

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

BACKGROUND

UNDP BiH, with the support of the Swedish International Cooperation Development Agency (SIDA), Environmental Fund of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund of RS and Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BiH, has been implementing the Green Economic Development Project (GED) since 2014. These terms of reference provide the overall framework for conducting an evaluation of this Project, as the part of Project financed by Sweden comes to a close in December 2017. The purpose of the Mid-term Project evaluation is to assess progress made against planned objectives, identify lessons learned, and make strategic recommendations for future decision-making in the area of energy efficiency in public sector buildings, both for UNDP, SIDA and local stakeholders. The evaluation should be conducted by a professional service provider over a period of 45 days from July to September 2017.

Project Description and background

From an energy consumption perspective, Bosnia and Herzegovina is characterized as a country with very high inefficiency within the residential, non-residential/public, industry and service sector. At the same time however, Bosnia and Herzegovina has one of the most significant energy conservation potentials in the region and could base its further mid-term economic development and generation of new employment on energy efficiency improvement measures in the residential and public sector. Currently, BiH consumes about 20% of its GDP on energy, which is three times higher than in the U.S. and EU countries. According to the Report “Regular Review of Energy Efficiency Strategies in BiH” prepared under the obligations of the Energy Charter Treaty, gross total primary energy consumed per unit of GDP is 0.938 toe / USD 2000, which is 2.5 times the average of 27 EU countries and higher than almost any other country in the SEE region. Moreover, the average energy consumption of a public building in Bosnia and Herzegovina is three times higher than the EU average, categorizing them as *completely energy inefficient buildings* (in accordance to EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme – EMAS). In order to meet this energy intensive consumption demand, a significant amount of budget funds must be allocated for energy expenditures of public buildings (educational, health, cultural, municipal and entity/state institutions etc.) representing a major proportion of the already inadequate public budget.

Therefore, In 2013 UNDP signed agreement with the Environmental Fund of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) on implementation of five year (2014-2018) Green Economic Development (GED) Programme. Afterwards the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BiH and Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund of Republika Srpska joined the Programm as partners. The donor of the GED Project is the Government of Sweden.

The GED Project aims to institutionalize the energy management activities within the public sector buildings in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Those activities are in line with EU directives ([Energy Efficiency Directive](#), [EPBD directive](#)), and the Energy Community Treaty. At the beginning of the Project, local authorities and relevant ministries lacked human and financial resources to cover these actions. Therefore, focus was made towards cantonal and entity governments, as a first step towards institutionalization of energy management and Energy Efficiency Action Plans in the public sector.

The main Project goal is to create favorable conditions for investments into energy efficiency measures while contributing to market development and economic progress of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The GED Project has five components:

- **Strengthen institutional capacities** - capacity building and technical assistance to the Environmental Funds along with the establishment of the Association of Thermal Power Engineers.
- **Institutionalization of the energy management** - introduce the EMIS system in public buildings, educate end users, monitor the achieved savings, and create a legal obligation on the monitoring of consumption in public buildings.
- **Establish a legislative framework** - creation of bylaws and financial mechanisms with the Environmental Protection Funds to create a sustainable system of financing of projects in the field of energy efficiency.
- **Implement infrastructural measures** - contribute to energy savings, employment of local workforce, increase comfort in public buildings, create savings in the budgets, and reinvest saved funds.
- **Raise public awareness about energy efficiency** - educate citizens and youth about energy efficiency measures and energy saving tips.

Out of five GED Project Components (PC) SWEDEN is effectively contributing and creates add-value on Capacity building (PC 1), Infrastructure EE measures (PC 4) and Public awareness (PC 5) components.

The outcomes of the project are reflected in financial savings of budgetary beneficiaries, generation of „green jobs“ and reinvestments of the accumulated savings.

Overall Objective of the Assignment

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) should provide an impartial view of the Green Economic Development (GED) Project's approach, strategy and performance for the past three years. It will assess the Project's operational aspects, such as Project management and quality of implementation, as well as the extent to which the Project objectives or targets are being fulfilled. By looking at corrective actions needed for the Project to achieve impact, the MTE is to provide guidance for UNDP Project management and stakeholders on how to consolidate the Project delivery for the remaining Project duration, including its sustainability and scaling up perspectives. For this purpose, a Service Provider will be contracted.

