**Interim Evaluation Terms of Reference for UNDP-supported GCF-financed projects**

**Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to** [**UNDP Procurement Website**](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/)

**Job title:** National Consultant for Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project

**Project title:** Scaling-up Investment in Low-Carbon Public Buildings

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** National Consultant

**Duty Station:** Home based (Bosnia and Herzegovina)

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date: 1 June 2022**

**Duration of Contract:** *1 June 2022 to 30 September 2022 (up to 30 workdays)*

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation (IE) of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project titled [**Scaling-up Investment in Low-Carbon Public Buildings**](https://open.undp.org/projects/00100067)(PIMS#5882 / GCF FP051) implemented through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is to be undertaken in 2022. The project started on the 29 May 2018 and is in its 4th year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Project background**

As a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) has undertaken important steps towards understanding and addressing climate change issues. It is increasingly recognized not only by the Government and scientific community, but also by its citizens that climate change is an issue of key strategic importance. BiH has put great emphasis on climate change as one of the most significant development challenges facing the country. In 2017, BiH submitted its Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC), as part of the negotiations leading to the historic Paris Agreement, which it signed in April 2016. The NDC has been enhanced, adopted by BiH authorities, and submitted to UNFCCC in Apr 2021.

Due to a long period of neglect and under-investment during and after the Bosnian war (1992-1995), public infrastructure, in particular buildings, in BiH is now in a dire state and in urgent need of upgrade and modernization. Over 70% of BiH’s public buildings were designed and built over 30 years ago with no consideration for their energy performance, let alone carbon footprint.

Public buildings have been identified as the sector with the largest potential for cost-effective energy saving in BiH (20-60%)[[1]](#footnote-2). Detailed energy audits conducted in public facilities by UNDP confirm that average energy use in a building can be reduced cost-efficiently by about 60%, assuming a given comfort level in the building (e.g., 20°C) before and after retrofitting. In addition to energy efficiency, significant potential for GHG emissions reduction lies in fuel switch[[2]](#footnote-3) measures: over 80% of public sector buildings are currently using fossil fuels (coal, light fuel oil (LFO), natural gas) or district heating systems, which are also predominantly coal based. Deployment of BiH’s vast renewable energy resources – bioenergy (biomass/biogas), solar and other sources – combined with investments in energy efficiency (EE), therefore have the potential to play an instrumental role in reducing GHG emissions and energy use in public buildings, currently amounting to approximately 10% of BiH’s annual governmental budget. In total, the cost-effective energy savings potential in public buildings is estimated at around 700 GWh/year[[3]](#footnote-4), which translates into 560,000 tCO2/year or over 10 million tCO2 in GHG emissions reduction over the investment life cycle for both energy efficiency (EE) and renewable energy (RE) measures in buildings.

Public buildings, i.e., buildings that belong to a state, municipality or other type of public authority and are used by the public, come in a wide variety of shapes, sizes and purposes, and they have been built at different times according to different standards. Consequently, addressing energy use in any given building requires a tailored approach, which needs to reflect the specifics of a particular building. Such an approach carries significant upfront transaction costs.

Due to the fragmented and complex inter-authority jurisdictions, especially in FBiH, authorities and line ministries do not possess a clear overview of public buildings under their jurisdiction, not to mention energy- and water-related consumption and the costs they incur on a monthly basis: public expenditures on energy and water are not monitored, recorded or analyzed in any systematic way. Official data on energy intensity of public building stock do not exist. Although draft plans for improved energy performance in buildings (Operational Energy Efficiency Action Plans of public sector buildings in several Cantons in FBiH and Energy Efficiency Action Plan of Republika Srpska in RS) are being laid down, a comprehensive policy implementation platform and monitoring framework for public buildings is missing and has to be put in place to promote and enable low-carbon investment on the ground.

Multiple public authorities and entities in charge of public building management and building end-users lack essential capacities to identify, prepare and implement low-carbon investment projects. Lack of human and technical resources, information, as well as practical experience with project identification and preparation, and with implementation planning and business-models for low-carbon investment in the public sector, represent another important non-financial barrier that needs to be overcome.

