United Nations Development Programme

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Job title:	A team of one International Consultant and one National Consultant for Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Outcome Evaluation, Moldova United Nations Partnership Framework/ Country Programme Document 2013-2017
Duty station:	Chisinau, Republic of Moldova
Contract type:	Individual Contract (IC)
Duration of Employment:	September-December 2016
Expected workload	International consultant- 30 days (5 in country, 25 home-based) National consultant – 25 days
Starting date:	26 September 2016

A. BRIEF NATIONAL and PROGRAMME CONTEXT

Environment, climate change and disaster risk reduction are identified in the current 2013-2017 United Nations-Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework "Towards Unity in Action" (UNPF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document(CPD) cycle as one of the priority areas of concern towards achievement of the major development priorities set by Moldova while implementing its vision to be a prosperous and modern European country in line with the 2014 EU-Moldova Association Agreement.

Due to its dependence on the agriculture which employs almost 40% of the people and from which 12% of GDP derives, Moldova is highly vulnerable to climate variability and change. The projections show that an increase in temperatures and intensity of extreme events is expected in the future in the country, as well as changes in the precipitation patterns. The National Adaptation Strategy adopted in 2014 is intended to increase national capacity to adapt and respond to the climate change-related threats, but also lays the foundation for mainstreaming of climate change consideration across sectors.

Further, the country is party to the Convention on Climate Change since 1995, and it joined the Kyoto Protocol in 2003. In line with the provisions of the given Convention, the Republic of Moldova is part of the group of non-annexed countries which are not bound to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but may benefit from support offered by developed countries for the implementation of technologies with an advanced level of energy efficiency and reduced GHG emissions.

The Republic of Moldova associated itself with the Copenhagen Accord (COP 2009) and through the submitted Intended Nationally Determined Contributions, it aims to achieve a country-wide unconditional target to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 64-67 percent below its 1990 level in 2030. The reduction target could be increased to 78 percent below the 1990 level, conditional to a global agreement on low-cost financial resources, technology transfer and technological cooperation. The country expressed its intention to sign the Paris Agreement in autumn 2016 creating a momentum for further domestic actions

towards low-carbon and climate-resilient future.

Moldova lacks its own energy resources with 95% of energy consumption being covered from imports. The energy efficiency is 3 times higher than the EU average and the residential area is the main energy consumer (44%), followed by transport (18%) and industry (13%). Energy sector is also the main source of GHG emissions, with a share ranging between 67.3% to 79.8% over 1990-201. As such, being a member of the Energy Community since 2010, it committed to ensure sustainable development of the energy sector, by increasing interconnectedness of power and gas lines and of the renewable energy in the total energy mix by 20% in 2020. The country also targets to reduce energy efficiency by 10% in 2020.

Moldova is also confronting with environmental degradation, pollution and unsustainable use of natural resources which impede Moldova's development agenda. The country has the lowest forest coverage in Europe of only 11.1% and scarce grassland ecosystem identified in 2% of the natural and semi-natural habitats. Although creation of the National Park Orhei has increased the representativeness of protected areas system in Moldova from 4.58 to 5.5% in 2013, the coverage rate is far below the existing European average. Biodiversity degradation and loss is further recognised as a development challenge in the 2014 National Environmental Strategy, urging for scaling-up of financial flows in this area and also for strengthened policy coherence in support to cross-sectoral biodiversity mainstreaming.

The country lacks a comprehensive national strategy and institutional framework for disaster risk management. The national and local capacities for disaster preparedness for response are limited as well as understanding of disaster risk in all its dimensions which makes for the climate change and disaster risk management to be approached in isolation.

Overall, the environmental sector is still not recognised as a priority and continues to be underfinanced with week linkage between strategic and finance planning.

Against this background the UNPF and UNDP Country Programme Document 2013 – 2017 response is aimed at supporting the Government of Moldova in strengthening policies and capacities for sustainable and resilient management of the environment and natural resources and adaptation to climate change at all levels, but also in implementation of country's priorities and European integration objectives in the area of energy and disaster risk reduction. Results achieved with UNDP assistance will contribute to the achievement of UNPF/CPD *Outcome 3.1. which refers to improved environmental management in significantly increased compliance with international and regional standards* and *Outcome 3.2. focusing on strengthening national policies and capacities which enable climate and disaster resilient, low emission economic development and sustainable consumption.* These interventions are implemented with donor co-funding such as the EU, GEF and Austrian Government in close collaboration with Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Health, Energy Efficiency Agency, Energy Efficiency Fund, Agency Moldsilva, State Hydro-meteorological Service, Civil Protection and Emergency Situation Service, NGOs and CBOs, and LPAs.

B. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation exercise is commissioned according to the UNDP Evaluation Plan for the current CPD and UNPF Action Plan (2013-2017) in the Republic of Moldova. The evaluation covers Outcome 3.1. and Outcome 3.2. of the of the UNPF/CPD 2013 – 2017 and will put a major focus on assessing the impact and overall contribution of the UNDP Environment & Energy Cluster towards progress in achieving *improved environmental management in significantly increased compliance with international and regional standards* and *strengthening of national policies and capacities which enable climate and disaster resilient, low emission economic development and sustainable consumption.* In addition, the evaluation will assess the impact produced so far under the area of intervention, as well as draw conclusions and recommendations for eventual adjustments, and, to extend possible, lessons learnt for further programming and implementation of programme. The evaluator shall also give importance to assessing efficiency and to a

possible extent effectiveness of the UNPF/CPD Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2. whether the size of resources, both financial and human, and partnership strategies continue to be cost-effective and may be applied in continuation and/or revised/changed.

The following Outputs falling under this Outcome, as stated in UNDP CPD 2013 – 2017, are to be part of this evaluation:

CPD/UNPF Outcome	CPD Outputs	UNDP Programmes/Projects
Outcome 3.1: *Improved environmental management in significantly increased compliance with international and regional standards.* **Indicator:** *Surface of protected areas managed in line with international standards.*	**1. Better capacities of institutions for environmental management and planning at all levels, in line with Multilateral Agreements and EU acquis** **Indicator:** Environment Protection Agency established and functional **Baseline:** draft NES foresees creation of EPA **Target:** EPA established and functional. **2. Central, local authorities effectively manage biodiversity/ ecosystem services, biodiversity conservation is integrated in land use and spatial planning** **Indicator:** Surface of protected areas managed in line with international requirements **Baseline:** 4.65% (2011) **Target**: 7 % and in line with international standards **3. Effective information/ participation policies/ mechanisms enable better environment decision-making** **Indicator:** Public information and participation mechanisms in place **Baseline:** None **Target:** Iinformation and participation mechanisms established.	Improving coverage and management effectiveness of the protected areas system in Moldova (2009-2013) National Biodiversity Planning Project to support implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan In Moldova (2012-2014) Strengthening capacities to undertake environmental fiscal reform to meet national and global environmental priorities (2012-2015) Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Moldova's Territorial Planning Policies and Land-Use Practices (2015-2019)
Outcome 3.2: Strengthened national policies and capacities enable climate and disaster- resilient, low emission economic development and sustainable consumption. **Indicator:** Percentage of renewable energy in energy consumption	**1. Stronger national and local capacities to develop and integrate CCA and DRM into policies as well as implement them at all levels.** **2. Enhanced local capacities to address climate and disaster risks and to access risk information and knowledge on adaptation.** **Indicator:** Number of national, sector and local policies/plans adopted/revised with climate change and DRM mainstreamed **Baseline:** 0; **Target:** DRM/CC Strategies adopted; climate screening framework for sector policies adopted and implemented; 100 local plans. **3. Communities, private sector and farmers (including the vulnerable and women) with access and knowledge to use renewable energy sources and green technologies (biomass).**	Implementation of the Hydroclorofluorocarbon (HCFC) Phase-out Management Plan, stage 1 and 2 (2011-2016)) Moldova Disaster and Climate Risk Reduction Project (phase I and II) (2011-2016) Moldova Energy and Biomass Project, phase 1 and 2 (2011-2017) Clima-East: Ecosystem-based adaptation and mitigation (2013-2016) National Climate Change Adaptation Planning (2013-2017) Low Emission Capacity Building Programme (2014-2016) ESCO Moldova- Transforming the market of urban energy efficiency in

