**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**for UNDP-supported GEF-finance projects**

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Title: Evaluator - Terminal Evaluation for UNDP-supported GEF-financed Project**

**Project:** Climate Smart Urban Development Challenge

**Reporting to:** UNDP Evaluation Manager

**Duty Station:** Home-based

**Contract Type:** Individual Contract Framework Agreement (IC) or Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA)

**Duration:** 27 working days within the period July - September 2022

**BACKGROUND**

##### **Introduction**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled **“Climate Smart Urban Development Challenge”(PIMS#5551)** implemented through the UNDP. The project started on 21 February 2017 and is in its final year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects ([TE\_ Guidance for UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)).

##### **Project Description**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), acting as an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), is supporting the Ministry of Environmental Protection (MoEP) to implement the five-year “Climate Smart Urban Development Challenge (CSUD)” project, jointly financed by the GEF, MoEP and stakeholders. The objective of the project is to promote climate-smart urban development. By a challenge prize approach, it seeks to actively engage the civil society, public and business communities to come up with new and innovative ideas on how to contribute to this in practice and to jointly develop, finance and implement these ideas further. Broader and more effective use of new information and communication technologies (ICT)to enable and spearhead innovation and productivity gains, optimization of the resource use (e.g. by improved energy efficiency and resource sharing), reduction of physical mobility needs, more attractive public and non-motorized transport, increased use of renewable energy sources, climate smart waste management (improved recycling schemes and waste to energy) and other measures contributing to climate change mitigation are among the topics to be considered in this context.

The project implementation started in February 2017, and was to last until February 2022, but its implementation has been extended by August 2022. The total project budget is US$ 12,510,000, out of which US$ 1,950,000 is GEF budget, UNDP US$ 100,000, in-kind US$ 500,000 and other (parallel) cash US$ 9,960,000.

Main project outcomes are:

Outcome 1: Improved access to and availability of data by an open data approach for development, management and monitoring of CSUD related performance of Serbian municipalities.

Outcome 2: New innovative technical and systemic solutions and business models contributing to climate

Outcome 3: Knowledge management and M&E to facilitate learning, scaling up and replication of project results.

All activities and measures undertaken by the project will need to result in tangible GHG emissions reduction and considered from the perspective of climate smart planning. Project provided assistance in the establishment of “Innovation Challenge Programme” with the goal to provide initial capital for interested stakeholders (including businesses, research-scientific institutions, civil society organizations, individuals etc.) for testing and initiation of most innovative project ideas, including the opportunity for further co-financing of the most successful solutions. By the establishment of “Innovation Challenge Programme, project seeks to actively engage the civil society, research-scientific institutions, public and business community to come up with new and innovative ideas on how to contribute to this in practice and to jointly develop, finance and implement these ideas further.

The project assists municipalities to mainstream ICT into city management systems, putting in place digital inventories and tools to gather data and monitor actions. The Open Data Challenge was a public call for proposing innovative and cost-efficient ideas/solutions for simple and user-friendly public access to city/municipal climate change-related data, and for improving the management of this data. Open Data Challenge Call was open from 22 November 2017 until 05 February 2018, following the awarding of the best innovative ideas in June 2018. Under this challenge eight innovative ideas proposed by local self-government (municipalities and cities) were awarded, covering areas of energy efficiency, solar energy promotion, sustainable transportation, waste management, engagement of citizens in urban planning and development. In the following stage, the project is focused at the development and testing of the information system for climate smart urban development (including also the local greenhouse gas inventory). After completion of such information system, Local low-carbon development strategies were developed for five cities.

The Innovation Challenge was a public call for proposing innovative and cost-effective ideas for the reduction of greenhouse gases (GHG) emission created by public services and facilities, while simultaneously providing social, economic and environmental benefits for the community and its citizens. Out of 111 innovative ideas received to the challenge, 34 project ideas in total proposed by individuals, public and private companies, CSOs, local self-governments and research community, have been selected and were further mentored by the Climate Incubator/Accelerator towards mature projects stage. Selected project ideas under the Innovation Challenge are related to the areas of energy efficiency, renewable energy, bio-fuels, urban mobility, agriculture, green infrastructure, organic waste management, forestry.

