

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project [Technology transfer for climate resilient flood management in Vrbas River Basin \(PIMS 5241\)](#), implemented by the UNDP Country Office in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Project Title: | <i>“Technology Transfer for Climate Resilient Flood Management in Vrbas River Basin”</i> | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 5241 | | <i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i> | <i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i> |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00083690 | GEF financing: | 5.000,000 | 5.000.000 |
| Country: | (BIH) Bosnia and Herzegovina | IA/EA own: | - | - |
| Region: | CEE | Government: | 75,700,000 | 75.700.000 |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Other: (in-kind UNDP) | 60,000 | 60.000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Total co-financing: | 75.760.000 | 75.760.000 |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 80.760.000 | 80.760.000 |
| Other Partners involved: | Implementing entity/Responsible Partner: Ministry of Spatial Planning, Construction, and Ecology of Republika Srpska; Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 24 March, 2015 |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: April 2020 | Actual: April 2020 |

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Country context

Bosnia and Herzegovina is a middle income country which is still recovering from the 1992-1995 war which had a devastating impact on its human, social and economic resources, leading to enormous challenges of the post-war reconstruction and economic and social recovery. This challenge has been further compounded by the transition towards market economy requiring structural reforms and improved governance. The slow rate of the post-war economic recovery of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been compounded by the negative impacts of climate change on key sectors such as agriculture, energy (hydropower), the environment and, in particular, the frequency and magnitude of flood disasters, which have tripled in frequency in the last decade.

In May 2014, Bosnia and Herzegovina experienced its worst flooding in 150 years which resulted in 23 deaths, \$2.7 Billion USD worth damages and approximately one million people affected. Bosnia and Herzegovina that still has not fully recovered from the 2014 disaster is significantly exposed to the threats of climate change but has very limited capacity to address and adapt to its negative impacts, in particular the frequency and magnitude of floods from its major rivers. The Vrbas River Basin is characterized by a large rural population comprised of the poorest and most vulnerable communities in the country, including war returnees and displaced people, with high exposure to flooding and its devastating impacts.

Project summary:

The "Technology transfer of climate resilient flood management in Vrbas River Basin" project is a 5-year, 5 mill USD SCCF funded project with **the overall objective to transfer technologies for climate resilient flood management in order to increase resilience of highly exposed rural poor, returnee and displaced persons communities in Vrbas River Basin**. Adaptation technologies for climate resilient Flood Risk Management (FRM) include the development of state-of-the-art hydrological and hydrodynamic models and GIS tools for the Vrbas River Basin incorporating climate change predictions and producing flood hazard maps as the basis for spatial planning and long-term strategic FRM. The Project includes the upgrade and rehabilitation of the hydrometric network, and the harmonization and centralization of the hydrometric database. It develops the flood forecasting system and enhance the existing early warning system within the VRB. Emergency response is being enhanced through the development of emergency response plans, and provision of training in flood-specific civil protection are provided. Further, an institutional capacity development plan for the long-term development of capability and capacity in FRM is developed. The project works closely with affected communities to introduce climate resilient community-based non-structural measures and provides training to local communities in climate resilient FRM.

The Project has three outcomes, along with their associated outputs and activities, which contribute to the achievement of the Project objective

Outcome 1: Key relevant development strategies/policies/legislation integrate climate change-resilient flood management approaches;

Outcome 2: Climate resilient flood risk management is enabled by transferring modern technologies and strengthening institutional capacities

Outcome 3: New technologies and approaches for enhanced flood risk management applied to increase resilience of vulnerable communities in Vrbas River Basin.

Detailed outline of the Project results, baselines and targets is available in the Projects Results and Resources Framework ([Annex A](#))

Target groups and beneficiaries

By transferring best available technologies for climate resilient flood risk management, the Project directly benefits 250,000 poor, returnee and displaced people exposed to floods in 14 municipalities and cities of Vrbas River Basin: Srbac, Laktaši, Banja Luka, Čelinac, Kotor Varos, Kneževo, Mrkonjić Grad, Jajce, Šipovo, Jezero, Bugojno, Gornji Vakuf-Uskoplje, Donji Vakuf and Gradiška.