	Indicator: Percentage of renewable energy in energy consumption; number of biomass heating installations and biomass producers (disaggregated by gender) **Baseline:** 5%, 30, 0; **Target:** 11%, 200, 20%	Moldova by introducing Energy Service Companies (2014-2018)

C. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This is a summary progress evaluation, aiming to assess the extent to which programme and project activities implemented with partners during 2013-2016 have contributed to the progress under **UNPF/CPD Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2. for UNDP**, as well as to achievement of set targets, whether existing UNDP's partnership arrangements with local partners proved to be successful and relevant and overall whether UNDP-supported activities have contributed to improved management of environmental and natural resources in compliance with international/EU standards. The evaluation shall identify changes that happened within the last 3 years as they relate to the development outcomes, the degree and levels of these changes, i.e. enabling environment, organizational and/or individual levels. It shall also assess whether UNDP's strategic positioning in this area can be improved.

Since this is an evaluation carried out at the end of the development interventions planned for the current UNPF/CPD, the evaluation team shall give greater importance to assessing efficiency and to a possible extent the effectiveness of UNDP's Environment and Energy Portfolio CPD Outcome 3.1. and 3.2., whether the size of resources, both financial and human, and partnership strategies continue to be cost-effective and may be applied in continuation and/or revised/changed.

The evaluation team shall take into account and rank the following items:

- Status of and degree of change in the outcomes, and factors influencing the outcomes
- Level of incurred changes: Enabling environment, Organizational and/or Individual levels
- UNDP strategic positioning on achieving the outcomes
- Relevance of the outcomes and outputs
- Partnership strategy
- Sustainability: whether there is ownership and capacity to maintain and manage development in the outcomes

The International Consultant will work in a team with a national consultant that will provide necessary support, as per the TOR.

The main partners to be involved in the evaluation are: Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Health, Energy Efficiency Agency, Energy Efficiency Fund, Agency Moldsilva, State Hydro-meteorological Service, Civil Protection and Emergency Situation Service, NGOs and CBOs, and LPAs.

Worksheet on Outcome Evaluation: Categories of Analysis/Scope

Category	Notes
Progress to outcome realization	Review indicators and benchmarks to determine extent/degree of contribution in the outcome realization by assessing progresses made to-date vis-à-vis baseline. Focus on the how and why outputs and strategies contributed to achieving outcome. Focus on questions of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact.
Factors affecting outcome	These are social, political and economic factors. As such, the evaluation scope shall be as broad as possible so as to take all factors into account.

UNDP's contribution to outcome	Conduct quantitative and qualitative assessments of contributions from UNDP's interventions vis-à-vis outcome indicator baseline. Assessment should focus on determine the continued validity of the strategies applied to-date by UNDP and so as to decide whether they should be revised and/or changed for the next programming cycle.
Partnership strategy	Determine whether the best possible synergies have been established among partners and the steering role played by UNDP within this context. Assess whether other stakeholders and/or sponsors should be included and/or excluded from the programme in continuation as well as referring to the next phase of CPAP.

Specifically, the outcome evaluation should address, but not be limited to, the following ***questions and issues***:

1. Outcome analysis
   - Are the outcomes and associated projects relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and the UNDP mandate?
   - Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
   - Were there multi-level interventions conducted (environment, organization, individual)? How many?
   - Are the outputs and outcomes leading to benefits beyond the life of the existing projects?
   - Which findings may have relevance for eventual adjustments and/or future programming?
   - Are the stated outcome, indicator and target appropriate for the development situation in Moldova and UNDP's programme of assistance in this field?
   - What is the current status and prospects for achieving the outcome with the indicated inputs and within the indicated timeframe?
   - What are the main factors (positive and negative) within and beyond UNDP's interventions that affected or are affecting the achievement of the outcome? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?
   - Were UNDP's proposed contributions to the achievement of the outcome appropriate, sufficient, effective and sustainable?

2. Output analysis
   - What are the key outputs that have been produced by UNDP to contribute to the outcome?
   - Are the UNDP outputs relevant to the outcome?
   - Are the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link these outputs to the outcome, or is there a need to improve these indicators?
   - Is sufficient progress been made with regard to UNDP outputs?

