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| International Consultant for the Evaluation of UNDP/GEF Project “Reducing GHG emissions from road transport in Russia’s medium-sized cities”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference:** | PIMS 4304 |
| **Country:** | Russia |
| **Type of Contract****Description of the Assignment:** | Individual Contract (IC)International Consultant to conduct the Terminal Evaluation of UNDP/GEF – Ministry of transport of the Russian Federation project “Reducing GHG emissions from road transport in Russia’s medium-sized cities”  |
| **Project:** | Reducing GHG emissions from road transport in Russia’s medium-sized cities |
| **Period of Assignment/Services:** | 27 working days over the period from 1 September 2017 to 31 December 2017 |
| **Duty Station:** | Home Based (15 working days) with one mission (12 working days including 2 travel days to Russian Federation (Moscow, Kazan, Kaliningrad))  |

 |

Introduction

This terminal evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP evaluation guidance for GEF financed projects. The terminal evaluation should start in September 2017 and be carried out over a period of a maximum of 3 months.

The objectives of the terminal evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant supported by the national consultant.

The Project aims to reduce GHG emissions through improved planning and management of the public transport based on efficient monitoring systems and promotion of eco-friendly vehicles. The main outcomes of the Project are pilot activities in 5 cities of Russia (Kazan, Kaliningrad, Irkutsk, Krasnoyarsk, Rostov-on-Don), supportive federal policies and legislative framework for sustainable transport in the Russian Federation. Also, the Project helps disseminate and replicate successes of the pilot sites, where it supports development and implementation of integrated urban transport strategies. Those include comprehensive travel demand surveys and traffic management plans, regulations for integrated urban planning, enhanced public transport systems, and promoting innovative transport solutions such as public rapid transit and non-motorized transport modes.

The Project implementation started in 2013 despite the fact that the Project document was signed by the Deputy Minister of Transport of the Russian Federation and the Head of UNDP office in Russia on September 2012. The project had been planned for 5 years and asked for a no-cost extension for 3 more months. The expected project’s closing date is 31 December 2017.

In accordance with UNDP and GEF policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP- GEF projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference set out the expectations for a terminal evaluation of the project “Reducing GHG emissions from road transport in Russia’s medium-sized cities”(PIMS #4304).

Objective and scope

This Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The project mid-term evaluation (MTE) took place in late 2015 (final report submitted in early 2016) and it relates to main achievements of project objectives and progress towards attainment of the key indicators. One of the main recommendations of the MTR was that the project hire and international consultant to provide overall guidance and strategic support to the project implementation. The MTR permitted to understand how successfully the Project was implemented and what were the ways it intended to achieve the expected results, and to identify the necessary adjustments in order to improve the activity during the second and final part of the project. The final evaluation should assess the extent to which the recommendations of the mid-term review have been taken into account by the Project.

The terminal evaluation will explore in detail five major criteria:

* Relevance: the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time;
* Effectiveness: the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved;
* Efficiency: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible;
* Results: the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer-term impacts including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects;
* Sustainability: the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf>) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation will be carried out by a lead international consultant and supported by a national consultant. The final evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of the evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, National Project Director, UNDP Project Support Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in Istanbul and other key stakeholders.

**Field Mission**

The international evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission of at least 10 working days (not including travel day) to the project pilot sites and Moscow*.* The 10 working days mission should include at a minimum 4-6 working days based in Moscow, 1-2 working days in Kazan and 1-2 working days in Kaliningrad for a total of 10 working days. The national evaluator will accompany the international evaluator to all meetings both in Moscow and in Kazan and Kaliningrad.

It is estimated that the amount of time to be spent in Russian Federation by international evaluator should be at least 14 days which includes 2 travel days, 10 working days, and 2 days of weekend.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations at a minimum: UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, UNDP-Russia Projects Support Office, Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation, Administrations of pilot cities (Kazan, Kaliningrad), Federal State Budgetary Institution “Research Center for Complex Transport Projects of the Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation”, OJSC “Scientific and Research institute of motor transport”, Moscow Automobile and Road Construction University (MADI), Institute for Transport Economics and Transport Policy Studies of the National Research University "Higher School of Economics", Municipal budget institution " Organizer of passenger transportations" (the largest bus public transport operator in Kazan), Administrations of Pilot Replication Cities. The evaluators should also speak to key international and national consultants of the project including to the international consultant who designed and wrote the project document, to the project mid-term evaluator and to the international CTA hired by the project.

A list of persons and organizations for interviews will be proposed by the project team and should be agreed upon at least 1 week prior to the mission to the Russian Federation. The international evaluator should request additional meetings/interviews as required. UNDP and NIM Partner should be informed of additional interviews/meetings required by the FE team, and the dialogue with the evaluated party should be handled in an inclusive and transparent manner.