The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and tenderers shall elaborate on how this will be ensured during the evaluation process. Other stakeholders that should be kept informed about the evaluation include:

- Environmental Fund of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund of RS
- Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BiH
- Swedish International Cooperation Development Agency (SIDA),

Specifically, the MTE is intended to assess Project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, as well as to identify lessons learned from implementation to date in order to provide an

objective assessment for the Project implementer and the Project Board. To this end, the evaluation is expected to:

- Enhance the likelihood of achievement of Project objectives by analyzing strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
- Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the Project;
- Enable informed decision-making;
- Enhance organizational and development learning;
- Set the foundations for the Project's sustainability or scaling-up;
- Suggest and provide insights into possible follow up activities.

SCOPE OF WORK

A fair knowledge and understanding of the Project's context and operating environment will be required. In keeping with SIDA and UNDP priorities, a human-rights based approach and gender should be taken into consideration across all evaluation criteria as well as multidimensional poverty aspect. The evaluation will assess a number of elements to determine the Project's achievements and constraints, performance, results, impact, relevance and sustainability.

Main evaluation criteria of the Mid-Term Project Evaluation

The Mid-Term Project Evaluation will answer the following questions:

Relevance

- To what extent are the Project's objectives and outputs still **relevant to the needs of the country and beneficiaries**? Was the design of the Project appropriate for reaching its results and outcomes?
- What changes could be made to make this intervention more relevant? Were the unique needs of girls and boys taken into consideration / to what extent was gender equality respected and mainstreamed within the project implementation?
- Has the project's ToC inscribed a clear pathway of how the project contributes to outcome level change as specified in the programme/CPD, backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context?
- Has the project pro-actively taken advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities?

Effectiveness (results)

- Which are the Project **highlight achievements** so far? To what extent has the Project **achieved its intended results**, as envisioned by the Annual Work plan as well as Results and Resource Framework? How well project achievements contribute to the achievement of programme's objectives?
- To which extent have the Project's actions contributed to intended outcomes of the requisite **quality** and are they **effective and efficient**? If so, why? If not, why not? Can the costs for the project be justified by its results?
- What are the gaps left to achieve the set targets and is the current performance pace sufficient to do so? What are the underlying causes of eventual underperformance / delays and the key drivers of success?

- How effective is the Project's interaction with other interventions in BiH (by other actors in the field of energy efficiency and energy management), to trigger synergies with the purpose of maximizing development results?
- What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified?
- What is the quality of interventions and results achieved on local/municipality/Cantonal/Entity/BiH level?
- Have any changes in the overall context in BiH (political situation, emergency/floods) affected Project implementation and overall results

Efficiency (processes):

- To what extent has support to governments and institutions as implementing partners been an efficient implementation modality?
- To what extent have the target group and participants taken an active role in implementing the Project? What modes of participation have taken place?
- How efficient are institutions in supporting the implementation?
- To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled and with the planned financial resources?
- Are there any duplication of efforts in terms of other initiatives within local and international community?

Sustainability

- Is it likely that the benefits of the project are **sustainable**? To what extent has the Project approach (intervention strategy) managed to create **ownership and meaningful participation of the key stakeholders in Project implementation**? What are, in this regard, challenges to be overcome or potentials to be unlocked?
- To what extent are key **stakeholders/final beneficiaries satisfied** with the Project implementation so far, specifically in terms of the partnership support and what are specific expectations for the remaining duration of the Project? Which are the main benefits - in qualitative and quantitative terms – for final Project beneficiaries?
- At this stage of Project implementation, what could be possible **after-Project priority interventions and general recommendations**, which could further ensure sustainability and scaling up of Project's achievements?

Programme Impact:

- What is the overall impact of the project in terms of direct or indirect, negative and positive results? Which target groups and institutions benefit from the Project?
- What are the positive or negative, **intended or unintended, changes** brought about by the Project interventions so far? This may, inter alia, include an overview of the number of beneficiaries benefiting from improved service delivery or number of new jobs created/retained etc. What are the key **lessons** to be drawn at this point of the Project implementation? What are the main **recommendations for the remaining duration** of the Project?
- How have cross-cutting issues, such as gender, disability, and reaching the most vulnerable children, been effectively taken up?

- How have energy efficiency standards been advanced through the Project activities?
- Were there positive spill-over effects in terms of providing basis for new initiatives and projects?

Partnerships and cooperation:

- How effective is the **Project's interaction with other interventions** in BiH (by other actors in the field of energy efficiency and energy management), to trigger synergies maximizing development results?
- Were efficient and mutually satisfactory cooperation arrangements established between UNDP and other partners? Other agencies? Governmental institutions?
- Were partners' inputs of quality and provided in a timely manner? Have partners fully and effectively discharged their responsibilities?
- Have any new partners emerged that were not initially identified?