3. Resources, partnerships, and management analysis
   - Was UNDP's resource mobilization strategy in this field appropriate and effective in achieving this outcome?
   - Was UNDP's partnership strategy in this field appropriate and effective in achieving this outcome?
   - Are UNDP's management structures and working methods appropriate and effective in achieving this outcome?
   - Overall, assess the scope, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of UNDP's resources mobilization, partnership and management arrangements in achieving this outcome.

4. Recommendations
   - Based on the above analysis, recommendations should be providing as to how UNDP should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures for an efficient and effective implementation of the current CPAP and to the extent possible for the next country programming cycle.

To the extent possible, answers to the above questions shall address the implications for women and men, their participation in design and implementation of the outcome and particular programmes and projects in the outcome area, whether the latter had addressed the issues of gender inclusion, equality and empowerment and contributed to strengthening the application of these principles to various development efforts in the country, and how gender issues had been mainstreamed across the outcome area by UN/DP.

Evaluation shall also address the extent to which UNDP had advocated for the principle of equality and inclusive development, and has contributed to empowering and addressing the needs of the disadvantaged and vulnerable population

D. METHODOLOGY

Overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodologies is provided in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results and the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators. Based on these guiding documents, and in consultation with UNDP in Moldova, the evaluators should develop a suitable methodology for this outcome evaluation.

During the outcome evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

- Desk review of relevant documents (project documents with amendments made, review reports - midterm/final, donor-specific, etc);
- Discussions with the Senior Management and programme staff of UNDP Country Offices;
- Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP, and the Government, as well as with other donors and partners
- Interviews with partners and stakeholders (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used); other donors, including European Commission, SIDA, SDC, ADA, WB, etc.
- Field visits to selected project sites and discussions with project teams, project beneficiaries;
- Consultation meetings.

E. DELIVERABLES

The key product expected from the evaluation team is a comprehensive evaluation report that includes, but not limited to the following components: (see the UNDP Guidelines for outcome evaluators for detailed information):

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the interventions
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and method
- Development context
- Data analysis and key findings and conclusions
- Recommendations and lessons learned for the future (including viable project ideas and other recommendations)
- Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.[1]

The international evaluator, with support from the national consultant, should provide a proposed report structure to UNDP prior to the start of fieldwork. The report should be prepared in English. The UNDP Evaluation Focal Team will ensure that report is translated into Romanian. It should take into account the

[1] See the ***UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*** for a detailed guidance on the preparation of an outcome evaluation report.

opinions/voices of people from Moldova, government representatives, donors and NGOs. The evaluators will prepare a presentation of the preliminary findings to be discussed at a roundtable in Chisinau with UNDP and its partners. Consultation process, entirely or in parts, might be undertaken separately by UNDP.

An outline for the future UNDP interventions in the respective area (if still deemed relevant) based on the recommendations of the mission is to be produced. The format of the outline will be agreed between UNDP, and the evaluator prior to the start of the evaluation.

The evaluators are required to discuss the full draft of the evaluation report prior to the mission to Moldova. Both products shall be submitted in electronic form.

Dissemination mechanisms

The results shall be presented at a round-table to all key stakeholders (representatives of Government, relevant Parliamentary Committees, projects and specialized NGOs) and shared through specialized local and regional networks. The final evaluation report will be placed on the UNDP web-site and distributed through regular Government channels to interested parties.

Evaluation ethics

The evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The Evaluation team will take every measure to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key information providers in the collection of data.

F. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATION

For international consultant:

1. Academic Qualification
   - Advanced university degree in environment, energy, disaster risk reduction- related sciences, public administration, international development or other related field;
   - Trainings in project management and monitoring and evaluation is an advantage.
2. Years of experience
   - At least seven years of work experience in the field of environment, energy and disaster risk reduction related sciences, public administration, including participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation;
   - At least three years of proven experience in conducting complex[2] evaluations, especially in the environmental, energy and disaster risk reduction fields;
   - Working experience in subject area's programme and project monitoring and evaluation in the Eastern Europe region is required. .
3. Competencies
   - Good understanding of the environmental, energy and disaster risk reduction issues;
   - Sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation);
   - Proven knowledge of monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures of international organizations and financial institutions;
   - Excellent analytical skills and report writing abilities;
   - Availability to work with UNDP during the indicated period;
   - Good communication skills;
   - Excellent proficiency in English (the knowledge of Russian and Romanian is an advantage);

[2] Complex evaluation here and thereafter is an Evaluation of national multi-stakeholder, multiyear framework and strategic development programmes, including multi-sectorial outputs and activities with potential country and local level impact.