Project progress summary

The Project has made significant progress and is on track with regard to most of its objectives to transfer technologies for climate resilient flood management in Vrbas River Basin. Some of the main Project's achievements include setup and operationalization of a hydro-meteorological network consisting of 7 hydrological, 2 meteorological and 20 rain gauges; the development of a climate change model for Vrbas River Basin; development of hydrological and hydrodynamics models (including 2D model for the whole basin); completion of vulnerability assessment, including gender segregated data and development of flood depth-damages curve; The project finalized flood hazard and risk maps for 20-, 100- and 500-year return periods for Vrbas River Basin. For the first time in the country, the Project developed torrential flood sensitivity models for the whole basin, which also included erosion maps. Significant progress has been made in data management with a) the establishment of a geoportal that links spatial data infrastructure and hydro-meteorological data and b) the upgrade and population of an existing obsolete water information system, that now for the first time in Bosnia and Herzegovina enables automatic exchange of information among all three water agencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Through implementation of non-structural floods protection measures, in two years, the Project protected from floods 1,129 houses, 226 enterprise facilities, 2,631 ha of agricultural land and nearly 70,000 people. 59,000 people, representing ordinary citizens, farmers, civil protection practitioners, relevant government institutions, local communities and local governments were trained on the specific aspects of climate change adaptation and risk mitigation, readiness and reaction on flood event at local level, hydro-meteorological network operations and maintenance, civil protection coordination, spatial planning and zoning for flood areas; protection and rescue during the flood, flood risk management, agriculture and soil in floods risk management.

The Project directly contributes to the Outcome 5 of the UNDP Country Programme Document 2015-2019 and UNDAF 2015-2019 for Bosnia and Herzegovina: By 2019 legal and strategic frameworks are enhanced and operationalized to ensure sustainable management of natural, cultural and energy resources.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The **purpose** of the TE is to provide an impartial review of the Project Technology transfer for climate resilient flood management in Vrbas River Basin (PIMS 5241) in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, overall performance, management and achievements. The information, findings, lessons learned,

and recommendations generated by the evaluation at this particular time will be used by the UNDP and the implementing partners to strengthen the remaining Project implementation and inform prospects for eventual replication and sustainability of the intervention.

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 the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The evaluation will assess the extent to which planned project results have been achieved since the beginning of the Project in March 2015 and likelihood for their full achievement by the end of the Project in March 2020 (based on the Programme Document and its results framework). Specifically, it will consider the relevance and influence of the Project on the individuals and groups living within the 14 municipalities and cities where the project activities are implemented.

The **scope** of the evaluation covers the following specific aspects, integrating the GEF's Operational Principles¹ as appropriate:

- Project design, risk assessment/management;
- Progress toward results, outputs, outcomes and impacts;
- Implementation and execution arrangements, including GEF Agency oversight;
- Partnership approach and stakeholder participation;
- Communications and public awareness;
- Work planning, financial management/planning, co-financing;
- Flexibility, innovation and adaptive management;
- Gender and human rights integration and mainstreaming in implementation;
- Catalytic role: Replication and up-scaling.

Finally, the evaluation will assess the monitoring and evaluation aspect of the project and its compliance with UNDP and GEF minimum standards, including SMART criteria for indicators.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method² for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined 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 within this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as a part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

As a part of the evaluation inception report, the evaluator will propose a detailed evaluation methodology and agree on a plan for the assignment. The proposed methodology may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the TE, exploring specific, gender sensitive data collecting and analytical methods and tools applicable in the concrete case.

¹https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting_documents/C.31.12_Operational_Guidelines_for_Incremental_Costs_4.pdf

² [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Annex 2. Summary of common data-collection methods/sources used in UNDP evaluations](#)

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, analytical and going beyond known facts within project reports. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts.

The evaluator is expected to conduct **one field mission** to Bosnia and Herzegovina and will cover several project implementation sites and localities, including: Banja Luka, Bijeljina, Sarajevo and 3 partner municipalities in Vrbas River Basin.

Interviews will be held with the following institutions and individuals at a minimum:

- The GEF operational focal point for Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- The Ministry for Spatial Planning, Construction, and Ecology of Republika Srpska;
- The Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Managements of Republika Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Sava River Basin Water Agency;
- Public institution Vode Srpske,
- Hydro-meteo Institute of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Hydro-meteo Institute of Republika Srpska;
- Civil protection of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Civil Protection of Republika Srpska;
- Representatives of Local Governments in Vrbas River Basin;
- Project final beneficiaries at community level,
- UNDP Country Office and UNDP projects with whom Project was partnering and achieving synergies in the course of the project implementation;
- UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor based in UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, Turkey.

