



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

OCCASION

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

DISCLAIMER

This document has been produced without formal United Nations editing. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or its economic system or degree of development. Designations such as “developed”, “industrialized” and “developing” are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Mention of firm names or commercial products does not constitute an endorsement by UNIDO.

FAIR USE POLICY

Any part of this publication may be quoted and referenced for educational and research purposes without additional permission from UNIDO. However, those who make use of quoting and referencing this publication are requested to follow the Fair Use Policy of giving due credit to UNIDO.

CONTACT

Please contact publications@unido.org for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at www.unido.org



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO project:

**Promoting ultra low-head micro hydropower technology to increase
access to renewable energy for productive uses in rural India**

UNIDO SAP ID: 120182

AUGUST 2015

CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3
II.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	8
III.	EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	8
IV.	EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION	9
V.	TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES	9
VI.	PROJECT EVALUATION PARAMETERS	9
VII.	REPORTING	14
VIII.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	15
	Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report	17
	Annex 2 - Overall ratings table	19
	Annex 3 - Checklist on evaluation report quality	22
	Annex 4 – Job descriptions	23
	Annex 5 – Project results framework	31
	Annex 6 – Gender mainstreaming checklist for UNIDO energy-related project	33

I. Project background and overview

1. Project factsheet

Project Title	Promoting ultra low-head micro hydropower technology to increase access to renewable energy for productive uses in rural India
UNIDO project No. (SAP ID)	120182
Thematic area code	Environment and Energy – EC33
Region	Asia and Pacific
Country	India
Implementing agency	UNIDO
Project executing partners	Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE), Government of India; Uttarakhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (UREDA) Government of Uttarakhand; Uttarakhand Irrigation Department, Government of Uttarakhand;
Project implementation start date	January 2013
Original expected implementation end date	January 2015
Revised expected implementation end date (if any)	December 2015
Actual implementation end date	December 2015
UNIDO inputs (EUR)	938,053
UNIDO's fee (13%) (EUR)	121,947
Co-financing	In-kind
Grand Total (EUR)	1,060,000
Planned terminal evaluation date	September – November 2015

Source: Project document

2. Project summary

The State of Uttarakhand, India faces issues of limited connection in rural communities to central power grid and the lack of reliable electricity supply even where villages are connected to the power grid. Moreover, the state has been seeking alternative solutions based on decentralised renewable energy and mini grids for various small and medium industrial enterprises. The current situation of access to electricity in the state hampers further development of rural industrialization, especially in the agro-industry sector as well as any improvement of the living standards in the rural communities.

The field of hydropower is currently one of the key areas for sustainable industrial development in the State of Uttarakhand and a policy has been recently developed to progress in producing electricity from micro level hydropower systems, especially with renewable and green technologies. The local institutions in the renewable energy field such as Alternate Hydro Energy Centre (AHEC) of Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) and Uttarakhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (UREDA) of Uttarakhand Government are located in the state and have expressed their interest in getting involved in the project in the area of the local capacity-building, research, facilitation and awareness-raising with the aim to promote innovative hydropower technology in the State.

The feasibility study with Indian experts has found an enormous untapped potential of small and micro hydropower development in India. The development potential of small hydropower (up to 25 MW) accounts for more than 15 GW in the whole country. The study carried out in the State Uttarakhand has estimated that over 1.5 GW of electricity can be generated based on micro hydropower system by using existing water resources of irrigation canals, drinking water supply channels and water released from sewerage systems outlets. Such existing water infrastructures, however, require low head systems that can generate electricity with a hydraulic head of less than 3 m (Ultra Low Head Micro Hydro Power turbine system, hereafter ULH-MHP system). The State Uttarakhand has an area of 53,566 km² with about 10 millions of population (as of 2011). Although roughly 90% of households has access to electricity (as of 2011), frequent power cuts make power supply in the “electrified” villages unstable additionally the electricity requirement has not been focused for small scale industrial use through decentralized power generation options.