The evaluation shall further assess:

- If the programme has had any positive or negative effects on gender equality? Could gender mainstreaming have been improved in planning, implementation or follow up?
- If the programme has been implemented in accordance with a human rights perspective: i.e. Have target groups been participating in project planning, implementations and follow up? Has anyone been discriminated by the project through its implementation? Has the project been implemented in a transparent fashion? Are there accountability mechanisms in the project?
- To what extent is poverty, in its different dimensions, addressed in the design, implementation and follow up of the intervention? What/which dimensions are addressed? How could the intervention be strengthened so that poverty reduction is more explicitly addressed?
- Have communication and outreach of the Project been satisfactory?

Proposal for next phase project

- How the proposed programme document for the next phase embeds findings from the current phase? Any suggestions and recommendations?

Evaluation questions are expected to be developed further in proposal and further developed during the inception phase of the evaluation.

c) Methodology

The methodology to be used is based on the UNDP Evaluation Policy available at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml> .

The proposed methodology consists of a preliminary desk review, key informant interviews followed by field visits and the report write up. Focus groups will serve the purpose of collecting the feedback of end beneficiaries.

The Service provider will elaborate on suggested methodology, and give additional proposals how the final methodology should incorporate all necessary elements.

The Service provider is required to review the GED Project Document, the inception report (if applicable), progress and annual reports, key Project deliverables, monitoring tools, national and strategic documents and other relevant documents that the team considers relevant for this evidence-based review. The briefing kit will be prepared by the GED Project.

The Service provider is expected to meet UNDP Country Office management for an initial briefing and the debriefing at the end of the assignment. They are expected to interview the GED project team, partners as well as other stakeholders as needed. To assess project approach and modalities, they will meet representatives of the Environmental Fund of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund of RS, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BiH, international agencies/institutions and representatives of the Swedish International Cooperation Development Agency (SIDA),

The service provider will meet with representatives of other agencies active in the field of EE to assess their cooperation with GED Project, if needed.

Additionally, to assess Project performance, approach and modalities the Service provider is expected to conduct at least 4 field missions, where the Service provider will meet project beneficiaries, so as to obtain critical feedback and information on the Project activities and results at the local level and assess the Project performance and its approach and modalities. During these meetings, it would be important to record and accumulate inputs necessary not only for the Project MTE, but for potential follow-up intervention in the relevant field. Once collected, this data will be analyzed in a systematic process that involves organizing, summarizing, tabulating and comparing the results with other appropriate information to extract useful information that responds to the evaluation questions and fulfils the purpose of evaluation. This will involve deciphering facts from a body of collected evidence, by systematically coding and collating the data collected, ensuring its accuracy, conducting statistical analysis and translating the data into usable formats or units of analysis related to each evaluation question.

The work plan and timetable will be prepared by the Service provider but will need to be approved by the GED Project prior to initiation of field visits. The Service provider is expected to prepare a report highlighting in particular recommendations for improving the project approach and set-up and strengthening its overall performance, as well as suggestions for follow up project based on concept note.

The expected duration of the assignment is up to 45 days, over a period of July-September 2017.

Tasks

The service is divided into 6 principle tasks, as follows:

Task 1 – Desk review

Following the initial meetings with the Project management, the Service Provider will conduct a detailed review of all relevant Project documents produced during its implementation. Documentation includes, but is not limited to: Project document; Project reports; Project Board presentation and minutes, conceptual papers and analyses/Studies; data on implementation of infrastructure Projects supported by the intervention and all other relevant documents and reports prepared by the Project staff.

During the desk review, the Service Provider will focus on evaluating the Project baseline, indicators and targets, as well as the relevance, quality and adequacy of Project approach versus its objectives and the

output. Additionally, they will also submit the proposed structure of the MTE report for review and approval.

Task 2 – Evaluation / Mission to BiH

Upon the approval of the work plan and the structure of the MTE report by UNDP, the Service Provider is expected to carry out the Project MTE based on the approved methodology. UNDP will provide support to the Service Provider in organization of meetings and interviews.

Once all data has been collected, the Service provider will conduct data analysis in order to give insight into the Project progress, efficiency and adequacy, as previously explained, focusing on the process and level of success of partnership building and ownership over Project products and results. Particular attention will be paid to the potential sustainability of the Project achievements beyond the lifespan of the Project.

During the mission, the Service Provider will visit all stakeholders such as IFI (International Financial Institutions), SIDA and other stakeholders.

Task 3 – Evaluation and suggestion on follow up project based on developed Concept Note

Evaluation of follow up project idea based on the already prepared Concept Note for the next phase, including reflections on relevance, expected key achievements and suggestions for improvement, as well as how the proposed project embeds findings from the current phase.

