2009-2030 (2013, 2012)
14. Capacity Development for Energy Efficiency Systems in Jamaica Evaluation Report, 2015
15. “Wind Power for Domestic/Community Feasibility Study and Regulatory Review”, Prof Anthony Chen, 2014

**Approval**

**This TOR is approved by:**

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

Name and Designation:          Elsie Laurence-Chounoune, Deputy Resident Representative

Date:              **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1. 2007-2011 Country Programme Document, Outcome 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. 2007-2011 Country Program Action Plan, Output 3.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. UNEG, “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines [↑](#footnote-ref-4)