An inclusive project intervention that brings state-of-the-art technology and energy production connected to the rural industry sector such as agro industry and energy supply services, while ensuring the national capacity for local manufacturing and investment opportunities for replication in a business model framework, is thus needed to support successful new green technology deployment in India.

The project was developed in response to the interest expressed by the Government of India to help in design of a pilot project on ultra low-head micro hydropower (ULH-MHP) technology. This renewable energy technology has been the most up-to-date technique developed in this field, being innovated approximately four years ago, which remains available only in Japan.

Different from the conventional hydropower technologies, this hydropower system can generate electricity from low-head water flow in the small waterfalls of the existing water-supply and sewage, power station waterways, drainage from factories, agricultural waterways and stream channels, which have not been previously considered feasible for hydro power generation. This is an environmentally-friendly system that does not need large-scale engineering work and its maintenance does not require advanced technology - this makes it a very suitable way to generate electricity especially in the developing countries.

The goal of the project is to increase the access of rural communities to renewable electricity in the State of Uttarakhand, India. The project will demonstrate, deploy and transfer the ULH-MHP technology from Japan to the State of Uttarakhand. The project will also seek to create a favourable environment to deploy the ULH-MHP technology through the development of business models. The project will bring the ULH-MHP systems into operation and build the

capacity for the mini grid operation/maintenance as well as local manufacturing of turbine units and spare parts.

The project consists of the following key activities:

- 1) Identification of business opportunities via technology transfer;
- 2) Demonstration of mini-grid system for productive uses;
- 3) Capacity building with institutional networking; and
- 4) Awareness-raising and market/investment opportunities to mainstream the new technology;

This project is built on the strong commitment and leadership of the Government of India, in line with the national strategy and local institutional capacity for the technology transfer. Given the relevance of micro hydropower technology, it is foreseen that this intervention will guide a pathway to increase the number of people with access to sustainable energy and to promote innovative technologies with the prospect of delivering long-term green growth and jobs for the benefit of local communities.

Project implementation started in January 2013 and the initial project end date was in January 2015, which was revised to December 2015.

The project is funded by the Government of Japan and UNIDO grant amounting to EUR 1,060,000, including UNIDO's fee of EUR 121,947 (13%). Details on the budget are presented in Section 6.

An independent terminal evaluation for this project was foreseen in the project document as part of Monitoring & Evaluation plan, with the purpose of conducting a systematic and impartial assessment of the project in line with UNIDO policies. The terminal evaluation is planned to take place **during September- November 2015**.

3. Project objective

The goal of the project is to increase access of rural communities to renewable energy for productive uses in the State of Uttarakhand, India.

The expected outputs of the project are as follows:

- Output 1: ULH-MHP (Ultra Low Head Micro Hydro Power) system installed and operational;
- Output 2: Advisory support to create a favourable environment for ULH-MHP technology deployment;

The project will be implemented along with four development stages of activities: 1) Design, 2) System Demonstration, 3) Business Development, and 4) Strategy Development. The project is targeted to design 3 pilot mini-grid systems for catalyzing productive activities based on 10kW ULH-MHP unit using existing infrastructure such as service water canals and irrigation canals.

4. Relevant project reports/documents

Progress Reports

Several progress reports are available to track the progress of project activities over the implementation period. They include progress reports on; the technology demonstration by technology provider and community development process by facilitating agencies.

Meeting minutes

Several meeting minutes are available to record significant processes of decision-making among project partners, which include minutes for Project Steering Committee meetings, beneficiaries, and governments.

Technical documents

Technical documents are available for the pilot project sites. They contain site-specific description such as technical design of the system, co-financing/commitment scheme, and socioeconomic information. Review reports will guide to understand the lessons-learned on the localization process of installed system and training activities for knowledge management. There are documents like 'Master Plan Survey Document', FAQ, O & M Manual, Feasibility survey format, agency selection documents, community training module, monitoring report by third party agency, etc.

Dissemination materials

Newsletter, brochure, webpage, community modules on awareness, do's & don't s on technology, presentations, news articles, conference /workshop papers and film can highlight the key achievement of the project activities.

