

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project name:	Development and Commercialization of Bioenergy Technologies in the Municipal Sector in Ukraine
Post title:	National Consultant for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of full-sized UNDP-GEF project
Type of contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Assignment type:	International Consultant
Country / Duty Station:	Home Based with a 2-week mission (10 working days not including travel days) within Ukraine
Expected places of travel (if applicable):	Kyiv, Ukraine and day trips to pilot projects in other parts of Ukraine
Languages required:	Fluent English and Ukrainian (or Russian)
Starting date of assignment:	August 2019 – October 2019
Duration of Contract:	30 working days spread over a three months period
Duration of Assignment:	30 working days
Payment arrangements:	Lump-sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results)
Administrative arrangements:	UNDP Ukraine will arrange travel to Kyiv, Ukraine if needed and transport for day trips within Ukraine. The national consultants shall be paid for their travel by UNDP Ukraine in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations.
Evaluation method:	Desk review with validation interview
Application deadline:	31 st May 2019

Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported 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 full-sized project “Development and Commercialization of Bioenergy Technologies in the Municipal Sector of Ukraine” project (PIMS number 2921).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Development and Commercialization of Bioenergy Technologies in the Municipal Sector of Ukraine			
GEF Project ID:	4377		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	2921	GEF financing:	4.7	4.7
Country:	Ukraine	IA/EA own:	0.9	0.9
Region:	Europe and CIS	Government:	3.27	3.27
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	25.89	25.89
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Objective 3: Promote Investment in Renewable Energy Technologies	Total co-financing:	30.06	30.06
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	34.76 (* as per ProDoc)	
Other Partners involved:	State Agency on Energy Efficiency and Energy Saving of Ukraine; Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		24.06.2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31.12.2019	Actual: 31.12.2019

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to accelerate sustainable agricultural biomass utilization for municipal heat and hot water services in Ukraine over its five-year implementation period (2014-2019) to enable Ukraine to substantially move closer to its target of having some 7% of the country's annual primary energy requirements for heating and hot water services supplied by biomass by 2035, as outlined in the "Energy Strategy of Ukraine to 2035".

The project is also to contribute to the reduction of GHG emissions by creating a favorable legal, regulatory and market environment and building institutional, administrative and technical capacities to promote the utilization of the country's extensive agricultural biomass potential for municipal heat and hot water services.

Since its commencement in 2014, the project has contributed to shaping the renewable energy policy in Ukraine, and successfully implemented pilot activities demonstrating benefits of agrarian biomass for municipalities. The project has provided substantial capacity building assistance to the Government of Ukraine, and particularly to the State Agency for Energy Efficiency, responsible for the renewable energy policy of Ukraine. Municipal Biomass Programmes have been developed for 7 pilot oblasts (Poltava, Ivano-Frankivsk, Zakarpattia, Volyn, Dnipropetrovsk, Zhytomyr and Cherkasy).

Four Draft Laws (#4334 to stimulate the production of heat energy from alternative energy sources; #4580 on the transfer of authority to set tariffs and licensing; #4581 on signing long-term contracts for the supply of heat energy; and #4643 on improvement of relationships in the heating sector) were drafted with substantial input from the project and registered in the Parliament of Ukraine. In partnership with IFC, the project has developed the design for a Financial Support Mechanism aimed to stimulate investment in the bioenergy by municipalities.

The project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with the total GEF contribution of USD 4,700,000 and is implemented by UNDP in Ukraine, reporting both in specific GEF and UNDP formats. The project aims to achieve this target by introducing a conducive regulatory framework and by establishing a financial support mechanism (FSM) that together will facilitate private sector participation in utilizing agricultural biomass to supply municipal heat and hot water services and assist the Government in closing private sector funded investments in municipal biomass. One of the key outputs of the Project is providing technical assistance to municipalities in developing feasibility studies, business plans and technical design documents for municipal biomass heat and hot water systems.

In 2016 in cooperation with the GEF Small Grants Programme and local non-governmental organizations several pilot projects on planting energy willow have been launched in Zakarpattia oblast, Poltava oblast, and Ivano-Frankivsk oblast.

In 2015-2016 ten municipal bioenergy pilot projects have been implemented in different municipalities.