The current financing paradigm for investment in low-carbon retrofits of public buildings in BiH can be summarized as follows:

* The existence of seemingly numerous, but cumulatively insignificant, grant-based funding sources/projects from national and international organizations complemented by end-users’ own finance
* The lack of a coordinated and integrated approach to public building retrofits that leads to ineffective and sub-optimal allocation of public funds
* The lack of private sector involvement and interest in market-based finance, including lack of a developed market for the ESCO business model and energy performance contracts

**About the project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project title | [Scaling-up Investment in Low-Carbon Public Buildings](https://open.undp.org/projects/00100067) |
| Atlas ID | 00100067 |
| Corporate outcome and output | UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025, Outcome 2; Output 2.3.1 |
| Country | Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| Date project document signed | 1 August 2018 |
| Project End date | 28 May 2026 |
| Project budget | 17,646,000 USD |
| Project expenditure at the time of evaluation | 6,160,031.78 USD |
| Funding source | Green Climate Fund |
| Implementing party | UNDP |

The **project “**[**Scaling-up Investment in Low-Carbon Public Buildings**](https://open.undp.org/projects/00100067)**”** is supported by the [Green Climate Fund (GCF)](https://www.greenclimate.fund/) and implemented by UNDP in BiH.

The **overall project’s objective** is to scale-up investment in low-carbon public buildings via design and implementation of the National Framework for Low-Carbon Investment in Public Buildings, comprising an integrated package of policy, regulatory, technological, informational, financial, and managerial solutions designed to address country-specific risks and barriers to investment. The GCF project will result in a four- to five-fold increase in the level of investment in low-carbon public buildings; this, in turn, will enable BiH to meet its stated objective to reduce GHG emissions from the public buildings sector.

**Outcomes of the project are:**

Outcome 1.1 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for low-emission planning and development

Outcome 1.2 Lower energy intensity of buildings, cities, industries, and appliances

**Outputs of the project are:**

Output 1.1 Addressing non-financial barriers to investment in low-carbon buildings and infrastructure (“Policy de-risking”)

Output 1.2 Addressing financial barriers to low-carbon investment in buildings and infrastructure (“Financial de-risking and Investment support”)

**Output 1** will provide technical assistance (TA) to public and private sector stakeholders at municipal, cantonal, entity and national level in BiH to help address non-financial barriers, and to create conducive policies, regulations, and capacities for implementation of the National Investment Framework for Low-Carbon Public Buildings.

**Output 2** will facilitate implementation of the National Investment Framework for Low-Carbon Public Buildings, including the required investment support to improve risk-return profiles and to bring prospective low-carbon building projects to financial close.

Impact:

The project will result in a real and visible paradigm shift in the BiH public building sector towards low-carbon sustainable development, as specifically recommended in the Nationally Determined Contribution, the National Communication to the UNFCCC and the National Climate Change Strategy of BiH. It is expected to result in direct emission reductions of 2,019,976 tCO2e by facilitating and scaling-up investment in low-carbon retrofits in 430 public buildings (representing 11% of the total public building stock in the country). Low carbon retrofit projects include both EE and fuel switch measures in all buildings.

In addition to contributing to global environmental benefits, the project will improve the access of local communities, including vulnerable communities, to clean, safe, and affordable energy: the retrofitted public buildings will provide improved occupancy conditions, affordable clean, adequate warmth in schools and hospitals and improved indoor and outdoor air quality.

The project will also change the established paradigm whereby assistance is provided by various agencies in isolation: instead, it will establish a mechanism that combines various financial sources and instruments under one Investment Framework and where resources from each partner are deployed to address a specific risk or barrier to investment, cumulatively ensuring much more attractive terms for investment than if the same assistance were provided in isolation.

The proposed low-carbon solutions in public buildings will support the transition towards a zero-carbon public sector with corresponding significant reduction of GHG emissions. In addition, introduction of RE, in particular switch from LFO to locally available biomass will improve security of energy supply to essential public infrastructure, improve conditions for occupants and users of public buildings, most of whom are women and children; reduce local pollution and improve public health; and drive local economic growth and employment.

The cumulative impact of the benefits of the application of the proposed low-carbon solutions in public buildings will:

* enable the transition towards a zero-carbon public sector with corresponding significant reduction of GHG emissions
* make essential public infrastructure energy-independent, thus providing shelter and essential services to local communities during emergencies
* improve conditions for occupants and users of public buildings, most of whom are women and children
* reduce local pollution and improve public health
* drive local economic growth and employment

The Green Climate Fund is built on the premise of providing finance that is catalytic and plays a paradigm shifting role. This project directly responds to these challenges by proposing an approach that enables both: i.e. catalyzing larger flows of finance for low-carbon investment and shifting the established paradigm about how this investment has to be made. It will support implementation of low-carbon retrofits in 430 public buildings, thus essentially scaling-up current level of investment in the sector by a factor of four to five.