Project Document: The original project design is relevant to provide the country context, address key needs and expected outcomes.

5. Project implementation arrangements

Implementation Agency: UNIDO holds the ultimate responsibility for the implementation of the project, the delivery of the planned outputs and the achievement of the expected outcomes.

Execution Agency: Uttarakhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (UREDA) Government of Uttarakhand (UREDA) is the nodal execution agency of the project.

Project Execution Unit (PEU): The project is managed and implemented by UNIDO and directly executed by the Project Execution Unit (PEU), which is established in the premise of Execution Agency - UREDA. The PEU consists of a full time National Project Coordinator (NPC) and a project assistant with a Micro Hydro system Expert and Business Development Expert. The PEU is responsible for the coordination of all the project activities as described in the proposal. It shall delegate responsibilities to liaise and maintain mutual collaboration between UNIDO and project partners towards achieving one goal as a team.

Project Steering Committee (PSC): PSC is established to periodically review and monitor project implementation progress, facilitate co-ordination between project partners, provide transparency and guidance, and ensure support and sustainability of the project results. The representative of the Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE) chairs the PSC meeting. PSC are composed of the representatives from key project partners:

- State Government of Uttarakhand such as Uttarakhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (UREDA) and Uttarakhand Irrigation Department;
- Alternate Hydro Energy Centre - Indian Institute of Technology (AHEC-IITR);
- Donor government (Government of Japan) and donor agency (NEDO);
- UNIDO;

Counterparts and beneficiaries contribute to the project such as labour, land, office space, funding opportunities for events and project activities, assets etc.

Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE):

Provision of national-wide expertise on renewable energy application for productive uses and co-financing support for the project;

State Government of Uttarakhand:

State government body such as Uttarakhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (UREDA) and Uttarakhand Irrigation Department will provide local expertise and support for the selection of pilot sites, demonstration of mini grid systems, authorization, provision of land and office, training activities at the site, public awareness raising, and regional policy promotion;

Community:

Provision of in-kind support for labour, productive assets, equipment etc for the demonstration of mini grid system for productive uses;

6. Budget information

The Government of Japan - Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) has released 1,000,000 Euro for the project implementation through UNIDO in cooperation with Ministry of Economy, Trade & Industry Japan (METI). UNIDO will also contribute 60,000 Euro (From UNIDO) to the project to secure the UNIDO mandate to develop business models based on mini grids for access to energy and productive activity. The estimated budget is presented below.

Budget Line	Item	Amount (EUR)		
		Output 1	Output 2	Total
11-01	International Consultants	24,000	24,000	48,000
15-00	Local Travel	12,000	12,000	24,000
16-00	Staff Travel	8,000	8,000	16,000
17-00	National Consultants	103,000	90,000	193,000
21-01	Contractual Services - installation and demonstration of low head microhydro power technology	410,000	0	410,000
30-00	Training programme for micro hydropower technology and mini grids	72,000	72,000	144,000
45-01	Equipments - productive assets	59,000	0	59,000
51-00	Other direct costs (incl. evaluation)	7,000	37,053	44,053
	Subtotal	695,000	243,053	938,053
	Overhead costs (13%)	90,350	31,597	121,947
	Total	785,350	274,650	1,060,000
	Grand Total			1,060,000

Source: Project document

UNIDO budget execution

As of July 2015, about 83% of fund has been obligated excluding reserved fund for Monitoring & Evaluation plan (SAP database, 14 July 2015).

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in January 2013 to the estimated completion date in December 2015. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The evaluator should provide an analysis of the attainment of the project objective(s) and the results. Through its assessments, the ET should enable the Government, counterparts, UNIDO and other stakeholders and donors to verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators. The assessment includes re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in chapter VI.

The TE has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO and the donor that may help for improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The TE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The key question of the terminal evaluation is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve the project objective, i.e. if the project has increased or is likely to increase the access of rural communities to renewable energy for productive uses in the State of Uttarakhand, India for the promotion of new technology.