In September 2018 the Project has started a contest among municipalities seeking for technical assistance for adoption of agricultural biomass-based heating technologies. It is intended to provide technical

assistance with developing feasibility studies and technical designs for biomass heating installations for up to 25 municipalities during the period between November 2018 and September 2019. By May 2019 14 feasibility studies and 1 technical design have been prepared; 14 municipal bioenergy projects have been completed under the UNDP assistance.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines¹ and UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects².

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.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method 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** (see Annex C), 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. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an 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, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Kyiv and Zhytomyr, including the following project sites (Zhytomyr School #1, the National Center for Ecology and Nature). Interviews (in person or via skype/telephone) will be held with the following organizations:

- 1) State Agency for Energy Efficiency
- 2) Ministry of Regional Development, Construction, Housing and Communal Services
- 3) Verkhovna Rada
- 4) Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, GEF Focal Point
- 5) Oblast state administrations: Poltava, Ivano-Frankivsk, Zakarpattia, Volyn, Dnipropetrovsk, Zhytomyr and Cherkasy
- 6) Recipients of UNDP grant support:
 - Cherkaske Village Council;
 - National Center for Ecology and Nature (Kyiv);
 - Nevytske village council;

¹ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf

² <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

- Uman School #9;
- Uman School #12;
- Uman Daycare center #21;
- Zhytomyr School #1;
- Zhytomyr Daycare center #10;
- Zhytomyr Agrarian University;

7) Recipients of the technical assistance from UNDP:

- Bakhmut City Council;
- Berezdiv Village Council;
- Divychky Amalgamated Territorial Community (ATC);
- Kherson City Council;
- Korosten City Council;
- Kupyansk City Council;
- Irshava ATC;
- Mykhailo-Kotsiubynske ATC;
- Odesa Hospital #11;
- Radekhiv City Council;
- Starokostiantyniv City Council;
- Uman City Council;
- Voznesensk City Council;
- Zaytseve ATC.

8) Association of local self-governments "Association of Ukrainian Cities"

9) Bioenergy Association of Ukraine

10) International Financial Corporation

11) Ukrgasbank AB

12) Oschadbank PJSC

13) Ecomerezha' NGO, Zaporizhzhya

14) 'Shyrokiy Step' NGO, Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, Kolomyia

15) 'Molochay' NGO, Zaporizhzhya

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material 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 TOR Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

Detailed Scope of work

The National consultant will provide support to the International consultant with evaluating the following four categories of project progress. See the Guidance for Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for additional information.

1. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- Review to what extent did the project contribute to the SDGs and the UNDP Strategic Plan?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within the project's time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. improved energy independence, improved condition in the local schools / hospitals / other public buildings, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

2. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Project strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target ⁵	End of project target	Midterm level and assessment ⁶	Achievement rating ⁷	Justification for rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green = Achieved	Yellow = On target to be achieved	Red = Not on target to be achieved
------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyze the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Final Evaluation.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits;
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that were not successful, identify lessons learned for future interventions;
- Make sure the data used is gender-disaggregated, whereas the progress analysis is gender-sensitive.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Overall Effectiveness

- Did the project achieve 18 municipal biomass systems brought on-line?

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Color code this column only

⁷ Use the 6-point Progress Towards Result Rating: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Did the project deliver cumulative energy savings of 285 GWh in terms of heat and hot water generated?
- Did the project contribute to establishing and adopting Municipal Targets for Biomass Energy in at least five oblasts of Ukraine?
- Did the project contribute to establishing a Financial Support Mechanism (FSM) that continues to operate beyond project lifetime?

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in 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 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 (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools that were being used including PIR reporting and quarterly financial reporting: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board including assessing how well the project has worked with UNDP Ukraine and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in identifying and implementing adaptive management measures
- Assess how well the Project international consultant and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process has been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

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 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**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Ukraine. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators 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 Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Duty station

Home-based with 10 working days mission within Ukraine which should be carried out within 3 weeks of the signing of the contract between the Parties.

