# **Individual Contract**

# **Terms of References**

## **Identification of the Position**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Job Title: | International Consultant for Final Project Evaluation |
| Project: | “Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development in Bosnia and Herzegovina” |
| Supervisor: | UN Evaluation Manager |
| Location: | Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| Travel requirement: | No |
| Practice Area: | Recilience and Climate Change |
| Application deadline: | N/A |
| Type of Contract: | International |
| Duration: | June 2022- September 2022 (up to 40 expert days) |
| Presence in the UNDP premises | Partial presence |

## **Background and context**

The governance system of Bosnia and Herzegovina is considered one of the most complex in the region. The country comprises two entities - the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska, with Brčko District as autonomous self-government, 10 cantons within the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and 145 local governments. The entities have a very high degree of autonomy, with their president, parliament, government, and courts. They have jurisdiction in the areas of environment, water management, agriculture, forestry, energy, public administration, health, education, police department, physical planning. Authorities at the state level cover foreign policy, defence, border monitoring, foreign trade, fiscal and monetary politics.

Climate change and high exposure to natural and man-made hazards hurdle the socio-economic development of the country. Yet, Bosnia and Herzegovina deals with disasters mostly in the aftermath through emergency response, as it has not yet embarked on a whole-of-government approach to disaster risk reduction (DRR), nor does it have country-wide DRR strategic frameworks ensuring integration of risk reduction into relevant development policies across government levels. As a result, DRR has only been partially mainstreamed into various sectors, norms, standards and regulations necessary to manage and reduce risk, while existing policies and legislation still focus on rescue and relief activities. Disaster risk management in the country is associated with constructing flood defences, reinforcing, or upgrading infrastructure, with most efforts being invested in strengthening capacities for disaster management.

Even though the Sendai Framework for DRR recommends DRR Platforms to have multi-level and multi-stakeholder composition and pursue an all-of-society engagement, this is not the case in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as several key sectors are excluded from DRR exchange (e.g., health, education, social protection, urban planning, agriculture).

Authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina and key domestic stakeholders realize the increasing threat posed by climate change to the development of the country and have advocated the need of adapting to avoid or minimise negative consequences. Nevertheless, multisectoral approach of Bosnia and Herzegovina in managing disaster risks suffers from lack of effective and time-efficient coordination and information-sharing systems among sectors (including specific and in-place procedures, protocols and standards, as well as risk reduction measures addressing resilience building and recovery). DRR capacity in the public sector remains insufficient.

Systematic local planning has gained momentum in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Due to the Programme intervention, significant progress was indeed achieved in the past years towards mainstreaming DRR into local development strategies and planning financial frameworks. Making a systemic shift towards risk-informed, climate smart human development planning, however, remains a challenge.

Taking into account the cross-sectoral dimension of DRR, a Joint UN Programme financed by the Government of Switzerland was launched in 2019, engaging a wide range of stakeholders in promoting and stimulating a whole-of-government approach to DRR, with focus on the local level. The Ministry of Security of Bosnia and Herzegovina is the lead Programme institutional partner, including other relevant entity institutions and ministries (civil protection, education, social welfare, health and agriculture). Ten (10) local governments and their communities were engaged in the programme’s implementation, including to the most vulnerable community members.

**About the Joint UN Programme:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | “Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development in Bosnia and Herzegovina” |
| **Atlas ID** | 00112460 |
| **Corporate outcome and output** | **Outcome 3.** By 2019, there is effective management of explosive remnants of war and armaments and strengthened prevention of and responsiveness to man-made and natural disasters (UNDAF 2015-2019)  **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 (Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework 2021-2025) |
| **Country** | Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| **Date Project document signed** | November 11th, 2018; revised signature September 26th 2021 |
| **End date** | June 30th, 2023 |
| **Budget** | USD 4,321,948 |
| **Funding source** | Government of Switzerland and Participating UN Organizations (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, FAO and UNESCO) channelled through MPTF (https://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/JBA10) |
| **Implementing party** | Participating UN Organizations (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, FAO and UNESCO) |

The Joint UN Programme “[Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development in Bosnia and Herzegovina](https://open.undp.org/projects/00112460)” is supported by the [Swiss](https://www.greenclimate.fund/) Embassy and United Nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, implemented by UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO, FAO and UNFPA in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The end-of Programme vision is that governments at all levels in Bosnia and Herzegovina systematically undertake coordinated, multi-sectoral and concrete risk reduction and preparedness measures. As a result, the population in the country is more socially and economically resilient to effects of disasters and climate change. Overall goal of the first phase of the Joint UN Programme is for local governments in Bosnia and Herzegovina to have improved their DRR institutional capacities, frameworks, public services and partnerships, and population in risk-exposed localities is less vulnerable socially and economically to effects of disasters and climate change.