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects. It will be carried out as an independent in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team leader will liaise with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The evaluator will be required to use different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, based on diverse sources, as necessary: desk studies and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The specific mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The evaluator will develop interview guidelines. Field interviews can take place either in the form of focus-group discussions or one-to-one consultations.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO, output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.), mission-reports, and relevant correspondence;
 - (b) Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees);
 - (c) Financial data generated for the projects and available from UNIDO's internal management systems;
 - (d) Other project-related material produced by the project;

2. Since the project document contains a project results framework (included in annex of the TOR), the evaluator will assess performance against this framework. The validity of the theory of change will be re-examined through specific questions in the interviews and, possibly, through a survey of relevant parties involved in the project.
3. Counter-factual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available, the evaluation team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.
4. Interviews at UNIDO HQ to project management and technical support staff, and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.
5. A field mission to the project sites, which will include interviews to local governments, beneficiaries, local donor office/donor agency, UNIDO Field Office and the local project management members.
6. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or UNIDO ODG/EVA.
7. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix.

IV. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as a team leader and one national evaluation consultant.

Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions attached to these terms of reference.

Members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the programme/projects.

The Project Manager at UNIDO and the Project Team in India will support the evaluation team.

V. Time schedule

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in the period from September 2015 to November 2015. The field mission is planned for beginning of October 2015 (tentatively).

After the field mission, the evaluation team leader will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the Terminal Evaluation. The draft TE report will be submitted 4-6 weeks after the end of the mission.

VI. Project evaluation parameters

The evaluation team will rate the projects. The **ratings for the parameters described in the following sub-chapters A to J will be presented in the form of a table** with each of the categories rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in annexes.

A. Project design

The evaluation will examine the extent to which:

- the project's design is adequate to address the problems at hand;
- a participatory project identification process was instrumental in selecting problem areas and national counterparts;
- the project has a clear thematically focused development objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators;
- the project was formulated based on the logical framework (project results framework) approach;
- the project was formulated with the participation of national counterpart and/or target beneficiaries;
- relevant country representatives (from government, industries and civil society) have been appropriately involved and were participating in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies;

B. Project relevance

The evaluation will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

- National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and the population, and regional and international agreements. See possible evaluation questions under "Country ownership/drivenness" below.
- Target groups: relevance of the project's objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g. companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training, etc.).
- UNIDO's thematic priorities: Were they in line with UNIDO's mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the Programme & Budget and core competencies?
- Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment? Is there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context?

C. Effectiveness: Objectives and final results at the end of the project

- The evaluation will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes, have been achieved. In detail, the following issues will be assessed: To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from the project.
- How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
- What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Identify actual and/or potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below "monitoring of long term changes"). Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported in future.
- Describe any catalytic or replication effects: the evaluation will describe any catalytic or replication effect both within and outside the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project's catalytic role.

D. Efficiency

The extent to which:

- The project cost was effective? Was the project using the most cost-efficient options?
- Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects. Are the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets?
- Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?
- Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors' projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?

E. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes

Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Assessment of sustainability of outcomes will be given special attention but also technical, financial and organization sustainability will be reviewed. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

- **Financial risks.** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once UNIDO assistance ends? (Such resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors or income-generating activities; these can also include trends that indicate the likelihood that, in future, there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes.) Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?
- **Sociopolitical risks.** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- **Institutional framework and governance risks.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency and required technical know-how in place?
- **Environmental risks.** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to affect the environment, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems

- **M&E design.** Did the project have an M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the Project M&E plan (see annex 3).

- **M&E plan implementation.** The evaluation should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and the project had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Was monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts? Are there any annual work plans? Was any steering or advisory mechanism put in place? Did reporting and performance reviews take place regularly?
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was adequately funded and in a timely manner during implementation.

G. Monitoring of long-term changes

The M&E of long-term changes is often incorporated in UNIDO projects as a separate component and may include determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the evaluation report will describe project actions and accomplishments towards establishing a long-term monitoring system. The evaluation will address the following questions:

- a. Did the project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
- b. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?
- c. Is the system sustainable—that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?
- d. Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?