As a part of **desk review**, the evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports- and GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, 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 evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The evaluation methodology may also include **focus group discussions** and other data collecting methods, as appropriate, such as surveys, statistical analysis, social network analysis, etc.

Data analysis should be conducted in a systematic manner to ensure that all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence. Appropriate tools should be used to ensure proper analysis (e.g. data analysis matrix). As a part of the fact-finding effort, the evaluator should in particular seek evidence of impact during the field visits, i.e. progress towards the articulated global environmental benefits of the project.

Specifically, the **triangulation method** is suggested for data analysis, implying the use of three or more theories, sources or types of information and analysis to verify and substantiate the provided assessments. By combining multiple data sources, methods, analyses or theories, evaluators can overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single methods, single observer or single theory studies.

Finally, the evaluation approach and method need to allow the assessment of degree to which the programme initiatives have supported or promoted gender equality, a rights-based approach, and human development. In this regard, [United Nations Evaluation Group’s guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation](#) should be consulted.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out against the expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([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 performance criteria outlines in the table below. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

| Evaluation Ratings: | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation | | <i>rating</i> | 2. IA& EA Execution | | <i>rating</i> |
| M&E design at entry | | | Quality of UNDP Implementation | | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | | | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency | | |
| Overall quality of M&E | | | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | | |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes | | <i>rating</i> | 4. Sustainability | | <i>rating</i> |
| Relevance | | | Financial resources: | | |
| Effectiveness | | | Socio-political: | | |
| Efficiency | | | Institutional framework and governance: | | |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | | | Environmental: | | |
| | | | Overall likelihood of sustainability: | | |
| 5. IMPACT | | <i>rating</i> | 6. OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS | | <i>rating</i> |
| Flood risk management Status Improvement | | | Enabling environment for flood risk management improved | | |
| Contribution to Capacity development | | | Climate resilient flood risk management technologies transferred | | |
| Progress towards stress/status change | | | Flood risk management measures implemented | | |

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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 Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

| Co-financing (type/source) | UNDP own financing | | Government | | Partner Agency | | Total | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------------|--------|------------|------------|
| | (US\$) | | (US\$) | | (US\$) | | (US\$) | |
| | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants (GEF) | 5,000,000 | 3,819,984 | 917,531 | 917,531 | | | 5,917,531 | 4,737,515 |
| Loans/Concessions | | | 75,700,000 | 75,700,000 | | | 75,700,000 | 75,700,000 |
| In-kind support | 60,000 | | | | | | 60,000 | - |
| Other | | | | | | | - | - |
| Totals | 5,060,000 | 3,819,984 | 76,617,531 | 76,617,531 | - | - | 81,677,531 | 80,437,515 |

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project achieved impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluation 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.

In assessing project results, the TE will:

a) seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project appraisal document and indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established;

b) focus on achievements in terms of outputs, outcomes, or impacts. Output achievement is easy to access but not sufficient to show whether the interventions were effective in delivering global environmental benefits. Impacts may take a long time to manifest thus difficult to be assessed at this stage. Instead, assessment of outcomes captures project efficacy in terms of delivering medium-term expected results. The outcomes will be rated based on the following scale:

- **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.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in 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.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office in *Bosnia and Herzegovina*. The UNDP Country Office will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

A UNDP Evaluation Manager will be assigned by the Country Office, to oversee and support the overall evaluation process. In addition, an evaluation reference group will be formed to provide critical and objective inputs throughout the evaluation process to strengthen the quality of the evaluation. The Country Office Senior Management and the GEF Regional Technical Advisor will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation consultancy will be 25 working days according to the following plan:

| Activity | Timing | Completion Date |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Desk review | 4 days | October 30 th , 2019 |
| Inception Report | 3 days | November 4 th , 2019 |
| Evaluation Mission | 5 days (travel days excluded) | November 18 th , 2019 |
| Evaluation debriefings | 1 day | November 18 th , 2019 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 7 days | December 15 th , 2019 |
| Final Report | 5 days | February 20 th , 2020 |

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides detailed outline of the evaluation approach, methodology (evaluation matrix) and plan | Before 4 th November, 2019 | Evaluator submits to UNDP Country Office |
| Presentation | Initial Findings of the Evaluation | 18 November, 2019 | Evaluation presents initial evaluation findings to project management, UNDP Country Office |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed template) | Before 15 th December, 2019 | Sent to Country Office, reviewed by Regional Technical Advisor, GEF Operational Focal Points |
| Final Report* | Revised report | Before 20 th February, 2020 | Country Office uploads into UNDP Evaluation Resource Center. |