- Proven commitment to the core values of the United Nations, in particular, respecting differences of culture, gender, religion, ethnicity, nationality, language, age, HIV status, disability, and sexual orientation, or other status.

For national consultant:

1. Academic Qualification:
   Advanced university degree in environment, energy and disaster risk reduction related sciences, public administration, international development or other related field.
2. Years of experience:
   - At least 5 years of professional experience/technical knowledge in providing management or consultancy services in the area of environment, energy, disaster risk reduction and/or in other related fields;
   - Demonstrated experience in conducting/supporting evaluations, especially in environment, energy and disaster risk reduction fields;
   - Previous experience with practical use of monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
   - Experience in managing, monitoring and evaluating projects for UN or other international development agencies in the region will be an asset;
3. Competencies:
   - Fluent in English and Romanian both written and spoken. Knowledge of Russian is an advantage;
   - Sound knowledge of national environmental governance framework, including regulatory, and institutional setup;
   - Excellent written and oral communication skills, with analytic capacity and ability to synthesize project outputs and relevant findings for the preparation of analytical documents;
   - Ability to achieve results and deadlines in a timely manner, maintaining a high standard throughout;
   - Proven commitment to the core values of the United Nations, in particular, respecting differences of culture, gender, religion, ethnicity, nationality, language, age, HIV status, disability, and sexual orientation, or other status.

Timeframe

The detailed schedule of the evaluation and the length of the assignment will be discussed with the evaluation team prior to the assignment. The estimated duration of evaluators' assignment is up to 30 working days for the international consultant and 25 working days for the national consultant. The final evaluation report should be delivered by December 1, 2016.

G. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The International consultant will work in a team with a local consultant that will help with the analysis and research of the available relevant documentation, with setting up the meetings with the external actors and with the needed ad-hoc translations/ interpretation. To facilitate the outcome evaluation process, UNDP Moldova will set up an Evaluation Focal Team (EFT). The EFT with support from the Environment and Energy Portfolio Manager will assist in connecting the evaluation team with the senior management, and key stakeholders. In addition, the EFT will assist in developing a detailed evaluation plan; conduct field visits; and organize meetings. During the evaluation, the EFT will help identify key partners for interviews by the evaluation team. However, the evaluation will be fully independent and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analysing data for the outcome evaluation.

Indicative Schedule

Activity/Deliverables for the international consultant	**Activity/Deliverables for the national consultant**	**Place**
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan 2 days	Provide inputs to the methodology and work plan 2 days	On-line
Desk review (home-based) 5 days	Background materials for the international consultant collected 3 days	On-line
Visit to Moldova: Project site visits, interviews with partners and key stakeholders conducted. Summary key findings presented to the UNDP CO 5 days	Field visits and meetings with relevant parties for the International Consultant arranged. Participation in the meetings and follow-up on agreed actions 7 days	In Chisinau
Preparation and submission of 1st draft of the evaluation report 10 days	Inputs to the draft Evaluation Report provided. 6 days	On-line
On-line presentation of the evaluation report; incorporation of comments 4 days	Presentation of the Outcome evaluation report to UNDP and key stakeholders. Collection of comments and inputs for final adjustment of the report 5 days	On-line
Finalization of evaluation report. Final Outcome Evaluation report submitted and approved 4 days	Inputs to the final evaluation report and provided. 2 days	On-line
Total estimated number of working days - 30	Total estimated number of working days- 25	

A. DOCUMENTS FOR STUDY BY THE EVALUATOR

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results
2. UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
3. Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP
4. UNDP Result-Based Management: Technical Note
5. Government's Activity Program 2011-2014 and 2015-2018
6. Moldova National Development Strategy 2020
7. Development Partners' Briefing Book for the Government of Moldova
8. Project documents and progress reports, project evaluation reports
9. UNDP Assessment of Development Results, 2012
10. United Nations – Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework (UNPF) "Towards Unity in Action" (2013 – 2017)
11. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 - 2017