In order to support further development of innovative project ideas and project proposals selected during independent evaluation under both Challenges, into projects and businesses that are ready for implementation at local level, the Ministry of Environmental Protection and UNDP have established a Climate Incubator/Accelerator. Services that are provided through the Climate Incubator include: business advisory support, one-on-one mentoring, facilitating access to finance and market, building partnerships and networking, promotion, targeted trainings and review and/or development of technical documentation.

Overall, the CSUD project promotes innovative and integrative approaches and new technologies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions at the local level and new business models, public private partnerships and social inclusiveness. This should further trigger transformational shift towards smart, inclusive cities of the future that are based on citizens participation and citizens centered solutions.

*This is an adjusted standard term of reference for evaluations in UNDP, considering the impact of COVID-19 on evaluations, including consideration for COVID-19 situation assessment within countries, impact and restrictions on evaluations, alternative approaches, methodologies and considerations to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on evaluations.*

*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. The Government of Serbia declared the State of Emergency due to the COVID-19 outbreak on 14th March 2020. Consequently, number of restrictions were introduced related to movement of people and goods, working arrangements for public and private companies and state institutions. Daily Curfew restrictions were also introduced.*

*COVID-19 pandemic and the state of emergency declared by the Government in March 2020, caused a significant slowdown, even a deadlock in remaining project activities, which could not be resolved by the engagement of the project staff only. The state of emergency implied very strict measures including rigid travel restrictions (incl. public transport in the cities), as well as night and weekend curfews. Main project partners/beneficiaries are public institutions, which were heavily affected by the measures imposed to fight the COVID pandemic. Operating regime of all public institutions has been significantly changed and limited. Employees have been greatly focused on other urgent issues arising from the crisis. A significant number of employees in the ministries has temporarily been assigned to other duties or working remotely. Such measures have significantly impeded project activities, mainly capacity building and awareness raising. Consequently, the finalization of all expected project activities is delayed for three months, including the terminal project evaluation.*

*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 the 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, and 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 UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.*

*A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.*

##### **TE Purpose**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **TE Approach & Methodology**

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

The TE team (**evaluator and national consultant**) will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisors, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to implementing agency, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must 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 TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team. TE team should prepare and use questionnaires for broader stakeholder group and virtual interviews. The evaluation team can revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.

The final TE report should describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

1. **Detailed Scope of the TE**

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see TOR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects, available at: [*TE\_ Guidance for UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf).

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

1. Project Design/Formulation
* National priorities and country driven-ness
* Theory of Change
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Social and Environmental Safeguards
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards
1. Project Results
* Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
* Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to impact
1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned
* The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
* The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
* The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the ToR Annex F.

1. **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The **Evaluator** shall prepare and submit:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Deadline** |
| 1. TE Inception Report, including the Evaluation Criteria Matrix template, prepared and accepted | 11 August 2022 |
| 2. Presentation of Initial Findings to UNDP, Implementing partner and beneficiaries prepared and delivered  | 15 August 2022 |
| 3. Draft TE Report: Full draft report with annexes prepared and submitted  | 22 August 2022 |
| 4. Final TE Report\* (up to 30 pages) and Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report prepared and accepted | 2 days upon received comments on the Draft TE, not later than 14 September 2022 |

\*The final TE report must be in English.

All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[[1]](#footnote-1)

1. **TE Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP CO Serbia will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team, if necessary. Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation all meetings/interviews should be organized virtually. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. TE team will send deliverables to the Evaluation Manager.

1. **Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 15 working days within the period July - August 2022. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

* *28 July 2022: Application closes*
* *29 July 2022: Selection of TE Team*
* *01 August 2022: Prep the TE team (handover of project documents)*
* *03 August 2022: Document review and preparing TE Inception Report, Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission*
* *5 working days: TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews – virtually organized*
* *10 August 2022: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission*
* *5 calendar days: Preparation of draft TE report*
* *15 August 2022: Circulation of draft TE report for comments*
* *1 working day: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report*
* *17 August 2022: Preparation & Issue of Management Response*
* *19 August 2022: Expected date of full TE completion*

The expected start date of contract is *01 August 2022.*

1. **Duty Station**

Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation all meetings/interviews should be organized virtually.