*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.³

EVALUATOR

The evaluation will be conducted by 1 international consultant (evaluator). The evaluator will take the overall responsibility for the quality and due submission of the final evaluation report. S/he will have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. Specifically, the international consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Design detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Implement the evaluation mission;
- Conduct an analysis of the results, outcomes and outputs;
- Present preliminary TE findings to stakeholders;
- Draft the evaluation report;
- Finalize the evaluation report in English and submit it to UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

^{3 3} Audit trial template is available at http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf, p. 25

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Academic Qualifications/Education
 - Advanced university degree in Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Development Studies, or other closely related field or other sciences in sustainable development;
- Experience
 - Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in evaluations, preferably in GEF supported projects;
 - Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of climate change adaptation, climate resilient management or related disciplines;
 - Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation;
 - Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
 - General understanding and knowledge of the political/administrative and development context in the country.
- Languages Requirements
 - Fluency in English language.
- Other
 - Excellent communication and computer skills (MS Office applications) and ability to use information technologies as a tool and resource.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are 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'](#)

DUTY STATION

The consultant' duty station is home-based with one mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina and will be expected to undertake field visits to Vrbas river basin municipalities and respective agencies and institutes (Banja Luka, Sarajevo, Bijeljina).

Travel:

- International travel will be required to Bosnia and Herzegovina during the TE mission;
- The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

INDICATIVE PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

| % | Milestone |
|-----|---|
| 10% | At contract signing |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft terminal evaluation report |
| 50% | Following submission and approval (UNDP-Country Office and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor) of the final terminal evaluation report |

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org> , etc.) by 31st May, 2019. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

PROCUREMENT NOTICE

1. Sourcing of candidates (please complete applicable section):

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Advertisement: | Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/> | If yes: Dates: Local website: Global website: Newspaper: | 21st -31st May, 2019 Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Sourcing through Registry: | Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/> | Direct contracting | Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

2. Documents to Be Included When Submitting the Proposals

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal (outlining the specific design and methods for the evaluation):
 - o Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work;
 - o Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work;
 - the methodology should present the Consultants approach, proposed detailed methods, scope and evaluation criteria and questions;
 - the methodology should apply a mixed-method approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to validate and triangulate data;
 - the methodology should include the filled in evaluation matrix (Annex C);
 - the methodology should explain the data collection tool/s to be used.
2. Financial proposal (in USD)– Offeror’s Letter to UNDP Confirming the Interest and Availability
https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual
3. Personal CV including past experience in similar evaluations and at least 3 references

3. Financial Proposal

- **Contracts based on daily fee**

The financial proposal will specify the daily fee and travel expenses quoted in separate line items, and payments are made to the Individual Consultant based on the number of days worked.

Travel;

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP does not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

4. Evaluation

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Best value for money approach ⁴ : | Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/> | If yes, please specify percentage of technical and financial evaluations ⁵ | Technical Evaluation weight-70% Financial Evaluation weight- 30% |
| Lowest evaluated offer ⁶ : | Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

5. Technical evaluation criteria

Evaluation will be conducted through:

Interview Yes: No:

Desk review Yes: No:

| <i>Criteria</i> | <i>Weight</i> | <i>Max. Point</i> |
|--|---------------|-------------------|
| Ratings based on Shortlisting Criteria | 30% | 30 |
| Methodology | 25% | 25 |
| Phone Interview/Interview by Skype | 45% | 45 |

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Long/Shortlisting Criteria

| Criteria | Points |
|----------|--------|
|----------|--------|

⁴ When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

⁵ The financial proposal should account for at least 30% of the total score

⁶ When using this method, the award of a contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as both:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) offering the lowest price/cost

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Relevant Education | max 30 points (20 points allocated for MSc/MA; + up to 10 points for PhD). |
| Relevant professional experience | max 60 points |
| Knowledge of English | max 10 points - will be assessed as 10 points for fluency and the points decrease as per the level mentioned in the CV: good - 8 points; fair/upper intermediate – 6 points; intermediate - 4 points; beginner - 2 point. |

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 60 points would be considered for the Technical Evaluation