**Partnerships:**

The project is implemented by UNDP, following Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) between UNDP and the Government of BiH, and as per the policies and procedures outlined in the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP). According to the SBAA between UNDP and the Government of BiH signed on 7 Dec 1995, the project document is the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the SBAA. All references in the SBAA to “Executing Agency“ are deemed to refer to “Implementing Partner”.  According to the POPP: “Implementing Partner” is “the entity responsible and accountable for managing a project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outputs, and for the effective use of resources.” In addition, an Implementing Partner may enter into agreements with other organisations or entities, known as “Responsible Parties”, which may carry out project activities and produce project outputs on behalf of the Implementing Partner. Responsible Parties are accountable directly to the Implementing Partner. In the context of GCF and UNDP Accreditation Master agreement, signed on 5 August 2016, UNDP is also the Accredited Entity.

In line with UNDP’s DIM modality, UNDP is the Implementing Partner and serves as the “Executing Entity” (using GCF terminology). The project has two parallel implementation structures in FBiH and RS, respectively (reflecting the administrative structure of BiH). There are four Responsible Parties: the Ministry of Spatial Planning, Civil Engineering and Ecology of Republika Srpska and the Ministry of Spatial Planning of Federation of BiH respectively under Output 1.1 and 1.2, as well as the two Environmental Funds (FBiH and RS) under Output 1.2.

1. **Project Responsible Parties: The Ministry of Spatial Planning, Construction and Ecology (MSPCE)** of RS as the BiH the UNFCCC and GCF focal point - the Ministry’s mandate is to carry out “administrative activities and professional tasks related to the environment: protecting assets of general interest, natural resources, natural and cultural heritage; inspection and supervision in the field of urban planning, construction, utilities and environmental protection; cooperation with relevant ministries and institutions of the Federation of BiH; providing information about its work through the media and other means of information dissemination; and performance of other tasks in accordance with the law and other regulations of the RS and BiH”. The Ministry also carries out the role of national UNFCCC Focal Point, as well as the National Designated Authority for the GCF.
2. **The Ministry of Physical Planning of the FBiH (MPP FBiH)** - the Federal Ministry of Physical Planning carries out the administrative, expert, and other tasks falling under the competence of the Federation of BiH. The activities of the Ministry (including the mandate for the implementation of the relevant EU Directives for energy performance in buildings) are related to: physical planning and improvement; policy of land utilization at the Federal level; drafting, enforcing and applying the Physical Plan of the Federation of BiH, verification of the harmonization of the physical plans of the Cantons with the Physical Plan of the Federation of BiH; and supervision of appropriate institutions in this sector and other tasks as set out by the applicable legislation.
3. **The FBiH Environmental Protection Fund (EF FBiH)** was established by FBiH Law on Environmental Fund as a non-profit public institution, which is a legal entity with rights, obligations and responsibilities stipulated by the Law on the Fund and the Fund Statute. The activities of the EF comprise fund-raising, inducement and financing of programme preparation, implementation and development and other similar activities in the field of preservation, sustainable use, protection and improvement of the state of the environment and use of renewable energy sources, especially: professional and other activities in relation to obtaining, managing and utilizing the proceeds of the Fund, liaising with regard to environmental protection financed from funds of other countries, international financial institutions and bodies, domestic and foreign legal and natural persons; providing expert services in terms of financing environmental protection; maintaining databases of programmes, projects and other similar activities in the field of environmental protection; inducing, establishing and achieving cooperation with international and domestic financial institutions and other legal and natural persons to the effect of financing environmental protection in line with the Federal Strategy for Environmental Protection, environmental protection plans adopted on the basis of the Strategy, international agreements to which Bosnia and Herzegovina is a party and other programmes and documents relating to environmental protection.
4. **The RS Fund for Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency (FEPEE RS)** - was founded by the Law on the Fund and Funding of Environmental protection. The Fund conducts all activities in connection with collecting of funds and financing implementation of programmes, projects and similar activities in the field of conservation, sustainable use, protection and improvement of the environment, and on energy efficiency. The Fund is a legal entity with public authority. The Ministry for Urban Planning, Civil Constructing and Ecology of RS conducts supervision of the work of the Fund. The Fund is managed by a Management Board, which consists of three members – the Ministry of Energy, Industry and Mining, the Ministry of Spatial Planning, Civil Engineering and Ecology, and the Ministry of Water Management, Agriculture and Forestry of RS. It is audited by auditors appointed by RS, while the annual results and planned activities are adopted by the Government of RS.