Duty-station: home-based

**Travel:**

* International travel will not be required to *Republic of Serbia* during the TE mission;
* The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
* All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

1. **TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications**

The principal responsibility for managing TE resides with the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP CO Serbia will contract the consultants. A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader - Evaluator, and one national consultant.

The team leader- Evaluator will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report and accompanying annexes. The national expert will support the organization on the interviews with key stakeholders and project beneficiaries; assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project’s Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project’s related activities.

Skills and Competencies

• Excellent analytical skills

• Displays ability to synthesize research and reach empirically based conclusions on related subject

• Strong writing skills

• Proven capacity to produce reports

• Displays capacity to provide experienced advice on best practices

• Possesses knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues

• Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback

• Good application of Results-Based Management

• Good communication, coordination and facilitation skills

• Consistently ensures timeliness and quality of work

• Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability

• Demonstrates integrity by modeling ethical standards

Education

* Master’s degree in the project related field (mechanical/ electrical/ agriculture/ forestry/ environment engineering or economy);
* Knowledge of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement;

Experience

* Minimum 10 years of professional experience in relevant technical areas, preferably in energy/environmental protection sectors
* Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *GEF Climate Change Focal Area;*
* Experience in evaluating projects;
* Track record of professional international experience in project development/ management/ monitoring/ evaluation in the climate change field
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations, means of verification: the list of evaluated GEF projects
* Good knowledge of international experiences, state of the art approaches and best practices in the specific areas the project and its subcomponents are dealing with
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset
* Experience in working with wide range of stakeholders (private, governmental, etc.).

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.
1. **Evaluator Ethics**

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator 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 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 without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **Payment Schedule**
* 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the UNDP
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the UNDP
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the UNDP and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

* The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
* The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS

**Application Procedure**

Application should include:

- CV in English language containing date of birth, contact information (home address, phone number, e-mail) and timeline of work experience (including description of duties);

- Offeror’s Letter (only PDF format will be accepted) confirming Interest and availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment. Can be downloaded from the following link: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/Confirmation.docx>.

- The Offeror’s Letter should include financial proposal specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement with a breakdown of costs.

- Offeror’s Letter must also include the methodology concept containing a preliminary plan of work (no more than two pages).

Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the e-mail vacancy.rs@undp.org. The procuring UNDP entity will respond by standard electronic mail and will send response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

Financial Proposal:

Lump sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments 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 (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel

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

Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Cumulative analysis 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. \* Technical Criteria weight; 70%\* Financial Criteria weight; 30%Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weight  | Max. Points |
| Technical | 70% | 1. 70 points
 |
| * Criteria A
 | Desk review of CVs based on relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas, preferably in energy/environmental protection sectors | 30 |
| * Criteria B
 | Desk Review of CVs based on experience in working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations | 25 |
| * Criteria C
 | Qualifications (Educational background and language requirements) | 15 |
| Financial | 30% | 30 points |

 |

Additional Information:

* Individual Contract (IC) will be applicable for individual consultants applying in their own capacity.
* Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) will be applicable for applicants employed by any legal entity. Template of RLA with General Terms and Conditions could be found on: http://www.undp.org.rs/download/RLA%20with%20General%20Terms%20and%20Conditions.doc. In the case of engagement of Civil servants under IC contract modality a no-objection letter should be provided by the Government entity. The ‘no-objection’ letter must also state that the employer formally certifies that their employees are allowed to receive short-term consultancy assignment from another entity without being on “leave-without-pay” status (if applicable), and include any conditions and restrictions on granting such permission, if any. If the previous is not applicable ‘leave-without-pay’ confirmation should be submitted.

Engagement of Government Officials and Employees

* Government Officials or Employees are civil servants of UN Member States. As such, if they will be engaged by UNDP under an IC which they will be signing in their individual capacity (i.e., engagement is not done through RLA signed by their Government employer), the following conditions must be met prior to the award of contract:
	+ A “No-objection” letter in respect of the individual is received from the Government employing him/her, and;
	+ The individual must provide an official documentation from his/her employer formally certifying his or her status as being on “official leave without pay” for the duration of the IC.
* The above requirements are also applicable to Government-owned and controlled enterprises and well as other semi/partially or fully owned Government entities, whether or not the Government ownership is of majority or minority status.
* UNDP recognizes the possibility that there are situations when the Government entity employing the individual that UNDP wishes to engage is one that allows its employees to receive external short-term consultancy assignments (including but not limited to research institutions, state-owned colleges/universities, etc.), whereby a status of “on-leave-without-pay” is not required. Under such circumstance, the individual entering into an IC with UNDP must still provide a “No-objection” letter from the Government employing him/her. The “no objection” letter required under (i) above must also state that the employer formally certifies that their employees are allowed to receive short-term consultancy assignment from another entity without being on “leave-without-pay” status, and include any conditions and restrictions on granting such permission, if any. The said document may be obtained by, and put on record of, UNDP, in lieu of the document (ii) listed above.

**Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

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.

1. **Annexes to the TE ToR**
* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
* ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
* ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
* ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
* ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales and TE Ratings Table
* ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
* ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template
* Annex I: UNDP Evaluation dispute resolution process - handed over to evaluators when signing the contract

**Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**

available as well at: <https://open.undp.org/projects/00087660> (Project Document, pages 48-50)

**Project Results Framework**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts, SDG 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:** By 2020, there are improved capacities to combat climate change and manage natural resources and communities are more resilient to the effects natural and man-made disasters |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:** *consult with the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor before selecting one of the following outputs. Delete the outputs copied below that are not selected. See opening section under further information for additional details.*Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.**Output 1.4: Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation cross sectors which is funded and implemented.**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)Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation. |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline**49 | **Mid-term Target**50 | **End of Project Target** | **Assumptions**51 |
| **Project Objective:** Promote innovation and community engagement for climate smart urban development (CSUD) | *Mandatory IRRF indicator 1:*1.4.1 a: Extent to which climate finance is being accessed | NA | At least USD 3.5 million complementary financing leveraged to support climate smart urban development in Serbia | At least USD 10 million complementary financing leveraged to support climate smart urban development in Serbia | The anticipated co-financing contributions by the project partners met in full. |
| *Mandatory indicator 2:* Number of direct project beneficiaries with gender disaggregated data. | NA | 5,000 people, from whom not more than 55% for the same gender | 20,000 people, from whom not more than 55% for the same gender | A sum of targets for indicators 6 and 9 |
| *Indicator 3:* Direct incremental GHG emission reduction impact of the project | 0 | 20 ktons ofCO2eqcalculated over 20 years’ lifetime of the investment | 100 ktons ofCO2eqcalculated over 20 years’ lifetime of the investment | Successfully completed pilot/demo projects with adequate MRV systems in place |