Task 4 – Prepared draft Mid-Term Project Evaluation Report

A briefing session will be organized with representatives of UNDP and SIDA, so as to present the preliminary findings and recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation Report.

Following the briefing session, the Service Provider is expected to prepare a draft mid-term Project evaluation report, capturing findings and recommendations on both the Project approach and performance, as well as suggested follow up project. Suggestions and comments gathered during the briefing session will be taken into consideration. Also, any observations that may arise from the evaluation will be incorporated into the final report.

The draft MTE report will be submitted to the UNDP team for initial review. The minimum structure of the evaluation report (to be written in English language) is the following:

1. Executive summary;
2. Introduction;
3. Methodological approach;
4. Evaluation findings against the main evaluation criteria; including relevance, key achievements, performance, progress against set targets, efficiency, effectiveness, mainstreaming of gender equality and human rights principles and gaps/delays (if any) etc.
5. Main conclusions and recommendations;
6. Lessons learnt;
7. *Annex 1 – Summary of Project evaluation (template is herewith enclosed)*

Task 5 – Submission of Mid-Term Project Evaluation Report

Recommendations provided on the Evaluation by the Project owners embedded and the Mid-Term Evaluation Report submitted to UNDP

Task 6 Presentation on MTE findings

Presentation of evaluation to UNDP, donors and Project Steering Board

KEY DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINESS

The following deliverables are expected:

Description	Responsible	Expected Timeline
Evaluation – inception and research phases		
Desk review of reference material <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP team will support compilation of a list of the most important background material, documents, and reports. 	Evaluation team, UNDP team and implementing partners	(up to 10 days)
Developing work plan and methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The set of evaluation questions will be finalized, and the instruments developed. Field work schedule will be developed. Work plan, methodology, and interview instruments/surveys should be submitted to UNDP for approval. 	Evaluation team, UNDP, donors	
Conducting research in field <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews/meetings held with stakeholders and Project beneficiaries, including at least 4 field visits to project beneficiaries conducted and qualitative, as well as quantitative information collected by the Service Provider as main inputs for the Mid-Term Project Evaluation; Briefing and validation session with Project owners conducted. 	Evaluation team	(Up to 14 days)
Evaluation and suggestion on follow up project based on already developed Concept Note	Evaluation team, UNDP, donors	(up to 3 days)
Evaluation – reporting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the 1st evaluation draft report 	Evaluation team	(Up to 7 days)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidated comments by UNDP 	UNDP team	(Up to 2 days)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the 2nd evaluation draft report 	Evaluation team	(Up to 2 days)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidated comments by UNDP and donors 	UNDP team, donors	(Up to 2 days)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of the Final Evaluation Report 	Evaluation team	(Up to 2 days)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) an Evaluation Summary with findings and recommendations from the main report (b) a Power Point Presentation of the evaluation report 	Evaluation team	(Up to 2 days)
Use of evaluation findings		
Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of key findings of the evaluation to UNDP, donors and Project Steering Board 	Evaluation team	(Up to 1 days)

Qualifications of the Successful Service Provider at Various Levels

- Professional agencies/companies/organization registered for services in subject are eligible to apply.
- Applying companies must have at least 5 years of experience in the field of revision and /or project evaluation.
- Knowledge of the gathering data process, organization and conducting the research in different industries,
- Proven record of conducted minimum three (3) revisions of international donor funded projects of value not less than 3 million USD per project
- Proven experience in work in South Eastern Europe countries
- Reference list of the most recently implemented relevant projects needs to be submitted alongside the offer, including the contact details and statement/confirmation of organizations/clients on the success of similar projects in the environmental sector of no less than 3 references in the past 5 years.
- Proven record of delivery of services demonstrating excellent data collection, writing skills and overall knowledge of advocacy techniques and methods is required.
- Curriculum Vitae of the all required employees need to be submitted alongside the offer.

Minimum number and profile of employees required (team of two evaluators out of whom one must be a full-time employee). Additional employees contributing to the study would be an asset;

a) Evaluation Leader

- University degree (at minimum, a Master's degree or equivalent) in economics, finance, energy and/or buildings science, or a related discipline (certificates in evaluation studies is an asset)
- Extensive experience in designing and conducting evaluations and surveys, quantitative and qualitative analysis and data analysis (minimum of 6 years);
- Excellent knowledge of monitoring and evaluation methodologies; sound judgment and ability to objectively evaluate programmes in terms of processes, as well as results achieved (evidenced through previously conducted evaluations and references);
- Experience in conducting evaluations related to energy efficiency and green economy in the Western Balkan region and Countries with transitional economy (preferably in Bosnia)
- Knowledge of financial mechanisms for EE investments, and the EU acquis within this area.
- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, human rights and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Knowledge and experience in the area of environment, climate change and EE is considered an asset;
- General understanding and knowledge of the political and administrative context in BiH is necessary;
- Proven analytical skills and ability to conceptualize and write concisely and clearly;
- Proven communication skills and ability to interact with multiple actors including government representatives, donors and other stakeholders.
- Very good written and spoken English

b) Second Evaluation member

- University degree (at minimum, a Master's degree or equivalent) in economics, finance, energy and/or buildings science, or a related discipline (certificates in evaluation studies is an asset)
- Minimum three years of expertise in the area of conducting evaluations and surveys, quantitative and qualitative analysis and data analysis;
- Demonstrated ability to prepare interview/focus groups protocols and other evaluation instruments;
- Very good written and spoken English
- Local language knowledge would be considered as an asset
- Excellent analytical and report writing skills
- Experience in conducting evaluations related to energy efficiency and green development in the Western Balkan region and Countries with transitional economy (preferably in Bosnia)
- Knowledge and experience in the area of environment, climate change and EE is considered an asset;

Following characteristics are considered as an asset for each expert:

- Practical experience in similar projects in the Western Balkan region is preferred.
- Demonstrated leadership ability and technical ability to communicate complex ideas verbally and in writing.
- Prior UNDP experience and knowledge of UNDP and procedures and guidelines is an advantage.
- Have effective interpersonal skills and ability to work in complex, multi-stake-holder projects.
- It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary. It is highly recommended that local language speaking consultants are included in the team, in case Lead Evaluation member is international.

Criteria for Selecting the Best Offer

Combined Scoring method will serve as basis for evaluating proposals and awarding the contract, and the respective weight of each criteria.

Evaluation stage 1 - eligibility evaluation stage against the eligibility criteria

Proposals that fail eligibility criteria above are immediately eliminated.

Evaluation stage 2 – technical evaluation of the proposal

The technical components will be evaluated according to the Technical Evaluation Criteria defined below. Only those Proposers who attain **70 % of the obtainable score of the 1000 points** in the evaluation of the technical proposal will pass to the third evaluation stage and will have their Price Component envelope opened, in order to obtain their final evaluation score (based on the combined scoring method described below).

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable
1.	Expertise of Firm / Organization	30%	300
2.	Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan	30%	300
3.	Management Structure and Key Personnel	40%	400
Total			1000

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 1		Points obtainable
Expertise of the Firm/Organization		
1.1	Reputation of Organization and Staff / Credibility / Reliability / Industry Standing	100
1.5	Relevance of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specialised Knowledge - Experience on Similar Programme / Projects - Experience on Projects in the Region Work for UNDP/ major multilateral/ or bilateral programmes	200
		300

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 2		Points Obtainable
Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan		
2.1	To what degree does the Proposer understand the task?	80
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	30
2.3	Is the proposal based on an analysis of the current environment, climate change and EE circumstances in BiH structure and relevant stakeholders, and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposed methodology?	50
2.4	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR? Does the proposed plan promise efficient and realistic achievement of results?	100
2.5	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?	40
		300

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3		Points Obtainable
Management Structure and Key Personnel		
3.1	Evaluation Team Leader	250
		Sub-Score
General Qualification		240
Suitability for the Project		
	- Professional Experience in the area of specialization	140
	- Academic background	100
	- Language Qualifications - English	10

			250	
3.2	Second Evaluation Member			150
			Sub-Score	
	General Qualification		140	
	Suitability for the Project			
	- Professional Experience in the area of specialization	90		
	- Academic background	40		
	- Language Qualifications - English		10	
			50	
	Total Part 3			400

Evaluation stage 3 – Combined scoring

Rating the Technical Proposal (TP):

$$\text{TP Rating} = (\text{Total Score Obtained by the Offer} / \text{Max. Obtainable Score for TP}) \times 100$$

Rating the Financial Proposal (FP):

$$\text{FP Rating} = (\text{Lowest Priced Offer} / \text{Price of the Offer Being Reviewed}) \times 100$$

Total Combined Score:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{TP Rating}) \times (\text{Weight of TP} - 70\%) \\ + & (\text{FP Rating}) \times (\text{Weight of FP} - 30\%) \end{aligned}$$

Total Combined and Final Rating of the Proposal