The project is also implemented in partnership with:

* **The BiH Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations (MoFTER)** - is involved in its capacity as the State Ministry directly responsible for BiH’s participation in UNDP-assisted projects. In consultation with the Implementing Partner, MoFTER will designates its representative to serve on the Project Board.

**Target groups and beneficiaries:**

Beneficiaries and key institutional beneficiaries are the Ministry of Spatial Planning, Construction and Ecology (MSPCE) of RS, the Ministry of Physical Planning of the FBIH (MPP FBiH), the FBIH Environmental Protection Fund, the Fund for Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency of RS.

Project’s direct and indirect beneficiaries are citizens of BiH and many Local Governments (Cities, Municipalities, Cantons) that represent End-Users of project Activities. The project had its activities in at least 104 out of 144 local governments in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Overview of secured co-financing (in millions of USD):**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **In kind  (USD)** | **Grant  (USD)** | **Loan  (USD)** | **Total  (USD)** |
| UNDP |  | 2.05 |  | 2.05 |
| UNDP – GEF |  | 2.30 |  | 2.30 |
| Ministry of Spatial Planning of FBIH | 0.50 | 1.77 | 19.23 | 21.50 |
| Ministry of of Spatial Planning Civil Engineering and Ecology of RS | 0.50 | 6.00 | 12.77 | 19.27 |
| Environmental Protection Fund of FBiH | 0.10 | 4.00 | 10.00 | 14.10 |
| Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund of RS |  | 12.21 | 3.49 | 15.70 |
| Government of Western-Herzegovina Canton |  | 9.00 |  | 9.00 |
| Ministry of Economic Affairs of Canton 10 |  | 3.00 |  | 3.00 |
| City of Doboj |  | 2.00 |  | 2.00 |
| Municipality of Gračanica |  | 0.15 |  | 0.15 |
| Municipality of Modriča |  | 0.50 |  | 0.50 |
| Municipality of Maglaj |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 |
| City of Trebinje |  | 2.00 |  | 2.00 |
| Municipality of Teslić |  | 1.80 |  | 1.80 |
| The Government of Bosnia-Podrinje Canton |  | 2.30 |  | 2.30 |
| Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environmental Protection of Tuzla Canton |  | 3.00 |  | 3.00 |
| Ministry of Physical Planning, Constructions and Environmental Protection of Canton Sarajevo |  | 6.00 |  | 6.00 |
| Municipality of Petrovo |  | 0.25 |  | 0.25 |
| **TOTAL in USD (millions)** | **1.10** | **58.63** | **45.49** | **105.22** |

**Covid 19 context:**

Starting from March 2020, the projects’ implementation was negatively affected by the global outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID-19 imposed lockdown resulted in a temporary halt of the activities in the field, which caused delays in timely completion of some of the activities. The project has readjusted its activities to the new mode of work (respecting the imposed COVID-19 measures in the country), however the impact of COVID-19 could influence the total number of buildings planned for rehabilitation and/or number of EE measures planned for implementation per building.

Also, the project’s EE/RE integrated measures in the areas where the public buildings and infrastructure were affected by floods or are at risk will be aligned with the “Build Back Better” principle and will include flood-resistant building materials for EE measures and biomass fuel switch projects, all of which can strengthen resilience through improved resistance to floods and increased reliability and affordability of energy sources.

**Project alignment and relevance:**

The project at design was linked to UNDAF for BiH, Outcome 5: By 2019, legal and strategic frameworks enhanced and operationalized to ensure sustainable management of natural, cultural and energy resources. The project is also linked to the UN Coordination Framework for BiH 2021-2025, Outcome 1. By 2025, people benefit from resilient, inclusive, and sustainable growth ensured by the convergence of economic development, and management of environment and cultural resources.