The Programme focuses on:

a) Mainstreaming DRR into local strategicframeworkby introducing and operationalizing an integrated model of disaster risk governance and livelihood enhancement at the local level, as a springboard to a bottom-up introduction of DRR governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Special emphasis is put on improving local DRR coordination mechanisms in 10 local governments, as well as affirming risk-informed strategic planning processes with focus on the most vulnerable population groups.

b) Enhancing local level knowledge, technical capacity, and strategic frameworks by translating the priorities into concrete actions within partner high-risk localities, utilizing municipal risk assessments findings and identifying DRR priorities. Through pilot work in different sectors - i.e. protection and rescue, education, social and child protection, health and agriculture, the Programme aims to ensure basic standards and minimum compliance in terms of strategic, operational, technical and human aspects across different areas of life at the community level. Key sectoral interventions include a) strengthening of local-level capacities for floods and landslides prevention, b) building safe school environments, c) enhancing institutional preparedness and DRR profile of social, child protection, education and health-related authorities, and d) improving agriculture sector capacities to effectively prepare, respond and recover from disaster-related losses.

**Programme’s Outcomes:**

**Outcome 1.** At least 10 local governments have adopted DRR-featuring strategies, established partnerships for effective DRR interventions, and financed actions that build community resilience thus are better equipped to prevent and respond to disasters.

**Outcome 2.** Citizens in target localities, particularly the most vulnerable population groups, have become more resilient to disasters.

**Programme’s Outputs**

**Output 1.1** Local DRR Platforms are established to serve as locally-owned DRR coordination mechanisms and capacitated to mainstream DRR into local policies and strategies, and support community resilience-building;

**Output 1.2** Local government’s disaster risk assessment capacities are improved based on evidence and innovative technologies, with consideration of vulnerability aspects;

**Output 1.3** Municipal/city DRR strategic and action planning frameworks are upgraded based on multi-sectoral perspective, with focus on the vulnerable population groups;

**Output 2.1** Local level capacities for floods and landslides prevention and preparedness are enhanced through capacity development, prevention measures and awareness raising;

**Output 2.2** Safe school environments in partner localities are established through strengthening school capacities for disaster management and risk reduction;

**Output 2.3** Institutional preparedness and DRR capacities of social and child protection systems in partner localities are strengthened;

**Output 2.4** Preparedness and DRR capacities of local governments and healthcare institutions in partner localities to effectively address specific healthcare needs of children, youth and adolescents, and women in emergency settings enhanced;

**Output 2.5** Capacities of agriculture sector and vulnerable farmers in partner localities to increase disaster preparedness and reduce disaster losses are strengthened;

**Output 2.6** Local level capacities, tools and procedures for disaster preparedness are tested in practice to improve cross-sectoral coordination for effective disaster response*.*

*A detailed outline of the Programme Result Framework is available in Annex 1.*

**Partnerships**

The Joint UN Programme is implemented in partnership with:

* the Ministry of Security of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
* the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
* the Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
* the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
* the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare of Republika Srpska,
* the Ministry of Health of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
* the Ministry of Education of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
* the Ministry of Education and Culture of Republika Srpska,
* the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management of Republika Srpska,
* the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
* the Civil Protection Directorate of Republika Srpska and Civil Protection Directorate of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In addition to institutions which are part of the Programme Steering Committee, the Programme is directly working with the ten (10) partner local governments engaged in implementation: Banja Luka, Bijeljina, Prijedor, Srebrenica, Trebinje in Republika Srpska; Bihac, Kalesija, Kakanj, Gradačac, Sanski Most in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The coordination among these institutions and government agencies is ensured through the Steering Committee.

Furthermore, the Programme engaged several Implementing partners that are working in close cooperation with relevant UN agencies and partner local governments to implement relevant component of the Programme: World Vision Bosnia and Herzegovina, Public Health Institute of Republika Srpska and Center for mother and child, and social package for elderly, ill and weary "Fenix".

*An overview of key stakeholders and partners and their roles in evaluation is provided in Annex 2*

**Target groups and beneficiaries**

In addition to local governments and members of the local DRR Platforms directly benefiting from the Programme, the Programme targets citizens in partner localities. Among professionals and citizens, the Joint UN Programme focuses on vulnerable citizens in partner localities benefiting directly and indirectly from DRR measures (e.g. women, children and families from vulnerable groups in order to reduce their vulnerability to disaster risks and increase preparedness to disasters).