49 Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

50 Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

51 Risks must be outlined in the Feasibility section of this project document.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component/Outcome**52 **1:**Improved access to and availability of data by an open data approach for development, management and monitoring of CSUD related performance of Serbian municipalities. | *Indicator 4:* Number of municipalities having an integrated cross-sectoral on-line information management system with open public access covering at least the energy, transport and waste sectors with regularly updated monitoring data and clearly defined sector specific performance targets, which are disaggregated, to the extent possible, by gender. | 0 | 2 | 5 | Commitment of the local public authorities to co-operate and assign required human and other resources to build and operate the system |
| *Indicator 5:* Number of municipal CSUD indicators, for which data is publicly available on line | 0 | at least 3 indicators for each subsector (energy, transport, waste) | at least 5 indicators for each subsector (energy, transport, waste) | No legal obstacles or confidentiality requirements restricting the data access |
| *Indicator 6:* Annual number of data users (combined for all the participating municipalities) and disaggregated, to the extent possible, by gender. |  | 1,000 | 5,000 | The number of on-line visitors in the system can be monitored by the gender by available e ICT solutions |
| *Indicator 7:* Number of municipalities producing annual CSUD performance reports | 0 | 2 | 5 | Commitment of the local public authorities to co-operate and assign required human and other resources to work on this |
| **Component/ Outcome 2:**New innovative technical and systemic solutions and business models contributing to climate smart urban development identified, tested and replicated. | *Indicator 8:* Number of new innovative technical and systemic solutions and/or business models contributing to climate smart urban development identified, tested and replicated | NA | At least 1 new concept contributing to climate smart urban development tested in one of the subsectors | At least 5 new concepts contributing to climate smart urban development tested in different sectors and including at least one gender-sensitive concept | The challenge program and prizes can be made attractive enough for the targeted participants |
| *Indicator 9:* Number of direct beneficiaries with gender disaggregated data from the measures implemented53 | NA | 4,000, from whom not more than 55% for the same gender | 15,000, from whom not more than 55% for the same gender | Calculated on the basis of having CSUD measures implemented in at least 5 municipalities with total population of at least 150,000people and from whom at least 10% |

52Outcomes are short to medium term results that the project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the longer term objective. Achievement of outcomes will be influenced both by project outputs and additional factors that may be outside the direct control of the project.

53The co-financing and GHG reduction related targets of the measures implemented are addressed at the objective level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | will be targeted as direct beneficiaries of the measures implemented. |
| **Component/ Outcome 3:** Knowledge management and M&E to facilitate learning, scaling up and replication of project results. | *Indicator 10:* Status of the Project MRV system and quality of the data delivered by that | No project related MRV system in place | A MRV system for emissions reductions resulting from project activities in place and reporting verified data from all activities. | A MRV system for emissions reductions resulting from project activities in place and reporting verified data from all activities. | Envisaged co-operation with the EMIS project as it concerns any energy related data |
| *Indicator 11:* Agreed knowledge management products and events delivered | NA | The CSUD knowledge management web-portal establishedAt least one international CSUD knowledge management event (workshop or seminar) organized | The CSUD knowledge management web-portal sustained after the projectLessons learnt report finalizedAn international end of the project workshop organized |  |
| *Indicator 12:* Number of expressions of interest received for replicating the project intervention strategy, specific technical solutions or business models for new projects and/or municipalities | NA | 0 | At least one new municipality and 5 project proponents expressing interest to replicate one or more of the supported interventions. | The project implementation approach and awarded solutions show success |

**Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 12 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 13 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 14 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 15 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 16 | Audit reports |
| 17 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 18 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 19 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 20 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 21 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |
| 22 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 23 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 24 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 27 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |

**Annex C: Content of the TE report**

1. Title page
* Tile of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
* UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
* TE timeframe and date of final TE report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
* Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
* TE Team members
1. Acknowledgements
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
* Project Information Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Ratings Table
* Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
* Recommendations summary table
1. Introduction (2-3 pages)
* Purpose and objective of the TE
* Scope
* Methodology
* Data Collection & Analysis
* Ethics
* Limitations to the evaluation
* Structure of the TE report
1. Project Description (3-5 pages)
* Project start and duration, including milestones
* 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
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Expected results
* Main stakeholders: summary list
* Theory of Change
1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[2]](#footnote-2))

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
	1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
* Risk Management incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
	1. Project Results
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Overall Outcome (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender
* Other Cross-cutting Issues
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* Country Ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting Issues
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to Impact
1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned
1. Annexes
* TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* TE Mission itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Summary of field visits
* Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
* TE Rating scales
* Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Signed TE Report Clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

**Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level? |
| *(include evaluative questions)* | *(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 documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)* | *(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* |

**Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

**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 imitations, 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 and did not carry out the project’s Mid-Term Review.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

**Annex F: TE Rating Scales & Evaluation Ratings Table**

|  |
| --- |
| **TE Rating Scales** |
| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance | Sustainability ratings:  |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomingsUnable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment | 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainabilityUnable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings Table** |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight  |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

**Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:****Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

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

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

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/****Organization** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team****response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)