The project is linked to UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025: Output 1.5: Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy)

The project contributes to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG):

* SDG7 (Affordable and Clean Energy)
* SDG9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure)
* SDG11 (Sustainable cities and communities)
* SDG17 (Partnership for the goals)

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION**

The IE will assess implementation of the project and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the UNDP Project Document and GCF Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The IE will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the following evaluation criteria from the [GCF IEU TOR](https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/document/ieu-tor) (GCF/B.06/06) and  [GCF Evaluation Policy,](https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/evaluation-policy-gcf) along with [guidance](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm) provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Additional evaluation criteria can be assessed, as applicable. The IE must assess the following

* **Implementation and adaptive management** – seek to identify challenges and propose additional measures to support more efficient and effective implementation. The following aspects of project implementation and adaptive management will be assessed: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.
* **Risks to sustainability** – seeks to assess the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The assessment of sustainability at the Interim Evaluation stage considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The IE should validate the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Reports, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date.
* **Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency** - seeks to assess the appropriateness in terms of selection, implementation and achievement of FAA and project document results framework activities and expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts).
* **Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities** - looks at how GCF financing is additional and able to amplify other investments or de-risk and crowd-in further climate investment.
* **Gender equity** - ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts of climate change are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioural changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to climate change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making.
* **Country ownership of projects and programmes** - examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the GCF investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes.
* **Innovativeness in results areas** - focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and the extent to which the project interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways.
* **Replication and scalability** – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporate d in independent evaluations).
* **Unexpected results, both positive and negative** - identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (governments, stakeholders, civil society, AE, GCF, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.

**4. INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The IE team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful.

**Desk review:** The Evaluation will be conducted by the Evaluation team composed of an International Evaluation Consultant (Evaluation Team Leader) and National Evaluation Consultant. The IE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, FAA, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based assessment).

The IE team is expected to follow a [collaborative and participatory approach](https://www.undp.org/publications/discussion-paper-innovations-monitoring-evaluating-results)[[4]](#footnote-5) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders and beneficiaries.

**Field mission:** In line with UNDP Evaluation Guidelines and depending on the epidemiological circumstances in BiH, the Evaluation will make every effort to undertake 10 working days (not including weekends and travel days) visit to BiH within 2 weeks of the Inception Report approval. The purpose of this mission will be to meet with face to face and interview all key stakeholders. In the event that it will not be possible to plan a mission due to COVID-19 restrictions, the face-to-face interviews will need to be replaced with virtual technological solutions instead. A decision about the mission will be undertaken shortly after the assignment has started.

**Key informant interviews:** With the support of the National Evaluation Consultant, the Evaluation Team Leader will interview representatives of UNDP, GCF focal point (Ministry of Spatial Planning, Civil Engineering and Ecology of RS), Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations BiH, Ministry of Physical Planning of the FBiH, Environmental Funds of RS and FBiH, End-Users, Chief Technical Advisor, Regional Technical Advisor.

**Site visits/spot checks:** The IE team is expected to conduct field visits to project in Drvar, Ribnik, Prnjavor and Konjic in the country, which is to be decided in consultation with the project team.

If a field mission is not possible due to the epidemiological circumstances, then remote interviews will be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.

Other methodologies, as appropriate, such as case studies, statistical analysis, social network analysis, etc. online interviews, mobile questionnaires, online surveys, and collaboration platforms (slack or yammer) can be used to gather data. Stakeholders that are dealing with existing emergencies should be given advance notice (health care centres and hospitals, etc.). Data collection (government data/records, field observation visits, CDM verifications, public expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to the assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

The specific design and methodology for the IE should emerge from consultations between the IE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the IE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The IE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the IE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the IE must be clearly outlined in the **Inception Report** and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the IE team.

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the Interim Evaluation team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the Interim Evaluation report.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION**

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the Interim Evaluation team to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the GCF investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to GCF investment.

**i. 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. See Annex 9 of [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf) for further guidelines.
* 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 its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance, 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.
* Ensure that the indicators (gender-disaggregated) are SMART, aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the [GCF programming manual](https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/programming-manual).
* Evaluate the Theory of Change (ToC) proposed by the project during the inception and design phases in comparison to the approach, relevance, actions, interventions, practicality, and current context. Foresee the way forward and propose necessary adjustments.

**ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency**

* Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed and reviewed during project initiation?
* Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
* Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
* Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
* How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project?
* Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold, or does it need to be adjusted? Reconstruct the ToC, if appropriate, aligning it with the [GCF ToC format](https://pims.undp.org/workspace/file/download?id=945).
* Verify the mitigation impact that the project has achieved. Analyse the GHG emissions achieved (including indirect emissions). Has an appropriate MRV system for GHG emission been established and implemented? Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
* Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate, and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
* Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
* What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
* To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
* How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
* How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
* To what extent did the project’s M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
* Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
* To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
* Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how does the project apply adaptive management?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

**iii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of indicators against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[5]](#footnote-6)** | **Baseline Level[[6]](#footnote-7)** | **Level in 1st APR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[7]](#footnote-8)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[8]](#footnote-9)** | **Achieve-ment Rating[[9]](#footnote-10)** | **Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved** |
| **Fund Level Impact:** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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 and outputs analysis:

* Assess whether the total number of beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries of the project has been properly calculated.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
* Include a comprehensive assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on different aspects of project implementation. Assess the impact on results delivery, overall funded activity performance along with a plan of action to address these.

**iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the FAA/Funding proposal. Have changes been made and have these been approved by GCF? 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 UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.
* Assess the feasibility of completing the proposed activities within the given project timeline (if extension was sought for any project milestone; please consider the revised timelines as well) and make recommendations for extensions, as need be.

Financing and Co-financing:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective, and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Comment on the use of different financial streams (parallel, leveraged, mobilized finance), as applicable in the context of the project – see [GCF policy on co-finance](https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf)[[10]](#footnote-11). Discuss whether co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, have been fulfilled, as applicable.
* Conduct an analysis of materialized co-financing and implications for project scope and results. If co-finance is not materializing as planned (timing and/or amount), assess mitigation measures, and discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.
* Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate and impact on the project

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

* Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
* Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
* To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
* How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? 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?
* Discuss any quality assuring mechanisms being used (e.g., ISO standard, government accreditations, international certificates, etc.)
* Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems?
* 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?
* Is a grievance mechanism in place? If so, assess its effectiveness

[Social and Environmental Standards](https://www.undp.org/accountability/social-and-environmental-responsibility/social-and-environmental-standards) ([Safeguards](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_gef_policy_environmental_social_safeguards.pdf))

* Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?
* Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
  + The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
  + The identified types of risks[[11]](#footnote-12) (in the SESP).
  + The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
* Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project’s social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project’s design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP’s safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project’s approval.

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
* Assess the efficiency, timeliness, and adequacy of reporting requirements

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.

**v. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the FAA and Funding proposal, APRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GCF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**vi. Country Ownership**

* To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
* How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
* To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
* Is the project, as implemented, responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
* Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

**vii. Gender equity**

* Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
* Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
* Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
* Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
* How do the results for women compare to those for men?
* Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
* To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
* Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?
* How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

**viii. Innovativeness in results areas**

* What are the lessons learned to enrich learning and knowledge generation in terms of how the project played in the provision of "thought leadership,” “innovation,” or “unlocked additional climate finance” for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

**ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative**

* What has been the project’s ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
* Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
* What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
* [Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change](https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/programming-manual)?[[12]](#footnote-13)

**x. Replication and Scalability**

* What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
* Assess the effectiveness of exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints? Is there a need for recalibration?
* What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
* Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
* What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

**Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned**

The Interim Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary.

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

The Interim Evaluation will also include a separate section with a concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned (new knowledge gained from the project, context, outcomes, even evaluation methods; failures/lost opportunities to date, what might have been done better or differently, etc.). Lessons should be based on specific evidence presented in the report and can be used to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions, as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.

The Interim Evaluation report’s findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned need to consider gender equality and women’s empowerment and other cross-cutting issues.

**Ratings**

The Interim Evaluation team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Interim Evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the Project Scaling-up Investment in Low-Carbon Public Buildings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Interim Evaluation Rating[[13]](#footnote-14)** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be up to 30 working daysover a time period of 16 weeks. The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS** | **COMPLETION DATE** |
| 1. **Desk review and Inception Report** | | |
| Document review and preparation of Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report; Submission of IE Inception Report (Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission) | 4 | 15 June 2022 |
| 1. **Mission and Data Collection** | | |
| IE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | 10 | 10 July 2022 |
| Presentation of initial findings- last day of the Interim Evaluation mission | 1 | 10 July 2022 |
| 1. **Report Writing** | | |
| Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #1 (at least 5 ½ weeks before final report due date) | 7 | 5 August 2022 |
| Incorporation of comments on Draft IE Report #1; Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #2 (at least 4 weeks before final report due date) | 5 | 20 August 2022 |
| Incorporation of comments from Draft IE Report #2 and Finalization of IE report + completed audit trail from feedback on draft report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) | 3 | 22 September 2022 |