Relevant targets on the number and category of beneficiaries reached through the Joint Programme are provided in the Annex 1- RRF and ToC.

**Implications of the Covid-19 pandemic**

Starting from March 2020, the Programme’s implementation was negatively affected by the global outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID-19 imposed lockdown resulted in temporary halt of the activities in the field, which caused delays in timely completion of some of the activities. This, in turn, led to a 6-month no-cost extension of the Joint UN Programme by June 30th, 2023. In the light of above listed implications to the achievements and altered priorities in sectors (especially in health) within the Programme, Programme team managed to prepare and execute certain number activities planned for 2020. Due to uncertain situation, Programme team undertook revision of plan for 2020 in April thus creating several scenarios for activity implementation by the end of 2020 and shifting certain number of activities to be implemented in 2021. Revised plan was communicated and agreed by all partners in Programme retaining activity implementation mostly in online modality.

**Linkage with global and national strategic frameworks**

Bosnia and Herzegovina, along with other countries in the world, is signatory to various global commitments and negotiations, including the Sendai Framework for DRR (SFDRR) 2015-2030, the Agenda 2030 and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and the Global Climate Negotiations Through the Conference of Parties (CoP).

This Joint UN Programme contributes to the main priorities identified in the Sendai Framework for DRR:

1. understanding disaster risk, strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk;
2. investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience;
3. enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response; and
4. “building back better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, which resonates with the DRR challenges in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Programme is in line with Target E of the Sendai Framework calling countries to “substantially increase the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies by 2020”.

The Programme design was linked to the UNDAF for Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015-2020’s Outcome 3: “By 2019, there is effective management of explosive remnants of war and armaments and strengthened prevention of and responsiveness to man-made and natural disasters”.

As a part of the Strategic plans of the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Ministry of Security of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the **Programmes for Development of Protection and Rescue** (Programmes for DPR), technically perceived as civil protection strategic documents are legally binding for all government levels.

The Programme contributes to the **Development Program of Protection and Rescue of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2007-2012**[[1]](#footnote-2), the **Programme for Reducing the Risk of Natural and Other Disaster in Republika Srpska** and the **Protection and Rescue Plan Against Natural and Other Disasters of Republika Srpska,** particularly in terms of increase of capacities for prevention, preparedness and effective emergency response.

The Programme directly contributes to the implementation of the [**Action Plan for Flood Prevention and Water management in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2014-2017**](https://www.nwp.nl/sites/default/files/waterseminarsarajevo_rapport.pdf)**,** based on the EU Floods Directive.

Additionally, the Programme contributed to the **Strategic Plan for Rural Development of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2018-2021**, specifically to priority area related to agro-environmental measures.

Moreover, the main findings and recommendations of: (i) the **Floods and Landslides Risk Assessment for Housing Sector in Bosnia and Herzegovina**, (ii) the **Landslide Risk Management Study in Bosnia and Herzegovina**, and iii) the **Climate Change Adaptation and Low Emission Development Strategy for Bosnia and Herzegovina** have also been considered in the process of Programme design.

Moreover, by investing in local governments’ capacities and policy measures, the Programme is relevant to the [**Strategy for Local Self-Government Development of Republika Srpska 2017–2021**](http://www.vladars.net/sr-SP-Cyrl/Vlada/Ministarstva/muls/Pages/default.aspx#collapsible6)**.**

Currently, the Programme is linked to the new UN Coordination Framework for Bosnia and Herzegovina 2021-2025’s 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 Programme also contributes to the UNDP Strategic Plan 2021-2025’s “Output: 3.1 Institutional systems to manage multi-dimensional risks and shocks strengthened at regional, national and sub-national levels”.

The Programme also contributes to the UNFPA’s Strategic Plans 2018-2021 and 2022-2025: Increase efforts to integrate sexual and reproductive health services, including family planning, into disaster risk-reduction and climate-response strategies, including in national adaptation programmes of action.

The Programme also contributes to UNICEF’s 2018-2021 and 2022-2025 Strategic Plans, the Goal Area 4 (2018-2021): Every child lives in a safe and clean environment and Goal Area 4 (2022-2025), Every child, including adolescents, has access to safe and equitable water, sanitation and hygiene services and supplies, and lives in a safe and sustainable climate and environment.

The intervention contributes to several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs):

* Goal 4: “Quality education: Schools should incorporate disaster-resistant structures and adapt to local risks;
* Goal 5: Gender equality: Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision making in political, economic and public life;
* Goal 9: Industry, innovation and infrastructure: Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure;
* Goal 10: Reduce inequality: Disasters may exacerbate social inequalities;
* Goal 11: Sustainable cities and communities: By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters; holistic disaster risk management at all levels;
* Goal 13: Climate action: Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning*.*

The Programme contributes to the objectives of the Swiss Cooperation Strategy in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2021–2024, as DRR is considered as one of the main complementary concepts contributing to the outcomes of the domain of local governance and municipal services.

## **Purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation**

**a) Purpose**

## The purpose of the Final Evaluation (the Evaluation) is to provide an impartial in-depth review of all aspects of the Joint UN Programme **Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development in Bosnia and Herzegovina**, including its planning, design, implementation, monitoring and reporting.

## The Evaluation will assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and the potential for longer-term impact of the Programme, and make strategic recommendations for future decision-making and programming in the area of disaster risk reduction and resilience, both for participating UN agencies and the Programme stakeholders. Provided recommendations will be used in planning the second phase of the DRR JP.

## The Evaluation will assess progress and results against the Project Document and its Results Framework.

## The intended users of the Evaluation will be primarily the Programme’s stakeholders, Programme Senior Management Team, Government of Switzerland and the Joint Steering Board.

## The evaluation process will be informed by the United Nations' Norms and Standards for Evaluation.

**b) Objective**

The objective of the evaluation is to review and assess the overall performance of the Programme, its results, inputs activities, partnerships and UN-internal set-up and if and how the delivered outputs contributed to improved local community resilience and more effective prevention, preparedness and response to disasters and to provide forward-looking recommendations to the Government of Switzerland, UN, and Government stakeholders on the sustainability of the Programme results and its scaling up potentials.

In a substantive analysis of the effectiveness of the Programme approach and feedback from beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders, the Evaluation should assess cause and effect of relations within the Programme, identifying the extent to which the observed changes can be attributed to its interventions.

The selected Evaluator will take a broad overview of the Programme area by gathering perceptions, aspirations, feedback and data from relevant partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries for objective analysis and conduct of the evaluation.

The Evaluation will look to underline the key factors that have either facilitated or impeded Programme implementation.

**c) Scope**

The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the planned Programme outcomes and outputs have been achieved since the beginning of the Programme on 1st January 2019 and will provide advice for full implementation and achievement of the planned outcomes by 30th June, 2023 (based on the Programme Document and its results framework).

The Evaluation will look into the Joint UN Programme’s processes, strategic partnerships and linkages in the specific country’s context that proved critical in producing the intended outputs and the factors that facilitated and/or hindered the progress in achieving the outputs[[2]](#footnote-3), both in terms of the external environment and risks, crisis caused by the pandemic, as well as internal, including weaknesses in programme design, management and implementation, human resource skills, and resources. Particularly the inter-agency coordination, role of UNDP as lead agency and the role of the emerging UNRC and its office shall be assessed.

Based on the findings, the Evaluation will provide evidence-based recommendations for the next phase of the Programme in terms of the theory of change, objectives, strategy of intervention, modalities of implementation and geographical areas for interventions.

The Evaluation will also assess the cross-cutting aspects of the Programme, such as gender equality and human rights and innovativeness in result areas.

## **Evaluation criteria and key questions**

The Evaluation of **the Joint UN Programme Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development in Bosnia and Herzegovina** will address the following questions, so as to determine the Programme’s relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, including lessons learned and forward-looking recommendations:

**Relevance and coherence**

* To what extent have the Programme’s objectives been relevant to the needs and priorities of the country and beneficiaries, having in mind political, social, legal and institutional context of the country, effective national policies and strategies?
* Was the programme relevant to the UN’s mandate and the Agenda 2030, as well as the priorities set by the UNDAF / UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework and the Swiss Cooperation Programme in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2021-2024?
* To what extent have the Programme objectives and implementation strategies been consistent with global, regional and country’s resilience and DRR issues and priorities, including domestic and international frameworks?
* Have any changes been made to the Programme design during the implementation? If yes, did they lead to significant design improvements? Were adequate steps taken by the Programme to adjust its implementation strategy to the new circumstances and needs, including the COVID-19 pandemic, and to safeguard project investments and retain result orientation?
* Were coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined and did they support institutional strengthening and local ownership?
* Have the selection of 10 partner municipalities proven to be adequate? Should the Programme continue to work in Phase 2 with the same municipalities? If so, with what objective?
* To what extent were human rights, gender equality and social inclusion mainstreamed within the Programme? Has this mainstreaming been relevant to the needs of socially excluded groups and both women and men?
* To what extent has the Programme been successful in ensuring complementarity, harmonisation and coordination with other relevant interventions of the governments in BiH and other donors, avoiding duplication of efforts and adding value?

**Effectiveness**

* To what extent have the intended objectives/outcomes been achieved? What are the main Programme accomplishments? Overview of the Programme’s progress against the result framework indicators is to be provided in an Annex of the Evaluation Report.
* Briefly explain the reasons behind the success (or failure) of the Programme in producing its different outputs and reaching outcomes? Were key stakeholders appropriately involved in producing the programmed outputs?
* Are the Programme goals realistic? Is the comprehensive (complex) set-up of the Programme an enabling or a disabling factor for reaching the Programme objectives? To what extent the Steering Committee was effective and supportive to implementation of the Programme?
* To what extent has the Programme instigated systemic improvements in disaster risk management system, including cross-sectoral coordination at local level?
* What good and scalable practices or innovative approaches have been identified?
* Have DRR models of work introduced by the Programme been effective, avoiding overlaps with already existing structures, relying on local capacities and ensuring local ownership? What are related areas for improvement?
* How effective was the programme’s interaction with other complementary projects (including implemented by the UN) in order to trigger synergies maximizing development results?
* To what extend has the Programme outreached marginalized groups (i.e. women, persons and children with disabilities, the poor, vulnerable families and children, etc.)? What participation mechanisms have been applied?

**Efficiency**

* Have resources (financial, human, technical) been allocated strategically and economically to achieve the Programme results?
* Were the Programme activities implemented as scheduled and with the planned financial resources? Is the relationship between Programme inputs and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?
* To what extent did the Programme engage or coordinate with different beneficiaries (men and women), implementing partners and government counterparts to achieve outcome-level results? To what extent were the Programme coordination approaches conducive to the delivery of the Programme outputs?
* Has the communication, visibility and outreach of the Programme been successful in supporting its result orientation?
* Did the Programme have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving Project objectives?
* To what degree did the political developments influence the Programme’s efficiency?
* To what extend have UN partner agencies, UNDP and the UNRCO acted in harmonised manner, avoiding overlaps and remaining focused on the Programme results, both at the institutional and at the local level?

**Potential for longer-term impact**

* What is the Programme impact in qualitative as well as quantitative terms from a broader development and system building perspective? What would the development have been like without the Programme interventions in the area of concern?
* What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the Programme’s interventions?
* What real differences have the Programme interventions made to the beneficiaries? How many people have been benefited? Have women and men equally benefited from the Programme?
* To what extent are key stakeholders satisfied with the implementation and results of the Programme, specifically in terms of the partnership support, and what are specific remaining issues in the area of concern?
* What are the key lessons to be drawn at this point of the Programme implementation? What are the main recommendations for the remainder, as well as for future programming? What kind of adaptations are required in the Programme theory of change, objectives, implementation strategy and modalities including organisational structure in Phase 2, in order to achieve expected impact and sustain results?
* To what extent the Programme may have led to adaptive change and paradigm shift towards resilient development pathways?

**Sustainability**

* To what extent are the achieved outcomes and outputs sustainable? Will the outputs lead to benefits beyond the lifespan of the Programme?
* How well is the Programme embedded in the institutional structures that will survive beyond the life of the Programme?
* To what extent do government partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the Programme results?
* Is the Programme financially catalytic? To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
* To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and other development partners to sustain the attained results?
* To what extent has the integration of human rights and gender led to an increase in the likelihood of sustainability of Project results?
* What measures the Programme needs to include in the course of Phase 1 implementation and in Phase 2 design to ensure full sustainability of its results?

**Future-looking concept and recommendations**

It is critical for the Evaluation to balance its contribution to collective learning, with greater focus on adaptive management and systemic change, accountability over the use of public resources, considering the strategic context and the authorizing environment. With that view, in the forward-looking recommendations, the Evaluation will also consider:

* The need for follow-up work of the intervention.
* Possible priority interventions and scope of work visible and stipulated within the concept note and Programme document of the second phase, which could further scale and sustain the Programme’s achievements and contribute to accelerated and resilient development in Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly in the context of Agenda 2030?
* The inter-agency coordination, role of UNDP as lead agency and the role of the emerging UNRC office.
* The theory of change, objectives, strategy of intervention, modalities of implementation and geographical areas for interventions.

The evaluation needs to assess the degree to which the Programme’s supported or promoted gender equality, a rights-based approach, and human development. In this regard, [United Nations Evaluation Group’s guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation should be consulted.](file://C:\Users\azorlak\Desktop\The%20evaluation%20need%20to%20assess%20the%20degree%20to%20which%20UNDP%20initiatives%20have%20supported%20or%20promoted%20gender%20equality,%20a%20rights-based%20approach,%20and%20human%20development.%20In%20this%20regard,%20United%20Nations%20Evaluation%20Group’s%20guidance%20on%20Integrating%20Human%20Rights%20and%20Gender%20Equality%20in%20Evaluation%20should%20be%20consulted.)

## **Methodology**

Based on the [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/covid19.shtml)  and [UNEG Norms and Stand for Evaluations](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914) and in consultations with the participating UN Agencies and the UN Resident Coordinator, the Evaluation will be participatory, involving relevant stakeholders.

**The Evaluation will be conducted by an International Evaluation Consultant (the Evaluator).**.

The Evaluator will propose an evaluation methodology and agree on a detailed plan for the assignment as a part of the evaluation Inception Report. The proposed methodology may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the Final Project Evaluation, exploring specific gender sensitive data collecting and analytical methods and tools applicable in the concrete case. The Consultant is expected to creatively combine the standard and other evaluation tools and technics to ensure maximum reliability of data and validity of the evaluation findings.

The proposed methodology should employ participatory approaches, relevant quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the Evaluation, based on diverse ecosystem of evidence, using gender sensitive data collection and analytical methods and tools applicable in the concrete case. The Evaluator is expected to combine the standard and other evaluation tools and techniques to ensure maximum reliability of data and validity of the evaluation findings. **These methods and approaches need to generate feedback loops and insights for transformational change**. Stakeholder participation is an important source of data which can mitigate observational biases. The Evaluation recommendations will be forward looking and focused on adaptation in the changing system addressed by the Programme intervention.

Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the Evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the proposed methodology. The Evaluator shall, to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address these limitations.

The Evaluator is expected to carry out the evaluation process with careful consideration of these Terms of References. In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, the Evaluator should ensure an evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

Standard UNDP evaluation methodology would suggest the following data collecting methods:

* Desk review:

The Evaluator will conduct a detailed review of the Programme materials and deliverables including but not limited to the Programme Document and Addendums, theory of change and results framework, monitoring and Project quality assurance reports, annual workplans, consolidated progress reports etc. *An extensive list of documents for desk review is provided in Annex 3.*

* Key informant interviews:

The Evaluator will interview:

- representatives of Participating UN agencies (*UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, FAO and UNESCO)*

*- the UN Resident Coordinator*

*- the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH*

* *The State level institutions:*
  + *the Ministry of Security*
  + *the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations*
  + *the Ministry of Civil Affairs*
* *Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:*
  + *the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy*
  + *the Ministry of Health*
  + *the Ministry of Education*
  + *the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry*
  + *the Civil Protection Directorate*
* *Republika Spska*
  + *the Ministry of Education and Culture*
  + *the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management*
  + *the Civil Protection Directorate*

*- Local governments (Banja Luka, Bijeljina, Prijedor, Srebrenica, Trebinje, Bihac, Kalesija, Kakanj, Gradačac, Sanski Most), etc*.

- Implementing partners: World Vision Bosnia and Herzegovina, Public Health Institute of Republika Srpska and Centar "Fenix".

*A detailed list of main stakeholders that may be considered for meetings is provided in Annex 2.*

* Meetings / focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries and site visits as needed
* 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 also be used to gather data. Stakeholders that are dealing with existing emergencies should be given advance notice.

**The expected duration of the assignment is up to 40 expert days in the period June – September 2022, including one filed mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina in duration of minimum 10 working days.**

## **Evaluation tasks / deliverables**

Following the initial briefing and a detailed desk review, the Evaluator will be responsible for delivering the following products and tasks:

* **Inception Report** (max 10 pages) will be presented before the Evaluation starts, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by proposing methods, sources of data and data collection procedures. The Inception Report should elaborate an **evaluation matrix** (*provided in Annex 4*) for the Programme and propose a schedule of tasks, activities and evaluation deliverables. The Evaluation Inception Report should follow the structure proposed in the [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, p. 27](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf)
* **Evaluation and data collection:** Upon the approval of the Inception Report and the evaluation work plan by the UN team and the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH, the Evaluator is expected to carry out the Evaluation. Data collecting methodology will deploy remote and virtual methodologies.
* **Draft Evaluation Report:** Based on the findings generated through desk review and data collection process, the Evaluator will prepare and submit the Draft Evaluation Report to the UN team and key stakeholders for review. **The Evaluation findings, lessons learned and forward-looking recommendations will be separately presented in distinct sections of the Evaluation Report**. *Structure of the Report is outlined in Annex 5.*
* **Evaluation review process** (and eventual dispute settlement): Comments, questions, suggestions and requests for clarification on the evaluation draft will be submitted to the Evaluator and addressed in the agreed timeframe. The Evaluator should reply to the comments through the **evaluation audit trail document**[[3]](#footnote-4). If there is disagreement in findings, these should be documented through the evaluation audit trail, while effort should be made to come to an agreement.
* **Evaluation debriefing:** will be held with UN Joint Programme team and the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH, if needed and upon Management responses with institutions’ representatives and other key stakeholders to present main findings and recommendations in an online form (i.e. Skype/Zoom/Microsoft Teams briefing). In addition, short briefings on immediate findings with UN senior management and the Government counterparts involved in the Programme (Steering Committee members) will be considered after completion of the initial assessment.
* **Evaluation Report (maximum 40 pages of the main body)** **should** be logically structured (structure of the Evaluation Report is outlined in Annex 5 of the Terms of Reference), contain data and evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations, and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible.
* The Evaluation is ending with a Management Response provided by the UN Participating Agencies and the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH. It shall contain a general assessment of the conducted Evaluation and its process, as well as a statement of the UN Agencies’ and Embassy’s position regarding the conclusions and recommendations given in the final Evaluation report.

Finally, based on the evaluation findings and in a distinct report section, the Evaluator will provide a **forward-looking actionable recommendations to the Programme team and** the Government counterparts involved in the Programme (Steering Committee members)**,** outlining key strategic priorities to be addressed after completion of the Programme in first phase in terms of policy dialogue and the work influenced by UN, Government of Switzerland and follow-up activities by the governments and public institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

***Note (as per UNDP Evaluation Guidelines):*** *As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account, conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.*

*If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.*

*If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national Evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel****. No stakeholders, consultants or UN staff should be put in harm and the safety is the key priority.***

## **Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

The Evaluation will be conducted by the International Evaluation Consultant who will design and implement the evaluation process in line with these Terms of References.

**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**

* Qualifications/Education
* Minimum Master’s degree in climate/ environmental/disaster risk management / business/ public administration other related disciplines;
* Experience
  + Minimum 7 years of relevant experience project and programme evaluations;
  + Knowledge of UN monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines;
  + Experience working in or closely with UN agencies is preferred;
  + Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
  + Understanding of issues related to disaster risk reduction and climate change mitigation;
* Languages Requirements
* Fluency in English language; knowledge of local languages of Bosnia and Herzegovina will be taken as asset.
* Other
* A deep understanding of the development context in Bosnia and Herzegovina and preferably understanding of climate change/natural resource management issues within the country context;
* Understanding and knowledge of the political and administrative context in Bosnia and Herzegovina is an asset.

## **Evaluation timelines and deliverables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Anticipated timing** | **Number of days** | **Responsible party** |
| Desk review and Inception Report | 1 – 6 June, 2022 | 5 | Evaluator |
| Field data collection/[[4]](#footnote-5) | 13 June – 30 June, 2022 | 17 | Evaluator |
| Evaluation debriefing/presentation | 4 July, 2022 | 1 | Evaluator |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 6 – 16 July, 2022 | 10 | Evaluator |
| *Review of the Draft Evaluation Report* | *July - August* |  | *Evaluation Reference Group[[5]](#footnote-6)* |
| Final Report | 30 Sep, 2022 | 7 | Evaluator |

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid. Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

## **Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’.](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102) The Evaluator shall 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 Evaluator 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 with the express authorization of UNDP and partners. The Evaluator must be free from any conflict of interest related to this evaluation.[[6]](#footnote-7)

## **Implementation arrangements and reporting relations**

The Evaluator will report to the Evaluation Manager appointed by the UN team, who will oversee and support the overall evaluation process. An evaluation reference group will be formed to provide critical and objective inputs throughout the evaluation process to strengthen the quality of the evaluation. The UN Senior Management and Swiss Embassy Management will take responsibility for the approval of the evaluation report. UN team will support the implementation of meetings, including translation from and to local languages. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the UN Joint Progamme to the evaluation team.

## **TOR annexes**

*Annex 1. Project Logical Framework and Theory of Change*

*Annex 2. List of the main stakeholders and their roles in evaluation*

*Annex 3. List of documents to be considered for the evaluation desk review*

*Annex 4. Required Evaluation Matrix Template*

*Annex 5. Standard outline for an evaluation report*

*Annex 6. Code of Conduct*

*Annex 7. Link to UNDP Evaluation Guidelines and Evaluation Quality Assessment Process*

*Annex 8. Concept for the 2nd Phase of the Programme*

## **Procurement Notice**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Advertisement: | Yes: ☒  No: ☐ | If yes: Dates (XXX):  Local website:  Global website: | Yes:☒ No: ☐  Yes:☒ No: ☐ |
| Sourcing through Registry: | Yes: ☐  No: ☒ | Direct contracting | Yes:☐ No: ☒ |

1. **Documents to be included when submitting the proposals**

|  |
| --- |
| Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications and interest:   1. Most recent CV, including reference to similar evaluations conducted by the candidate; 2. Financial proposal (to be submitted separately); 3. Evaluation Methodology Proposal (outlining the specific design and methods for the evaluation):  * Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work; * Providing a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work; * the methodology should present the Consultant’s approach, proposed detailed methods and tools, scope and evaluation criteria and questions; * the methodology should apply a mixed-method approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to validate and triangulate data; * the methodology should include the filled in evaluation matrix (Annex 4).   The Annexes can be found at: URL: [Final evaluation Annexes.zip](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fundpbh01st001.blob.core.windows.net%2Fprocurement-files%2FFinal%2520evaluation%2520Annexes.zip&data=05%7C01%7Clejla.begovic%40undp.org%7C680a83ebc8fd43716c6408da22111f10%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637859754166663541%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=8mYiN98ReRwSBAr9qxVlz%2BYwUrFsX9VG6lUEFvevr2M%3D&reserved=0) |

1. **Financial Proposal**

|  |
| --- |
| **Contract is based on the lump sum fee**  The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in USD, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR.  In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount. |

**Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Best value for money approach[[7]](#footnote-8): | Yes: ☒  No: ☐ | If yes, please specify percentage of technical and financial evaluations[[8]](#footnote-9) | 70% of technical evaluation  30% of financial evaluation |
| Lowest evaluated offer[[9]](#footnote-10): | Yes: ☐  No: ☒ |  |  |

1. **Technical evaluation criteria**

Evaluation will be conducted through:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Interview | Yes: ☒ No: ☐ |
| Desk review | Yes: ☐ No: ☒ |

1. Qualification Requirements

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Points*** | ***Max. Points*** |
| Relevant education | Max 25 points (20 points for MSc/MA  + up to 5 points for PhD) | 25 |
| Relevant professional experience | Max 70 points | 70 |
| Knowledge of English | Max 5 points max 5 points - will be assessed as:  5 points for fluency and the points decrease as per the level mentioned in the CV: good - 4 points;  fair/upper intermediate – 3 points; intermediate - 2 points; beginner - 1 point. | 5 |
| Total |  | 100 |

*Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points would be considered for Technical Evaluation*

1. Technical Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight*** | ***Max. Point*** |
| *Technical* | *Total technical 100%* |  |
| *Criterion A:*   * Rating based on Qualifications | *20%* | *20* |
| *Criterion B:*   * Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies; * Excellent knowledge of monitoring and evaluation methodologies; sound judgment and ability to objectively evaluate Projects in terms of processes, as well as results achieved (evidenced through previously conducted evaluations and references). * Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies; * General understanding and knowledge of the political and administrative context in BiH. | *50%* | *50* |
| *Criterion C:*   * Evaluation Methodology Proposal (outlining the specific design and methods for the evaluation): * Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work; * Providing a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work; * Presenting the Consultant’s approach, proposed detailed methods and tools, scope and evaluation criteria and questions;   The methodology should apply a mixed-method approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to validate and triangulate data;  The methodology should include the files in evaluation matrix (Annex 4); | *30%* | *30* |

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

1. Final Evaluation

The final evaluation score will be based on Combined Scoring Method where technical evaluation will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the financial offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.

1. The new [FBiH Programme for DPR](http://fucz.gov.ba/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/New-PROGRAM-RAZVOJA-verzija-06-09-2016.pdf) has been prepared; however, due to limited implementation of the previous Programme, it has not been adopted. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Due to the period of conducting the Evaluation from June to September 2022 and the extended implementation by June 2023, the one will encompass complete evaluation of Outputs 1.1., 1.2., 1.3., 2.2., 2.3. 2.4. and 2.5., while Outputs 2.1. and 2.6. will be partially evaluated. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Template available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf>, p. 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. # Depending on covid restrictions.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. # Steering Committee members and Participating UN agencies, UNDP Evaluation Manager, UNDP EE Sector Leader, UNDP Project Coordinator.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Box 7. Sources of conflict of interest in evaluation](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as: (a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and (b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. The financial proposal should account for at least 30% of the total score [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. When using this method, the award of a contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as both: (a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and (b) offering the lowest price/cost [↑](#footnote-ref-10)