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Lead output: Output 5.2: Subnational actors implement climate change adaptation (CCA) and mitigation measures, sustainable energy access solutions, and manage natural resources sustainably. Complementary Output 5.1: Harmonized policies and legal frameworks enforced in accordance with international obligations. Complementary Output 3.2: UNDAF outcome 3. By 2019, there is effective management of war remnants and strengthened prevention and responsiveness for man-made and natural disasters, Output 2. Legal and policy frameworks in place supporting implementation of disaster and climate risk management measures, including gender perspective</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Outcome 5: By 2019 legal and strategic frameworks are enhanced and operationalized to ensure sustainable management of natural, cultural and energy resources.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Outcome 2.4: Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Objective 3: Adaptation Technology Transfer: Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 3.1: Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas Outcome 3.2: Enhanced enabling environment to support adaptation-related technology transfer</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 3.2.1 Policy environment and regulatory framework for adaptation related technology transfer established or strengthened Indicator 3.2.2: Strengthened Capacity to transfer appropriate adaptation technologies</p> | | | | | |
| | Indicator | Baseline | Targets End of Project | Source of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| <p>Project Objective:</p> <p>To transfer technologies for climate resilient flood management in order to increase resilience of highly exposed rural poor, returnee and displaced persons communities in Vrbas River Basin</p> | <p>Number of new technologies transferred to BiH as part of a methodology for strategic FRM</p> <p>AMAT indicator 3.1.1.1 Type of adaptation technologies</p> | <p>Limited institutional capacity and technologies in use for strategic FRM in BiH</p> | <p>At least 5 new technologies introduced (hydrological and hydrodynamic modelling, state-of-the-art monitoring equipment, Flood forecasting and early warning systems, flood damages and losses modelling and vulnerability assessment, and a number of non-structural flood management technologies to BiH)</p> | <p>Project monitoring reports and final evaluation</p> <p>Survey of Adopted policies and plans</p> <p>Survey of Technologies in place</p> | <p>Risk: Government bodies do not pay sufficient attention to climate change</p> <p>Governments on state and entity level are not able to reach an agreement on supportive regulatory documents and management plans</p> <p>Risk rating: low</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | transferred to the target groups. | | | | Assumption: Government will understand importance of CC induced flood risk management and provide support to regulatory documents |
| | VRB (12% of BiH territory) covered by an automated hydrometric monitoring network for effective Flood Forecasting and Early Warning | Hydrometric stations currently cover 50% of the area required for FFEWS for VRB | The VRB (i.e.12% of BiH) covered by a Hydrometric network that provides the optimal coverage required for FFEWS | | |
| Outcome 1: Key relevant development strategies/policies/legislations integrate climate change resilient flood management approaches | AMAT Indicator 3.2.1 Policy environment and regulatory framework for adaptation related technology transfer established or strengthened | 1: No policy/regulatory framework for adaptation related technology transfer in place | 4: Policy/regulatory framework for adaptation related technology transfer have been formally adopted by the Government but have no enforcement mechanisms | Project annual reports, Mid-term evaluation, final report Survey of Policy/regulatory framework in place | Risk: Consent to Policy/regulatory framework not given by all government levels Risk rating: Low Assumption: political support provided |
| | No, of Adaptation technology solutions for climate resilient flood management (CRFRM) enabled for implementation | 0: Document codifying standard methodologies and procedures for Climate resilient flood Risk Management (CRFRM) | At least 10 guidance documents produced on Climate Resilient Flood Risk Management topics | Project annual reports, Mid-term evaluation, final report Survey of Guidance documents developed | No risks identified |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Outcome 2: Climate resilient flood risk management is enabled by transferring modern technologies and strengthening institutional capacities | AMAT Indicator 3.2.2: Strengthened Capacity to transfer appropriate adaptation technologies | 1: Very few professional are aware of adaptation technologies | 3: High Capacity achieved (>75%). Provision of models, information systems, tools and training in the use of these to professionals, on various aspects of climate adaptation technologies | Project annual reports, Mid-term evaluation, final report | Risk: Management of relevant institutions do not recognise a need to such a training Risk rating: low Assumption: a need for a training recognized |
| | No, of institutions enabled to modify risk management strategies based on introduced vulnerability, loss and damages assessment and improved hydrometric monitoring technologies | Most of the socio-economic information required to assess flood damages, losses, exposure and vulnerability is not currently available and is not collected systematically and gender-disaggregation of data not systematically done. | GIS-based flood damages, losses and vulnerability assessment tool developed for VRB and systematic socio-economic survey methods established and implemented for VRB and introduces sex-disaggregated data collection protocols and methods | Project annual reports, Mid-term evaluation, final report GIS data base | Risk: institutions not willing to provide and/or do not have data Risk rating: medium Assumption: data will be gathered on the field |
| | No, of people in target basin benefitting from FRM adaptation technologies, tools, and adaptation strategies, and are less exposed to flood risk | Current approach limited of inclusion of local communities, and particularly the vulnerable groups | At least 5 technologies transferred to 13 communities in community-based adaptation measures | Project annual reports, Mid-term evaluation, final report | Risk rating: medium Assumption: interest of local communities in innovative solutions |
| Outcome 3: New technologies and approaches for enhanced flood risk management applied to increase resilience of vulnerable communities in VRB | No, of innovative Non-structural measures introduced and implemented as part of climate adaptation strategies to provide improved resilience to | Current approach to FRM is structural flood protection measures | Non-structural measures designed and implemented in 13 municipalities by 2020 At least 4,200 hectares of agric. land protected by non-structural measures (e.g. floodplain agro-forestry to be implemented on at least 840 hectares) | Project annual reports, Mid-term evaluation, final report Survey of Implemented measures | Risk: agreement between local governments on selected measures not reached Risk rating: low Assumption: local governments work for the overall gain, and interest of |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| | communities (include agric. | | | | local communities in innovative solutions |
| | No of communities benefitting from introduced forecasting, early warning, response and recovery technologies to support local communities at risk of flooding | FFEWS system currently disjointed and not fully electronically based | Fully integrated Flood forecasting and Early warning system implemented in VRB | Project annual reports, Mid-term evaluation, final report Assessment of FFEWS in place | Risk: data gathered not disseminated timely to all citizens Risk rating: low Assumption: capacities strengthen in order to recognize importance of data |