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report** | Proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the Interim Evaluation report, and options for site visits | 15 June 2022 | Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | 10 July 2022 | Interim Evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft IE Report #1** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | 5 August 2022 | Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point |
| **4** | **Draft IE Report #2** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | 20 August 2022 | Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point |
| **5** | **Final Interim Evaluation Report\* + Audit Trail** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report | 22 September 2022 | Interim Evaluation Team sends final report + completed Audit Trail to Commissioning Unit |
| **6** | **Concluding Stakeholder Workshop** (optional) | Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key actions in response to the report. | 29 September 2022 | Led by Interim Evaluation team or Project Team and Commissioning Unit |

\*The final Interim Evaluation report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

1. **INTERIM EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Monitoring & Evaluation Focal Point of the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s IE is the UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina.

During this assignment, the Interim Evaluation team will report to the Evaluation Manager appointed by the Commissioning Unit who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the IE team and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Interim Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION AND CORE COMPETENCIES**

A team of one International Evaluation Consultant and one National Evaluation Consultant will conduct the IE – the International Evaluation Consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National Evaluation Expert (with experience in project evaluations). The Evaluation Team Leader will lead the evaluation process and decide on planning and distribution of the evaluation workload and tasks. She/he will closely collaborate with the National Evaluation Consultant who will provide support throughout the evaluation process.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

**The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:**

a) Competencies

Core values

* Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability

Core competencies

* Demonstrates professional competence to meet responsibilities and post requirements and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
* Results-Orientation: Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals, generates innovative, practical solutions to challenging situations
* Communication: Excellent communication skills, including the ability to convey complex concepts and recommendations, both orally and in writing, in a clear and persuasive style tailored to match different audiences
* Team work: Ability to interact, establish and maintain effective working relations with a culturally diverse team
* Client orientation: Ability to establish and maintain productive partnerships with national partners and stakeholders and pro-activeness in identifying of beneficiaries and partners’ needs and matching them to appropriate solutions

b) Required qualifications for the Evaluation Consultant

Education

* A Master’s degree in natural resource management/ environmental management/ business/ public administration other related disciplines or other closely related field.

Work Experience

* At least 7 years of professional working experience in the areas of climate change and energy management;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change and energy efficiency sector management projects;
* Relevant experience in result-based management and project evaluations;
* Experience applying indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline and theory of change scenarios;
* Experience in gender sensitive data collecting and analysis;
* Experience working in the Western Balkans region;
* Prior work experience with UNDP/UN Agencies

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English

1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct (see ToR Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866). The evaluation team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluation team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

20% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report

50% upon satisfactory delivery of the of the first draft Interim Evaluation report

30% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation report by the Commissioning Unit, UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor and UNDP NCE Principal Technical Advisor +submission of completed Audit Trail

[Criteria](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default) for issuing the final payment of 30%[[14]](#footnote-15):

1. The final IE report includes all requirements outlined in the IE TOR and is in accordance with the IE guidance.
2. The final IE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other IE reports).
3. The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
4. RTA approvals are via signatures on the IE Report Clearance Form)
5. [**APPLICATION PROCESS**](https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx)**[[15]](#footnote-16)**

***Application procedure:***

Application with a CV must be submitted online via this website. Please click on “Apply Now” Tab and complete required fields and upload CV. Please note that website accepts only one document therefore, if you would like to upload more than one document, please make sure to combine it into a single one.

- Financial offer in a form of completed and Signed [Offeror’s Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and availability](https://www.ba.undp.org/content/dam/bosnia_and_herzegovina/docs/Operations/Jobs/Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx)to be sent to e-mail [ba.shared.hr@undp.org](mailto:ba.shared.hr@undp.org) with Subject: Job ID xxxxxx

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

**ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team**

1. Funding Proposal
2. Funded Activity Agreement (FAA)
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
7. Audit reports
8. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
9. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
10. GHG emissions data or access to EMIS

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project Concept Note
2. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
3. Country Programme Document for Bosnia and Herzegovina 2021 – 2025
4. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
5. Project site location maps
6. UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025
7. Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the period 2020-2030
8. Climate Change Adaptation and Low Emission Development Strategy for BiH
9. Initial national communication 1 (inc) of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
10. Second national communication of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
11. Third national communication and second biennial update report on greenhouse gas emissions of Bosnia and Herzegovina
12. Tipologija javnih zgrada
13. National Investment Framework document
14. Green Jobs - Analysing the Employment Impact of Energy Efficiency Measures in BiH
15. SECAP example
16. DEA example
17. STUDIJA ENERGETSKE OBNOVE STAMBENIH ZGRADA NA PODRUČJU GRADA TUZLA
18. Gender Action Plan – GCF LCPB – Report

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report**[[16]](#footnote-17)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **i.**  **ii.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID# * Interim Evaluation time frame and date of report * Region and countries included in the project * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * Interim Evaluation team members   Acknowledgements | |
| **iii.** | Table of Contents | |
| **iv.**  **v.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  Project Information Table | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(2-3 pages)*   * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary * Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendations Summary Table | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, Interim Evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations * Structure of the Interim Evaluation report | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | | |
| **4.2** | Relevance | | |
| **4.3** | Effectiveness and Efficiency | | |
| **4.4** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective * Comprehensive assessment of impact of COVID-19 on project implementation | | |
| **4.5** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Financing & Co-Financing * Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards) * Reporting * Communications | | |
| **4.6** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | | |
| **4.7** | Country Ownership | | |
| **4.8** | Innovativeness in results areas | | |
| **4.9** | Unexpected results, both positive and negative | | |
| **4.10** | Replication and Scalability | | |
| **4.11** | Gender Equity | | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | |
|  | **5.1** | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Interim Evaluation’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | Lessons learned   * Concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned based on specific evidence presented in the report, to be used to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions, as appropriate, and plan for scaling up. |
| **5.3** | Recommendations   * 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 |
| **6.** | Annexes   * Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim Evaluation report | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template**

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the Interim Evaluation team and included in the Inception Report and as an Annex to the final Interim Evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?** | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
| **(example)** Are the Project’s objectives and implementation strategies consistent with global, regional and country’s environmental issues and priorities, considering Green Climate Fund and UN/UNDP Strategic Frameworks, EU accession agenda and Agenda 2030? |  |  |  |
| **(example)** Based on an analysis of Project stakeholders, the evaluation should assess the relevance of the Project intervention to key stakeholder groups. |  |  |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| **(example)** To what extent have the intended results been achieved or are they likely to be achieved by the end of the project? What are the main Project accomplishments? Overview of the Project progress against the result framework indicators is to be provided in an Annex of the Evaluation Report. |  |  |  |
| **(example)** What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have the programme partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** | | | |
| **(example)** Has the co-financing mechanism for intervention on Public buildings, established by the Project and stakeholders, and applied through project activities been effective and adequate for achieving project results and scaling-up investments of stakeholders? |  |  |  |
| (example) Has the COVID-19 pandemic affected Project implementation and how? Were alternative approaches considered in the course of implementation? What are other potential risks for the Project’s efficient implementation? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| **(example)** Are there any social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of Project results and progress towards impacts? Is the level of ownership by the main stakeholders sufficient to allow for the Project results to be sustained? |  |  |  |
| (example) What are the innovations/ best practices that need to be further build upon? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR ANNEX D:** [**UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Interim Evaluation Consultants**](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100)**[[17]](#footnote-18)**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

**Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit, RTA and PTA included in the final report)*

**Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Regional Technical Advisor - Nature, Climate and Energy**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Principal Technical Advisor - Nature, Climate and Energy**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be listed as an annex in the final report but not attached to the report file.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Interim Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Interim Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft report** | **Interim Evaluation team**  **response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. World Bank, *Status of Energy Efficiency in the Western Balkans: A Stocktaking Report*, Report No. AAA49-7B, 2010 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Fuel switch measures (i.e. replacement of boiler and change of baseline fuel source) have a double impact on energy use/GHG emission reductions in buildings. First, large energy saving/GHG emission reduction (30-40%) can be achieved through enhancement of the fuel utilization coefficient: older, inefficient boilers utilize only 60% of fuel to heat, whereas new, efficient boilers utilize up to 94% of fuel to heat. Second, replacing fossil fuel with renewable energy alternatives, such as biomass or solar, means that the residual energy (heat) demand in buildings can supplied on a zero-emission basis. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. UNDP’s own estimates based on data from EMIS, detailed energy audit, as well as other sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF’s “types of risks and potential impacts”: Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. See Section ’9.4 Major Changes and Restructuring’ in the [GCF Programming Manual](https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/programming-manual) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings; 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings; 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings; 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings; 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings; 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings, Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

    Ratings for Sustainability: 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability; 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability; 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability; Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the IE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the IE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

    <https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)