H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results

Among other factors, when relevant, the evaluation will consider a number of issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. The assessment of these issues can be integrated into the analyses of project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and management as the evaluators deem them appropriate (it is not necessary, however it is possible to have a separate chapter on these aspects in the evaluation report). The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected project implementation and achievement of project results:

- a. **Preparation and readiness / Quality at entry.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- b. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country—or of participating countries, in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or governments in the case of multi-country projects—approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives?

- c. **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved? Which stakeholders were involved in the project (i.e. NGOs, private sector, other UN Agencies, etc.) and what were their immediate tasks? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions?
- d. **Financial planning.** Did the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize? Specifically, the evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.
- e. **UNIDO's supervision and backstopping.** Did UNIDO staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did UNIDO staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? Did UNIDO provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?
- f. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually realized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- g. **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- h. **Implementation approach.** Is the implementation approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks?

The evaluation team will rate the project performance. The ratings will be given to four criteria: Project Results, Sustainability, Monitoring and Evaluation, and UNIDO related issues as specified in Annex 2. The ratings will be presented in a table with each of the categories rated separately and with brief justifications for the rating based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in the same annex.

I. Project coordination and management

The extent to which:

- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)?

- The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?

J. Assessment of gender mainstreaming

The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected gender mainstreaming in the project:

- To which extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

The checklist of gender mainstreaming for projects is listed in Annex.

VII. Reporting

Inception report

This Terms of Reference (ToR) provides some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the International Evaluation Consultant will prepare, in collaboration with the national consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the ToR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Officer. The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the International Evaluation Consultant and National Consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable¹.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation–ODG/EVA (the suggested report outline is in Annex 1) and circulated to UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to UNIDO OGD/EVA for collation and onward transmission to the project evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

The evaluator will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feed-back in preparing the evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ after the field mission.

The TE report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

¹ The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation.

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in Annex 1.

Evaluation work plan

The “Evaluation Work Plan” includes the following main products:

1. Desk review, briefing by project manager and development of methodology: Following the receipt of all relevant documents, and consultation with the Project Manager about the documentation, including reaching an agreement on the methodology, the desk review could be completed.
2. Inception report: At the time of departure to the field mission, all the received material has been reviewed and consolidated into the Inception report.
3. Field mission: The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNIDO. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field missions, coordinate with the Government. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of preliminary findings to the key stakeholders in the country where the project was implemented.
4. Preliminary findings from the field mission: Following the field mission, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations would be prepared and presented in the field and at UNIDO Headquarters.
5. A draft terminal evaluation report will be forwarded electronically to the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and circulated to main stakeholders.
6. Final terminal evaluation report will incorporate comments received.

Evaluation phases	Deliverables
Desk review	Development of methodology approach and evaluation tools
Briefing with UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, Project Managers and other key stakeholder at HQ	Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during field mission
Data analysis	Inception Evaluation Report
Field mission Present preliminary findings and recommendations to key stakeholders in the field	Presentation of main findings to key stakeholders in the field.
Debriefing at UNIDO HQ	Present preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ Additional interviews and analysis
Analysis of the data collected	Draft Terminal Evaluation Report
Circulation of the draft report to UNIDO/relevant stakeholders and revision	Final Terminal Evaluation Report

VIII. Quality assurance

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO’s Office for Independent Evaluation, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by the Office for Independent Evaluation). The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality,

attached as annex 4. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO's Office for Independent Evaluation should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, which will submit the final report to the UNIDO Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary

- Must provide a synopsis of the storyline which includes the main evaluation findings and recommendations
- Must present strengths and weaknesses of the project
- Must be self-explanatory and should be maximum 3-4 pages in length

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process

- Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Scope and objectives of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

II. Country and project background

- Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project² and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
 - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
 - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
 - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
 - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
 - Counterpart organization(s)