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- Project Identification Form (PIF)
- UNDP Initiation Plan
- UNDP Project Document
- CEO Endorsement Request
- UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- Project Inception Report
- Project Baseline and M&E Plans
- Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
- Project Mid Term Review Report
- Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
- Annual Work Plans and Budgets
- Audit reports

- GEF focal area Tracking Tools - AMAT
- Financial expenditures, itemized according to template provided by MTR teams
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
- UNDP Country Programme Document
- Minutes of the Project Steering Committee and other meetings
- Project site location maps
- Technical consultancy reports
- Training materials (PPTs etc.)
- News and Awareness materials

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This list is to be further detailed with more specific questions by the Evaluator, in collaboration with the UNDP Country Office and UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser during the Inception Meeting.

| Evaluative Criteria Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|--|--|--|--|
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the project in line with national and local priorities? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project objective fit GEF and UNDP strategic priorities? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the programme contribute to gender equality, empowerment of women and human rights of target groups? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the project's interventions? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended specific objective/outcome and outputs/results? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project increased knowledge & understanding of institutional partners on climate resilient flood risk management? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project scaled up adaptation measures and reduced the vulnerability of target communities in the project area of Vrbas river basin? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project outreached marginalized groups (i.e. youth, persons with disabilities, returnees, internally displaced, minorities...) and supported gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment in climate change and adaptation processes? | • | • | • |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any weaknesses in programme design, management, human resource skills, and resources? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have resources (financial, human, technical) been allocated strategically to achieve the programme results? Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How was the results-based management used during project implementation? Was the project communication strategy sufficient to influence project results ? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project adhered to set guidelines for GEF, UNDP in achieving results? | • | • | • |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the risks identified within the project influenced the project results? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the sustainability of project results likely to depend on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any | • | • | • |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>additional financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends?</p> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the programme approach (intervention strategy) managed to create ownership of the key national stakeholders? • Do relevant stakeholders have the relevant capacities to ensure sustainability of the results achieved by the project? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would be future priority interventions to ensure long-term sustainability of the project's achievements and contribute to improved flood risk management? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the project potential for scaling-up and replication in terms of the need expressed by institutional partners and stakeholders? | • | • | • |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the project's effects and impact, both in qualitative, as well as quantitative terms, on the overall improvement of quality of life of citizens in targeted localities? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are key stakeholders/final beneficiaries satisfied with the benefits generated by the project? | • | • | • |

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p> | <p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p> | <p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p> |
| <p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p> | | |

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁷

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁹)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹⁰)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

⁸The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹⁰ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by COUNTRY OFFICE and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by | |
| UNDP Country Office | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |
| UNDP GEF RTA | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |