 

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Post Title:** | International Expert – Final Project Evaluation |
| **Project Titles:** | * Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje * Building Municipal Capacity for Project Implementation |
| **Duty Station:** | North Macedonia |
| **Duration of Assignment:** | Estimated 30 working days (01 May – 15 June 2022) |
| **Type of Contract:** | International Consultant (IC) |
| **Educational Background:** | Postgraduate university degree in relevant field (development, environment, management, engineering or similar) |
| **Work Experience:** | At least 8 years’ experience in project design and management, project monitoring and evaluation |

# Background

# These TORs describe the scope of work, duties and responsibilities of an international evaluation expert who will lead the evaluation of two UNDP projects funded by the Swedish Agency for Development and Cooperation (Sida), namely:

# Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje

# Building Municipal Capacity for Project Implementation

# In carrying out the assignment, the international expert will be supported by two national evaluation experts – one for each project.

# Following are basic information on the two projects, including the relevant context, intervention logic and expected results. The TORs also provides and insight into the evaluation methodology and evaluation questions which need to be adjusted by the three selected evaluation experts as part of an inception process.

**I.1 Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje**

* **Context and Challenges**

Air pollution is a major cause of premature death and disease and is the single largest environmental health risk in Europe, causing around 400,000 premature deaths per year. The report released in June 2019 by the U.N. Environment Program and prepared in cooperation with the World Health Organization confirms that the population in the western Balkans is exposed to some of the highest concentrations of air pollution in Europe, up to five times higher than the national and the EU guideline levels. Moreover, the three cities – Skopje, Bitola, and Tetovo – were ranked in 2017 as among the top ten most-polluted in Europe with conditions worsening tangibly and measurably in over the past five years.

A number of underlying factors have led to this current situation which need to be addressed in order to tackle air pollution from domestic heating sources. These include the following:

* Inadequate monitoring of air quality and potential sources of pollution. Though initial studies have been carried out and the general sources of pollution have been identified, Skopje lacks a comprehensive monitoring system that informs policy makers, private sectors, investors and the public to understand the ‘real costs’ of pollution. As mentioned in previous studies, reliable air quality monitoring data was not available to exhaustively complete the source appointment studies, and measurements did not fulfil the minimum data coverage requested by legislation, resulting in the unavailability of reliable annual average concentrations.
* Insufficient coordination amongst stakeholders. A number of stakeholders are involved or could be involved in addressing this issue, including the local government, national government, various donor organisations, and community groups. At the moment there are not effective platforms for coordinating action.
* Inadequate regulatory framework. Notably this is related to standards for heating units to ensure they are less polluting or more efficient – which would comply with the EU directive on ecodesign. It also relates to the regulatory framework governing the district heating use and distribution, which is insufficiently developed to encourage the use of the district heating grid.
* Lack of successful examples that demonstrate results. This relates to a lack of neighbourhood - or building-level examples of switching to district heating systems or improving end-use efficiency of buildings.
* Large number of inefficient buildings with no or limited insulation, and few workable schemes available to owners to finance or implement retrofitting. This results in more fuel (wood, plastics) being burned to heat space to limited comfort.
* Limited availability of efficient heating technologies. While the district heating system is mostly available in Skopje, in some parts of the City it is too expensive to connect to. In these cases, it is necessary to have efficient wood furnace technology available at a reasonable cost, and to work with district heating providers to improve affordability and residential uptake.
* Related to this, as described above, inefficient wood-burning stoves are used for heating predominantly. These should be phased out of the market entirely.
* And similarly, there is low awareness among the retailers of the key role that they can play in the low-carbon economy chain and the contribution to the behavioural change by offering smart and affordable packages to the households (focusing on low-income ones) to speed up the process of replacement of old inefficient stoves.
* Low awareness levels about the sources and effects of air pollution among certain categories of citizens, as relates to the impact of inefficient burning on health and the environment, and the possibilities for more cost-effective heating sources / stoves.
* Widespread polluting behaviours such as open burning of wood and plastics, as well as illegal /logging.
* **Project Approach and Objectives**

The “Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje” project aims to demonstrate a multi-pronged intervention to tackle air pollution in the City of Skopje linked to the residential sector. Its objective is to establish a fully functional platform that brings all traditional and non-traditional partners to work together to address the issue.

The project has four main components: Component 1: Develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the pilot area, and a coordination platform to tackle air pollution; Component 2: Implement regulatory changes necessary to transitions towards a lower emission household energy system; Component 3: Demonstration of measures that address the causes of pollution for household heating, and Component 4: Build public awareness.

The project enhances the coordination among all the responsible actors to ensure a “whole of government” and “whole of society” response to the air pollution challenge. The Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and the City of Skopje are the main project partners and beneficiaries, but the project peruses the involvement of all relevant stakeholders who can contribute to mitigate the problem. The mobilizing capacity of academia and civil society organizations is tapped to devise solutions and help change public behaviours.

The project is designed to support the advancement of the country’s EU accession agenda and is aligned to and will use where possible locally owned systems to develop sustainable outcomes with a strong local ownership. At the same time, the project facilitates the access to knowledge and experience from EU member states and advanced economies worldwide.

In designing the interventions, system thinking method, with the citizens in the centre of the solution (human-centred design) is being applied. The system-solving approach aims to explore a roadmap, that:

* Have clearly identified specific target groups
* Is focused at local level - designing and testing local actions specific for municipality or neighbourhood in Skopje Valley
* Relies on non-traditional forms of partnerships with private sector and academia
* Involves every single institution that have a roles and responsibilities in addressing the system
* Is focused on changing citizens’ behaviours (incentives vs. normative)

The project team is set to utilize the capacity and the network of Skopje Lab – the City of Skopje Innovation Lab, established in 2017 by the City of Skopje and UNDP as an experimental space for co-designing and testing new approaches for solving Skopje’s major urban challenges.

It aims to bring about change in the behaviour of people, and in the use of energy in Skopje through a comprehensive approach involving:

* Effective and inclusive monitoring / understanding of the sources of pollution
* Changes in the regulatory framework to bring about changes in behaviour amongst market operators and consumers
* Investments in interventions that will reduce energy consumption and pollution – including particulate matter, CO, and GHGs
* Communications / awareness raising activities to ensure public buy-in and better understand how to adjust programmes to achieve lasting impacts.

The project also seeks to engage NGOs through competitive open call for grants or services:

* NGO that would work with the potential beneficiary households in Lisice;
* NGO for awareness raising/advocacy activities;
* NGO for events organization (hackathon and data visualization).

Additionally, for the energy audits, efforts are being made to closely collaborate with the Association of Energy Auditors as a specialised association of citizens.

The intended project outputs and results will contribute to achieving the national priorities but also the outcomes set in the UNDP Country Project Document 2016-2020 signed by the Macedonian Government. It will also contribute to the advancement of the following SDGs targets 3.9, 7.1, 9.4, 11.6, and 13.2.

* **Summary of Expected Results and Key Outcomes**

The project is structured around four main components with sub-components and activities described below. The full Project Document comprising all necessary details will be shared with the selected expert.

**Component 1: Develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the pilot area and a coordination platform to tackle air pollution**

*Sub-component 1.1: Development of a comprehensive monitoring system for the pilot area*

Activity 1.1.1 Improvements to the existing monitoring system to measure air pollution by extending the network of monitoring stations and setting up an IoT and machine learning-based IT platform

Activity 1.1.2 Develop a monitoring system and an online platform for collecting and visualising data

Activity 1.1.3 Continued monitoring of the contributions to the air pollution by repeating heating study at the end of the project to include both small companies and households

*Sub-component 1.2 Modelling of air pollution sources*

Activity 1.2.1 Source apportionment modelling - Identify specific geographical areas in which investing in mitigation measures will have the greatest impact

*Sub-component 1.3 Implementation of a coordination platform*

Activity 1.3.1 Learning exchange and linkages with other initiatives to inform a long-term plan of action - Convening stakeholders, donors and relevant actors to implement necessary changes identified

In summary, the expected results under Component 1 will include:

* The development of a comprehensive monitoring system for the pilot area achieved by upgrading the current network, by developing an online platform to collect and visualise data, and by repeating the heating study;
* The modelling of air pollution sources through a source apportionment study;
* The implementation of a coordination platform which will creates synergies and linkages with other initiatives to inform a long-term plan of action.

**Component 2: Implement regulatory changes necessary to transitions towards a lower emission household energy system**

Activity 2.1.1 Assistance to support legislation changes - ecodesign adoption and implementation to eliminate poorly performing wood stoves / solid fuel heaters

Activity 2.1.2 Assistance to support legislation changes - waste management (promote recycling of plastic)

Activity 2.1.3. Regulatory impact assessment - cost-benefit, social, environmental, and gender impact for regulatory changes

**Component 3: Demonstration of measures that address the causes of pollution for household heating to show proof of concept**

Activity 3.1.1. Establishment of partnerships with all relevant stakeholders from private and civic sectors and formalization of the partnership with the Municipality of Aerodrom.

Activity 3.1.2 Selection of intervention neighbourhood

Activity 3.1.3. Energy audits and co-design of energy-efficient measures, less-polluting heating systems and yard/area improvements with selected stakeholders

Activity 3.1.4 Financing of interventions: subsidy for thermal rehabilitation for individual houses combined with redesign / installation of new heating elements, rubbish removal and yards arrangements where needed

Activity 3.1.5 Redesigning the model of municipal subsidies for the most the vulnerable categories of population

The key expected results of Component 3 are:

* Functional model for building of low-emission districts and later low-carbon cities.
* Subsidy model for low-income families to replace the current first-come first-served models of the City and municipalities which does not give desired results and cannot be used by low-income families
* Model for provision of subsidies for better off families to replace their inefficient stoves with solar systems or other less-polluting technologies, through empowering retailers to design and offer affordable and attractive packages.

**Component 4: Build public awareness**

Activity 4.1. Identification of target audiences, barriers and level of awareness, and desired attitude change

Activity 4.2. Co-design and implementation of behavioural-changing activities with the interested stakeholders

Activity 4.3 Transfer of Swedish outstanding residential low-emissions and sustainable living practices in the country.

These activities and results need to be accomplished within a Sida budget of app. **USD 2,056,766.76**, and additional UNDP co-funding of **USD 65,000**.

**II.2. Building Municipal Capacity for Project Implementation**

* **Context and Challenges**

Local self-governments continue to face significant challenges in improving quality of life of their citizens. The country faces many difficulties in attempting to pursue a more ambitious local development agenda, some of which include:

* **Lack of municipal-level statistical data** that could be used to prioritize distribution of available funds and track development progress.
* **Fragmented capacity of municipal administrations** **to plan, design and implement** development policies and projects and maximize the impact of the available funds.
* **Insufficient up-to-date urban planning and technical** **documentation** that is necessary to enter into appropriate investment cycles.
* **Inadequate institutional structure and share of responsibilities** among institutions of the local governance system
* To be able to optimize benefits from the use of available funding instruments (e.g., EU, other international financial institutions, government budgets/programmes), municipalities need to significantly strengthen capacity to prioritize, formulate and implement development projects.
* **Project Approach and Challenges**

The **Sida**-funded “Building Municipal Capacity for Projects Implementation” (**BMCPI**) project is set to address some of the most pressing issues faced by the local government institutions in their efforts to improve the living conditions for their citizens. It aims to address the main challenges of local development and to increase municipal capacities in preparing and designing local development projects.

The project is aimed at introducing Municipal Development Index (**MDI**), as well as the comprehensive systemic-level functional analyses (**FA**) of the country’s local self-government system. Altogether, these interlinked processes (TDF, MDI, and FA), will be instrumental in prioritizing support to those municipalities that are struggling the most in terms of the socio-economic development.

The central and most investment-heavy component of the project is the so-called Technical Documentation Fund (**TDF**) which has been piloted to showcase a model financial instrument for preparation of comprehensive technical documentation for the highest priority infrastructure recovery and development projects. The TDF primarily targets **municipalities and regional development centers** that are being selected for project support through competitive procedures.

In response to the COVID-19 crisis, the TDF was upgraded to include the **health care system** in the country. This was motivated by the growing pressure for health care services, as well as the arising funding opportunities for improving the conditions in the health care facilities across the country. For this purpose, the Ministry of Health is being supported by BMCPI to secure a high-quality technical documentation for the necessary reconstruction and adaptation needs of selected health care centers.

The principal idea behind the project concept is to equip municipalities with the technical documentation basis, and a set of new knowledge and skills required to make best use of available funding mechanisms for implementation of a wide range of environmental, social, and other types of priority infrastructure (e.g., EU, Government funding instruments, donations and loans provided by donors and International Financial Institutions – IFIs).

The activities under this project are fully aligned with the efforts of the local self-governments to become better able to pursue their development agendas in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including in promoting more balanced socio-economic growth.

* **Summary of Expected Results and Key Outcomes**

Over a period of **three years**, the project is expected to provide the following main results:

* Creating a Municipal Development Index (MDI) to serve as an instrument for tracking the progress of municipalities toward the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is envisaged to assist authorities in making more sound decision in distributing development funds, facilitating by this more balanced socio-economic growth.
* Carrying out a Functional Analysis (FA) of the local governance system targeting Ministry for Local Self-Government, the Bureau for Regional Development and the eight regional development centres, as well as the units of local self-government. The FA places special emphasis to ability of the system to deliver the development agenda at local level. It is expected to generate guidance on structural changes the system needs to undergo to improve effectiveness of the development agenda.
* Prototyping a Technical Documentation Fund (TDF) as a model financial instrument assisting primarily the less development municipalities in preparing comprehensive technical documentation required for accessing different funding sources (e.g., grants, loans or other funding opportunities provided by international and national sources). With the support of the TDF the project intends to provide a vast number of project beneficiaries (municipalities, regional centers and health care centers) with comprehensive technical documentation that can be used for future fundraising purposes.

The project implementation is guided by the Project Document and the subsequent adjustments in terms of budget and implementation approach in agreement with the Donor. The initial project budget was set at 1,543,338 USD, while the final project budget amounts to **2,518,462 USD** and includes additional Sida, UNDP and municipal co-funding. A more detailed description of the result areas as initially set in the BMCPI ProDoc is provided in Annex 1 of these TORs.

# Purpose and Scope of the Assignment

The general objective of the assignment are the final evaluations of the two Sida-funded UNDP projects, “Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje”, and “Building Municipal Capacities for Project Implementation” projects in terms of their Relevance, Impact, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Gender perspective and against the project-level theory of change/logical framework. More specifically, the evaluation shall focus, but not limit to the following key aspects:

1. To assess the level of utility and effects of providing support for the intended purpose and objectives.
2. To assess the capacity and potentials of project stakeholders to absorb, upscale and sustain project results.
3. To assess the level of involvement of local stakeholders in the project and their understanding, including financial and other commitment towards achieving the sustainability of project interventions
4. To analyze lessons learnt that can inform future responses and possible follow-up actions.

The indicative/tentative evaluation questions are provided in Annex 2 of these TORs[[1]](#footnote-2).

The **International evaluation expert** will act as the lead of three-member evaluation team. The **two national evaluation experts** will work under the guidance of and will support the lead international evaluation expert at all evaluation stages. Each national evaluation expert will support the lead international evaluation expert, primarily with the evaluation aspects/activities that relate to his/her share of the evaluation work, provide his/her feedback and input to the team of evaluators of the project evaluation. All three experts shall be hired separately and will team up upon signing of the respective individual contracts with UNDP.

These TORs describe the duties and responsibilities of the international project evaluation expert.