Travel

- National travel (10 working days - mission) will be required within Ukraine which is called the Terminal Evaluation mission; This 10 working days mission does not include travel days or weekend days. Travel costs need not to be included in the financial proposal. They will be paid for separately by UNDP.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	15.08.2019
Evaluation Mission	10 days	15.09.2019
Draft Evaluation Report	15 days	10.10.2019
Final Report	2 days	30.10.2019

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO

Draft Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO 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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator (team leader), and one national evaluator based in Ukraine. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The National consultant must present the following qualifications:

- University degree (at least Bachelor's degree or equivalent) in Economics, Energy, Engineering, Management or related field is required;
- Minimum 5 years of experience in project/programme development and implementation;
- Minimum 3 years of experience in energy efficiency field, preferably in the sphere of renewables;
- Minimum 2 years of experience with policy making and policy advice in the sustainable energy (energy efficiency, renewable energy) sphere;
- Minimum 2 evaluations of energy-related projects/programs conducted; experience with terminal evaluation of GEF-funded projects is an asset;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF is an asset;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Previous working experience with international development institutions is an asset;
- Fluent written and spoken English and Ukrainian is a must; knowledge of Russian is an asset.

Core Competencies:

- Ethics and Values: Demonstrate and safeguard ethics and integrity;
- Organizational Awareness: Demonstrate corporate knowledge and sound judgment;
- Development and Innovation: Take charge of self-development and take initiative;
- Work in teams: Demonstrate ability to work in a multicultural environment and to maintain effective working relations with people of different national and cultural backgrounds;
- Communicating and Information Sharing: Facilitate and encourage open communication and strive for effective communication;

- Conflict Management: Surface conflicts and address them proactively acknowledging different feelings and views and directing energy towards a mutually acceptable solution;
- Continuous Learning and Knowledge Sharing: Encourage learning and sharing of knowledge.

Expected outputs and deliverables

The national consultant is expected to deliver the following:

- Deliverable 1: Comments to the inception report of the international evaluator and organization of meetings for the mission (3 days);
- Deliverable 2: Presentation of initial findings (together with the international evaluator) - end of the evaluation mission (10 days);
- Deliverable 3: Baseline analysis and stocktaking report. The baseline analysis which examines the extent to which increase in biomass-based energy generation for municipal heat and hot water supply systems in Ukraine can be attributed to the project and the extent to which these policy, institutional, legislative, and regulatory changes would be happening anyway. The stocktaking report makes a brief summary of all the major reports/outputs prepared by the project and examines their impact and relevance. Finally, the national consultant will provide detailed comments and feedback on the draft evaluation report of the international evaluator (15 days);
- Deliverable 4: Contribution to the draft and final terminal evaluation report of the international evaluator (2 days).

The national consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation/language support, etc., as follows:

- Preparation of inception report/work plan of the international evaluator prior to the mission;
- Assessment of adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon;
- Preparation of the baseline analysis and stocktaking report (max 25 pages);
- Assessment of effectiveness of awareness generation activities through quality promotional packages/awareness material, number of awareness programmes, trainings undertaken, and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like, brochure, etc. should also be considered.

The national consultant will report directly to UNDP Ukraine country office and follow the guidance of the international evaluator leading the terminal evaluation. All reports are to be written in English. The national consultant will focus on the baseline analysis section of the terminal evaluation, outlining if other donors were making a distinction between what has happened as a result of the project and what has happened from business as usual situation. The national consultant should provide an electronic version of all the required deliverables.

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”](#).

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission of a detailed workplan/inception report prior to the field mission
50%	Upon submission of the draft TE report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice
40%	Upon finalization of the TE report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online⁸ by **07.06.2019**. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete CV 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).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

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 should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (P11 desk reviews and interviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified (received minimum 70% of maximum available technical scores) for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation”).

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Education (**maximum 11 points**): university degree in the relevant field (Bachelor’s or equivalent) – 7 points; Master’s degree in relevant field – 9 points; Master’s degree in Energy – 11 points;
- Experience in project/programme development and implementation (**maximum 15 points**): at least 5 years – 10 points; 7 or more years – 12 points; including biomass-related projects +3 points;
- Experience with renewable energy and energy efficiency (**maximum 15 points**): 3 years of experience with energy efficiency and/or renewables – 10 points; 4-5 years of experience – 11

⁸ <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/jobs.html>

points; 5 or more years of experience – 13 points; including work in international organizations +2 points;

- Evaluations of energy-related projects and programmes conducted (**maximum 13 points**): 2 evaluations – 8 points; 3 or more evaluations – 10 points, including those funded by UNDP/GEF – +3 points;
- Experience with policy making and policy advice in the sphere of sustainable energy (**maximum 10 points**): 2 years – 6 points; 3 or more years – 8 points; including renewables +2 points;
- Fluency in both English and Ukrainian (or Russian) – **6 points**.

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points

APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a **brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (if applicable). Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- **Filled P11 form** / CV including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees (blank form can be downloaded from http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc)
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and supported by a breakdown of costs, as per Annex I template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template (can be downloaded from http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=13028). Please note that all travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.) will be reimbursed separately as per UNDP rules.
- **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>.

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.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Outcome # 10: Government adopts policy frameworks and mechanisms adopted to ensure reversal of environmental degradation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and prevention and response to natural and man-made disasters.					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Indicator 1: Number of newly adopted environmental policy frameworks. Indicator 2: Number of active green investment schemes (GIS) and energy efficient (EE) projects. Indicator 3: % of national budget allocated to environment and energy sectors.					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page): Output 6: National and local capacities for climate change resilient policies and practices enhanced.					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme: To promote investment in renewable energy technologies.					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Total avoided GHG emissions from utilisation of biomass for municipal heat and hot water services.					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Avoided GHG emissions from utilisation of biomass for municipal heat and hot water services (tons CO ₂) and \$/t CO ₂ .					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective					
The objective of the project is to significantly increase the use of biomass energy as a fuel source for heating and hot water services in the municipal sector in Ukraine by at least 20% over the baseline scenario in order to reduce direct greenhouse gas emissions by 63,577 tons of CO ₂ over the 4-year life of the project and, subsequently, 19,143 tons of CO ₂ during each year of the	Municipalities/ Private Sector have operationalised direct investment in municipal biomass projects for heat and hot water supply.	GHG in the municipal heating sector scheduled to increase from 434.4 million tCO ₂ (in 2005, as per Ukraine's Third, Fourth and Fifth National Communications to UNFCCC prepared in 2009 (all three issued	285 GWh _{TH} in terms of heat and hot water generated (as a result of the 18 municipal biomass systems brought on-line) by project completion. Direct reduction of 63,577 tons of CO ₂ over the 4-year FSP project life cycle and 361,000	Project's annual reports, GHG monitoring and verification reports. Project final evaluation report.	Continued commitment of project partners, including Government agencies and investors/developers.

remaining 16-year life of the boiler equipment. When one looks at the 20 year lifetime of the boilers earmarked for development during the project period, the boilers will have generated 1,618,834 MWh _{TH} , with a combined amount of CO ₂ reduced of 361,000 tons, equivalent to \$13 of GEF funds per tCO ₂ .		in one document)) to as high as 740.7 million tCO ₂ by 2030. The present contribution of biomass towards heat/hot water supply is estimated at 75 GWh _{TH} . Negligible investments taking place in municipal biomass for heat and hot water supply.	over the full lifetime of the plants. Estimated cumulative indirect GHG emission reduction of over 1.4 million tons of CO ₂ by 2035 on the basis of a conservative policy scenario and a GEF causality factor of 80%.		
Outcomes					
Outcome 1A: Streamlined and comprehensive market-oriented policy and legal/regulatory framework to promote municipal biomass for heat and hot water services.	Policy and legal/regulatory framework finalized, adopted and available for consultation by potential investors.	None available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of recruitment of project manager and approved by Government 1.5 years after start of project.	Published documents. Government decrees/laws.	Commitment of the various Government institutions.
Output 1A.1: Report streamlining a market-oriented policy and legal/regulatory framework to regulate municipal biomass for heat and hot water services.	Report confirming that policy and framework arrangements are adopted and in place.	Potentially overlapping responsibilities of various Government institutions make the decision process quite cumbersome.	To be completed within 15 months of recruitment of project manager and approved by the Government 1.5 years after project start.	Published documents.	Commitment of the various Government institutions.

Output 1A.2: Strategy document aimed at sharpening the focus of the respective roles and responsibilities of Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food (MAPF) and Ministry for Regional Development, Construction, Housing and Communal Services (MRDCHCS).	Document outlining individual roles and responsibilities formulated, adopted and procedures in place.	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of recruitment of project manager and approved by the Government 1.5 years after project start.	Published documents.	Commitment of the respective Government institutions.
Output 1A.3: Criteria and procedures for the introduction of a transparent process in the selection/award of municipal biomass projects for development.	Guidelines for the selection of projects available and put into practice.	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of recruitment of project manager and approved by the Government 1.5 years after project start. Competitive selection/award of projects completed by the end of 3 years after project start.	Published documents. Signed documents.	Commitment of the various Government institutions and project developers.
Outcome 1B: Municipal Targets for Biomass Energy for heating are agreed and established.	Confirmation that municipal targets have been established.	None available at the present time.	To be completed within 12 months of project start.	Published document.	Commitment of Municipalities.
Output 1B.1: National Targets for Biomass Energy in heating until 2020 are agreed and adopted.	Confirmation that national targets for agricultural and wood biomass until 2020 have been	None available at the present time.	To be completed within 18 months of project start.	Published document.	Commitment of Government institutions and municipalities.

	established.				
Output 1B.2: Municipal Targets for Biomass Energy in heating (for at least 5 Oblasts including Ivano-Frankivsk and Cherkasy) are agreed and adopted.	Confirmation that municipal targets for agricultural and wood biomass have been agreed and adopted.	None available at the present time.	Municipal targets for at least 5 Oblasts including Ivano-Frankivsk and Cherkasy) completed within 12 months of project start.	Published document.	Commitment of 5 Oblasts including Ivano-Frankivsk and Cherkasy.
Outcome 2: Capacity available within MAPF to support development and implementation of a municipal biomass programme through the establishment of a Biomass Support Unit.	Number of staff who participated in and successfully completed capacity development programme, including training on the revised and updated Municipal Biomass Guide.	None available at the present time.	Ten staff trained within 15 months of recruitment of project manager.	Training modules/number of staff trained. Project report.	Concerned institutions willing to release staff for training.
Output 2.1: A sustainable Biomass Support Unit (BSU) established within MAPF to support the municipal biomass programme during the project lifetime and beyond.	Biomass Support Unit, including website, in place and operational.	None available at the present time.	To be fully operational within 15 months of recruitment of project manager.	Biomass Support Unit in place. Project report. Evidence that BSU has been integrated within MAPF structures.	Support of MAPF ensured prior to commencement of project activities.
Output 2.2: Suitable methodology for the economic/financial evaluation of municipal biomass systems.	Methodology applied by BSU for municipal biomass projects. Incentives operationalised.	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of recruitment of project manager and applied by Government	Project report.	Cooperation of concerned entities and staff.

Appropriate incentives to attract project developers.			thereafter.		
Output 2.3: Technology transfer opportunities and delivery models, including development of boiler construction and installation standards, formulated and operationalised.	Reports confirming that technology models and boiler standards have been developed and are being implemented.	None at the present time.	Completed within 24 months of project start.	Project reports.	Commitment of equipment suppliers and project developers.
Output 2.4: One-stop shop within BSU to provide information and guidelines on construction licenses and permits to developers.	One-stop shop is operational. Information brochure and website are available.	Under the business-as-usual scenario, the average time to secure all required construction licenses and permits can take up to 12 months.	All construction licenses and permits are issued within 6 months following completion of feasibility studies and selection of promoters.	Signed documents.	Continued investor interest.
Output 2.5: Capacity of BSU developed to monitor and document project experience.	Capacity development material prepared, including lessons learned.	No capacity development programme.	10 BSU staff trained by the end of project.	Project reports.	Designation of staff by Government.
Outcome 3: Investment promotion in municipal use of biomass through establishment/strengthening of Financial Support Mechanism.	Funding available from DerzhZemBank, including funds under FSM, to support preparation of feasibility studies, business plans and investment.	Not presently available.	Construction of at least 18 municipal biomass projects completed by the end of the project.	Signed Heat and Hot Water Purchase Agreements and other relevant documents.	Government has a sustainable financing mechanism in place.