The international evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, reports of contractors and sub-contractors to the project, reports of the international CTA, reports of the national evaluator, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

A list of documents that the project team will provide to the international evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation criteria & ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria:

1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E design at entry, M&E Plan Implementation, Overall quality of M&E);

2. IA& EA Execution (Quality of UNDP Implementation, Quality of Execution - Executing Agency, Overall quality of Implementation / Execution);

3. Assessment of Outcomes (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating);

4. Sustainability (Financial resources, Socio-political, Institutional framework and governance, Environmental, Overall likelihood of sustainability).

The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

Project finance/Co-finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Project Office and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. Conclusions should build on findings and be based on evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 27 working days during the calendar period of 4 months (1 September – 31 December 2017). The following tentative timetable is recommended for the evaluation; however, the final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of the assignment:

* Preparation - 3 days in September 2017;
* Evaluation Mission - 10 w/days in late September – early October 2017;
* Travel Days – 2 working days for travel to and from Moscow
* Draft Evaluation Report - 10 days, completed by mid of November 2017;
* Final Report - 2 days, completed by the end of November 2017/early December 2017

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

* Inception Report - Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method which includes a clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects to be evaluated no later than 1 week before the evaluation mission and submits the report to the UNDP PSO.
* Presentation - Initial findings at the end of the evaluation mission presented to the project management, UNDP PSO and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor at the end of the evaluation mission. Approval of the preliminary draft report with the Project team and NIM Implementing Partner;
* Draft Evaluation Report (per annexed template) including overall rating with annexes within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission sent to UNDP PSO, reviewed by RTA, PSO and Project team;
* Final Report - Revised report within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft sent to PSO for uploading to UNDP ERC. When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. Approval of the final terminal evaluation report with the Project team and NIM Implementing Partner.

Evaluation ethics

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment installments:

10% Following submission and approval by UNDP PSO of a detailed workplan/inception report prior to the evaluation mission;

55% Following submission and approval by UNDP (National Implementing Partner, UNDP-PSO, UNDP RTA) of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report;

35% Following submission and approval by UNDP (National Implementing Partner, UNDP-PSO, UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report.

Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional competencies:

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication skills and ability to work in a team;
* Ability to plan and organize work, efficiency in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations;
* Strong analytical, research, reporting and writing abilities.

Qualification requirements

Education

University degree (Masters or equivalent) in in the field of relevance such as urban planning and development, urban transport planning, civil engineering.

Relevant experience:

* Minimum 7 years of professional experience related to the transport sector;
* Experience in results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience with UNDP and GEF evaluations is a strong advantage;
* Work experience in Europe & CIS region and/or Russian Federation is an advantage.

Language skills

Excellent English (both oral and written); Russian language will be considered as an advantage.

Conflict of interest:

To ensure impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation, as well as to avoid the conflict of interest, UNDP will not consider the applications from the candidates that have had prior involvement in the design, formulation, implementation or evaluation of the above-indicated project.

Evaluation procedure

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* Responsive, compliant, acceptable;
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical criteria - 70% of total evaluation (max 70 points):

* University degree (Masters or equivalent) in in the field of relevance such as urban planning and development, urban transport planning, civil engineering (max 5 points);
* Minimum 7 years of professional experience related to the transport sector (max 10 points);
* Experience in results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (max 10 points);
* experience with UNDP and GEF evaluations is a strong advantage (max 10 points);
* Work experience in Europe & CIS region and/or Russian Federation is an advantage (max 5 points);
* Excellent English (max 5 points);
* Russian language will be considered as an advantage (max 5 points);
* Interview – maximum 20 points.

Financial criteria - 30% of total evaluation (max 30 points).

Only candidates passing the 70% threshold for the technical proposal will be considered for the financial evaluation.

The candidate with the highest score from technical criteria + financial criteria will be selected with the maximum score possible being 100 points.

Application process

Recommended presentation of offer:

1. Completed letter of confirmation of interest and availability. Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application;
2. CV or a UNDP Personal History form (P11)available athttp://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/dam/rbec/docs/P11\_modified\_for\_SCs\_and\_ICs.doc, indicating all past experience, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and three professional references;
3. Financial proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by the breakdown of costs. The breakdown should contain: professional fee for home-based work (number of working days), professional fee for work on mission (number of working days), travel costs (international/local travel and per diems). Per diems cannot exceed maximum UN daily allowance rates (http://icsc.un.org) and consultants are encouraged to bid lower amount to make their offers more competitive.

Please note that the professional fee is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of service, etc.). All envisaged international travel costs must be included in the financial proposal.

If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under reimbursable loan agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

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

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

General terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://on.undp.org/t7fJs>.

Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.