III. Project assessment

This is the key chapter of the report and should address all evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the TOR (see section VI Project Evaluation Parameters). Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from different sources. The evaluators' assessment can be broken into the following sections:

- A. Design
- B. Relevance (Report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries)
- C. Effectiveness (The extent to which the development intervention's objectives and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
- D. Efficiency (Report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner countries' contribution to the achievement of project objectives)
- E. Sustainability of project outcomes (Report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
- F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (Report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
- G. Monitoring of long-term changes
- H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (Report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability, delays of project outcomes and sustainability, and implementation approach)

² Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

- I. Project coordination and management (Report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)
- J. Gender mainstreaming

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed as required in Annex 2.

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

This section should include a storyline of the main evaluation conclusions related to the project's achievements and shortfalls. It is important to avoid providing a summary based on each and every evaluation criterion. The main conclusions should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the evaluation report.

B. Recommendations

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should:

- be based on evaluation findings
- be realistic and feasible within a project context
- indicate institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible
- be commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
- take resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons learned

- Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the evaluation
- For each lesson, the context from which they are derived should be briefly stated

Annexes should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, including an updated table of expenditures to date, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

Annex 2 - Overall ratings table

Criterion	Evaluator's summary comments	Evaluator's rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating), sub criteria (below)		
Design		
Effectiveness		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
Financial risks		
Sociopolitical risks		
Institutional framework and governance risks		
Environmental risks		
Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
M&E Design		
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
Project management		
UNIDO specific ratings		
Quality at entry / Preparation and readiness		
Implementation approach		
UNIDO Supervision and backstopping		
Overall rating		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

- Highly satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Moderately satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Highly unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits beyond project completion. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

- Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The project M&E system will be rated on **M&E Design, M&E Plan Implementation and Budgeting and funding for M&E activities** as follows:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Highly unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

M&E plan implementation will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on M&E plan implementation.

All other ratings will be on the six point scale:

HS	= Highly satisfactory	Excellent
S	= Satisfactory	Well above average
MS	= Moderately satisfactory	Average
MU	= Moderately unsatisfactory	Below average
U	= Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU	= Highly unsatisfactory	Very poor (appalling)

Annex 3 - Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO project:

PROJECT TITLE:

PROJECT NUMBER:

CHECKLIST ON EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY

Report Quality Criteria	UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation Assessment notes	Rating
A. The terminal evaluation report presented an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable.		
B. The terminal evaluation report was consistent, the evidence presented was complete and convincing, and the ratings were well substantiated.		
C. The terminal evaluation report presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes.		
D. The lessons and recommendations listed in the terminal evaluation report are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the future projects.		
E. The terminal evaluation report included the actual project costs (totals, per activity, and per source) and actual co-financing used.		
F. The terminal evaluation report included an assessment of the quality of the M&E plan at entry, the operation of the M&E system used during implementation, and the extent M&E was sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation.		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

Annex 4 – Job descriptions



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Title:	International evaluation consultant (team leader)
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home based
Mission/s to:	Missions to Vienna, Austria and India
Start of Contract (EOD):	1 September 2015
End of Contract (COB):	30 November 2015
Number of Working Days:	26-30 working days spread over 3 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The overall objective of this micro-hydro project entitled - Promoting ultra-low-head micro hydropower mini grids to increase access to energy for productive uses in rural India, is to increase the access of rural communities to renewable energy for productive uses in the State of Uttarakhand, India. The expected results are to install and make operational ultra low-head micro hydropower (ULH-MHP) mini-grid systems, which can generate electricity with a valid head of 1.0-3.0 m and the flow volume of 1.0-3.0 m³/s. The project takes places in collaboration with India and Japan and aims to create a favourable environment for future local technology deployment. During two years of project period, three main activities are targeted: 1) Demonstration of mini-grid systems for productive uses using ultra low-head micro hydropower technology; 2) Local capacity building of micro hydropower technology with institutional networking; and 3) Awareness raising and creating market and investment opportunities to mainstream the innovative energy solutions.

The project is managed and implemented by UNIDO and directly executed by the Project Execution Unit (PEU), which has been established in the project region - State Uttarakhand.

Detailed background information of the project can be found the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the terminal evaluation.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
<p>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument of 3A accordingly (if needed);</p> <p>Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyse other background info.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; - Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; - Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory frameworks. 	5 days	Home-based
<p>2. Briefing with the project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ;</p> <p>Preparation of the Inception Report;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; - Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant; - Inception report 	2 days	Vienna, Austria
<p>3. Conduct field mission to India in October 2015³;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; - Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; - Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the missions. 	7 days	India
<p>4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed; 	1 days	Vienna, Austria
<p>5. Prepare the evaluation report according to TOR;</p> <p>Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report 	8 days	Home-based

³ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts. Two or all three missions may be carried out consecutively.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report			
6. Finalize evaluation report, on basis of comments and suggestions received through evaluation manager	• Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager	5 days	Home-based
	Total	26 days*	

* NOTE: Please confirm the total duration can vary between 26 to 30 days, depending on the length of the field visit and the time required by the consultant in preparation of the evaluation.

MINIMUM ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced degree in environment, energy, engineering, development studies or related areas.

Technical and Functional Experience:

- A minimum of 10 year experience in environmental project;
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development;
- Knowledge of and experience in environmental projects management and/or evaluation (of development projects);
- Working experience in developing countries;
- Experience in rural energy and technology transfer desirable;
- Working experience in India an asset;
- Knowledge of UNIDO activities and experience in evaluation of UNIDO projects and an asset;

Languages:

Fluency in written, editing and spoken English is required.

Reporting and deliverables:

- 1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept Table of Contents;
- 2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:
 - Presentation of initial findings of the mission;
 - Draft report;
 - Final report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations.
- 3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:
 - Presentation and discussion of findings;
 - Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the evaluation report.

All reports and related documents must be in English and presented in electronic format.

Absence of conflict of interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a

declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT
(ISA)**

Title:	National evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home based
Mission/s to:	Travel to potential sites within India
Start of Contract (EOD):	1 September 2015
End of Contract (COB):	30 November 2015
Number of Working Days:	25 working days spread over 3 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The national evaluation consultant will evaluate the project according to the terms of reference under the leadership of the team leader (International evaluation consultant). S/he will perform the following tasks:

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working days	Location
7. Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); in cooperation with the Team Leader: determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in both English and local language (questionnaires, logic models) to collect these data through interviews and/or surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; · Drafting and presentation of brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project; 	5 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working days	Location
<p>during and prior to the field missions;</p> <p>Coordinate and lead interviews/ surveys in local language and assist the Team Leader with translation where necessary;</p> <p>Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework in India, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets; provide analysis and advice to the Team Leader on existing and appropriate policies for India for input to the terminal evaluation.</p>			
<p>8. Review all project outputs/ publications/feedback;</p> <p>Briefing with the evaluation team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders;</p> <p>Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with the Project Management Unit;</p> <p>Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the Team Leader in the Preparation of the Inception Report;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; · Division of evaluation tasks with the Team Leader; · Inception Report; 	5 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
<p>9. Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the Team Leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required;</p> <p>Consult with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission; · Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; 	7 days (including travel days)	India

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working days	Location
10. Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the Team Leader;	• Draft evaluation report prepared;	6 days	Vienna, Austria
11. Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from all stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards;	• Final evaluation report prepared	2 days	Home-based
	Total	25 days*	

* NOTE: Please confirm the total duration can vary between 23 to 25 days, depending on the length of the field visit and the time required by the consultant in preparation of the evaluation.

MINIMUM ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in environment, energy, engineering, development studies or related areas.

Technical and functional experience:

- A minimum of 5 years practical experience in the field of environment, energy, and technology transfer including evaluation experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries.;
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries;
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project in the Ministry and State Government is desirable.

Languages:

Fluency in written, editing and spoken English and local language (Hindi) is required.