Output 3.1: Financial Support Mechanism (FSM) established within DerzhZemBank of MAPF and continues to operate beyond project lifetime.	Financial Support Mechanism (FSM) established and operationalized and is supporting projects to be implemented.	None available at the present time.	FSM is operational 2 years after project start. As a mid-term target, the project will look into an eventual need for further subsidy and subsequent support to the Government for continuing with the subsidy scheme.	Applications for loans from project developers processed. Disbursements made to project developers.	Cooperation of MAPF and DerzhZemBank. Sustained interest of developers.
Output 3.2: Capacity developed within FSM to appraise projects in municipal use of biomass for lending.	Number of financial institution's staff successfully trained.	None available at the present time.	Five to six financial institution staff trained within 15 months of recruitment of project manager.	Number of staff trained. Project report.	Cooperation of DerzhZemBank.
Output 3.3: Feasibility studies and business plans for municipal biomass heat and hot water systems.	Reports available.	Non-existent at the present time.	Completed within 18 months of project start.	Project documentation.	All necessary data available to project developers.
Output 3.4: Reports on financial closure with project developers and completion reports for one project each in Cherkasy and Ivano-Frankivsk Oblasts and 4 additional projects in other Oblasts.	Signed financial closure documents.	Not presently available.	Completed within 30 months of project start.	Project reports.	Supportive financial regulations in place. Sustained interest of developers.
Output 3.5: Report on completion of a total of 18 municipal biomass heat and hot water systems by project	Completion reports.	Almost none being built at the present time.	18 municipal biomass heating and hot water systems completed by	Site visits and project reports.	Supportive policy, institutional, legal and regulatory framework,

end.			project end which will have generated 1,618,834 MWhTHin thermal energy with a combined amount of CO2 reduced of 361,000 tons over the 20 year lifetime of the boilers.		and sustained interest of investors.
Outcome 4: Outreach programme and dissemination of project experience/best practices/lessons learned for replication throughout the country.	Outreach programme formulated. Project experience compiled, analysed and disseminated.	Lack of sufficient information to pursue programme.	Increased awareness among stakeholders in place to promote and develop the market for municipal biomass.	Project final report and website.	Growth of programme will be sustained.
Output 4.1: National plan to implement outreach/promotional activities to support biomass projects targeting domestic (and international) investors.	National Plan for supporting national biomass projects available and operationalised.	No such plan available.	Completed within 18 months of project initiation.	Project documentation.	Expected expansion of programme.
Output 4.2: Comprehensive and reliable data compiled and available for future initiatives.	Project experience, lessons learned and best practices compiled.	None available.	Completed within 3 months of project end.	Project documentation.	Successful completion of project.
Output 4.3: Published Municipal Biomass Guide detailing a step-by-step approach for implementing municipal biomass programmes.	Increased capacity of municipalities to implement municipal biomass programmes.	None available.	Completed within 12 months of project initiation.	Project publication.	On-time finalisation of Municipal Biomass Guide.

<p>Output 4.4: Published materials (including video) on project experience/best practices and lessons learned.</p>	<p>Project experience and best practices compiled, published and available on website.</p> <p>Short video available.</p> <p>Annual Summit of the Regions Biomass Conference.</p>	<p>Lack of information on best practices and lessons learned.</p> <p>None available.</p> <p>None is being held.</p>	<p>Completed within 3 months of project end.</p> <p>Completed within 3 months of project end.</p> <p>Annual Summit of the Regions Biomass Conference organised in a different region each year.</p>	<p>Project documentation and web site.</p> <p>Video posted on website.</p> <p>Conference Proceedings.</p>	<p>Successful completion of project.</p> <p>Successful completion of project.</p> <p>Project activities are proceeding as per plans.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. PIF
 2. UNDP Initiation Plan
 3. UNDP Project Document
 4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
 5. Project Inception Report
 6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
 7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
 8. Audit reports
 9. Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the project
 10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm GEF Climate Change Mitigation Tracking Tool (https://www.thegef.org/documents/tracking_tools)
 11. Oversight mission reports
 12. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
 13. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
- The following documents will also be available:
14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
 15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
 16. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
 17. Project site location maps

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
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?			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

ANNEX D: EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation will at minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
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	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

ANNEX E: GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁹)

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

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

Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹⁰)

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

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.

- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- 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

Project Results

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

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

Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Relevant final stage GEF Tracking Tool
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX F: 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 Form¹¹

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: _____

¹¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO 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: _____