Absence of conflict of interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

Annex 5 – Project results framework

RESULTS	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS & RISKS
EXPECTED IMPACT			
Increased access of rural communities to renewable energy for productive uses in the State of Uttarakhand, India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of enterprises and households connected to mini grids; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodical statistical data collected by the state government 	
OUTCOME 1			
Technology of Ultra Low Head Micro Hydro Power (ULH-MHP) successfully demonstrated and deployed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> kWh of renewable energy generated from ULH-MHP; Key stakeholders (e.g. local operators of ULH-MHP) report that they are able to operate and maintain the systems by themselves; Local stakeholders' willingness to apply the technology (yes/no); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical surveys during the project implementation; Feedback from key local stakeholders; Project progress report; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The system is installed successfully and ready for demonstration at the site
OUTPUT 1			
ULH-MHP (Ultra Low Head Micro Hydro Power) system installed and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 ULH-MHP systems with the capacity of 30 kW installed and functional; # of local people trained to operate and maintain the systems (gender-disaggregated); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The system designed properly suitable for local condition; Installation completed on scheduled timeline;
OUTCOME 2			
Favourable environment created for ULH-MHP technology deployment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which RE policy and regulation recommendations are adopted (rating of 0 to 4); Extent to which the local capacity to produce ULH-MHP turbine units and spare parts, to develop R&D for ULH-MHP, to deploy ULH-MHP technology are enhanced (rating of 0 to 4); Increased investment into ULH-MHP systems; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project progress report; Key stakeholders survey, observations of experts; feedback from key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The demonstrated system is in function for electricity supply; Local skills for maintenance and manufacturing built through training activities;

OUTPUT 2			
<p>Advisory support to create a favourable environment for ULH-MHP technology deployment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of a review of policy, legal and regulatory framework for development of/ investment in renewable energy; • Availability of a RE policy paper with policy and regulation recommendations; • Business models developed for operating ULH-MHP system; • # of training courses on operation, local manufacturing and R&D of ULH-MHP with AHEC-IITR; • # of workshops for business partnership development; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demonstrated system is in function for electricity supply; • Mutual agreement between technology provider and local institutions is established;

Annex 6 – Gender mainstreaming checklist for UNIDO energy-related project⁴

	Question	Yes	No	Partially
ANALYSIS/ JUSTIFICATION	1. Does the project explicitly address a gender issue or issues? If so, please describe how and if not, please provide an explanation.			
	2. Does the background/context analysis of the project examine: (a) the different situations of women and men (b) the impacts the project will have on different groups			
DATA AND STATISTICS	3. Will the project collect and use sex disaggregated data and qualitative information to analyse and track gender issues?			
RESULTS FRAMEWORK	4. Are outcomes, outputs and activities designed to meet the different needs and priorities of women and men?			
	5. Does the results framework include gender responsive indicators, targets and a baseline to monitor gender equality results?			
BUDGET	6. Have adequate financial resources been allocated for the proposed gender activities (vis-à-vis per cent of total budget)?			
STAKEHOLDERS AND PARTICIPATION	7. Are women/gender focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/included in the project?			
	8. Does the project ensure that both women and men can provide inputs, access and participate in project activities (target at least 40 per cent of whichever sex is underrepresented)?			
GENDER CAPACITIES	9. Has a gender expert been recruited or do the project staff have gender knowledge and have gender related tasks incorporated in their job descriptions?			
	10. Will all project staff be sensitized to gender (e.g. staff will complete a basic online course ; staff will complete a basic online course; I Know Gender Course on UN Women's eLearning Campus https://trainingcentre.unwomen.org/)?			
IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS	11. Is there gender balanced recruitment of project personnel and gender balanced representation in project committees?			
MONITORING AND EVALUATION	12. Will the monitoring and evaluation of the project cover gender issues and monitor behavioural changes towards greater gender equality?			

⁴ See Guide On Gender Mainstreaming Energy And Climate Change Projects (UNIDO, 2014) http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media_upgrade/What_we_do/Topics/Women_and_Youth/Guide_on_Gender_Mainstreaming_ECC.pdf