**III. Overview of Duties and Responsibilities**

The evaluation shall document the learning achievements, and positive examples and provide recommendations to enable UNDP, and Sida on possible follow-up interventions. The evaluation will also highlight areas where the projects performed less effectively than anticipated, the rationale behind that, and the related recommendations to be considered in similar future interventions.

With the support of the two national experts, the international evaluation expert will lead the following key processes:

* Developing the methodological approach of the evaluation and the workplan including realistic timelines. The evaluation methodology evaluation questions and questionaries for different interviews, shall be refined based in the indicative list of questions listed above
* Developing the inception report, which will be submitted by the lead international evaluation expert. The inception report, including the updated interview questions shall be reviewed, commented, and approved by UNDP/Sida before starting with collection of information from stakeholders
* Collecting information from project stakeholders and beneficiaries.
* Analysis of the information collected. These analyses shall be conducted for each output and for the full projects.
* Developing of preliminary findings and presenting the findings to UNDP and the Donor
* Preparation of the draft report and the final report.

In addition, the s/he will ensure that:

* The responses to the indicative questions listed in the Annex should be followed by specific short- and long-term recommendations in the draft and final evaluation report. Recommendations shall consider that not only implementation was affected by the pandemic, but also the fact that pandemic may be an influencing factor in the forthcoming period, when other similar initiatives might be implemented
* Appropriate tools and practices and adopted and deployed in order to overcome limitations for primary data collection within a COVID-19 context
* The do-no-harm to the actors and beneficiaries involved in evaluation shall be considered, especially in the COVID-19 context.

The international expert will be responsible to consult and receive guidance from UNDP. The national experts, UNDP and the project team will provide administrative and logistical support as needed.

# IV. Methodology and Approach[[2]](#footnote-3)

**BRIEF PROCESS OUTLINE**

The evaluation shall include the following stages:

A ***Desk Review Phase***: A file with all documents relevant for the desk review will be provided upon signing of contract to the lead international evaluation expert and the national evaluation experts. The desk review tasks will be distributed to national consultants by the lead international consultant, in order to enable the evaluation team to conduct a comprehensive desk review of relevant project-related documents and embrace the respective project-specific perspective.

Lead the conceptualization of the ***methodological approach*** of the evaluation including quantitative or qualitative methods deemed appropriate to conduct the projects’ final evaluations. Methods should include desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; (virtual) field visits; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. A combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The lead international evaluation expert is responsible to coordinate the work with the national consultants and to task them in getting inputs from key stakeholders, if necessary and relevant. Through the guidance of the lead international evaluation consultant, the national consultants will support in revising the methodological approach as per the feedback provided by UNDP.

Draft the ***inception report***. The inception report shall include the list of interview questions and interviewees to be conducted. It also shall include:

* Overall approach and methodology
* Key lines of inquiry, updated list of questions, and interview protocol
* Data collection tools and mechanisms
* Proposed list of interviewees
* A work plan and timelines to be agreed with the UNDP project team.

The Inception Report should include a list of key risks, limitations, and risk management strategies for the evaluation, particularly under the constraints presented by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The responsibility to submit the inception report remains with the lead international evaluation expert. Comments provided for the inception report, will be worked through by the evaluation team, under the guidance of the lead international evaluation expert. Data collection phase shall commence after the inception report is approved by UNDP.

Guide the **meetings/interviews with the selected stakeholders** to be primarily conducted by the national experts. A detailed list of stakeholders and their contacts will be provided to evaluation team upon signature of the contracts.

The schedule for interviews shall be co-prepared by the international national evaluation experts and will be submitted to UNDP project team for feedback. UNDP will provide the relevant contacts and, wherever necessary will facilitate the organization of meetings and interviews.

If deemed necessary, the lead international evaluation expert will participate in those meetings and interviews which will be run in English and in virtual mode, while national evaluator is expected to run the meetings and interviews in local language/s, whenever stakeholders are not proficient in English. National evaluators will provide the lead evaluator with information from the meetings/interviews which will be run in local language/s, following the form and template agreed with the lead evaluator.

Once the field visits are completed, the lead evaluation expert, with inputs from the two national evaluators, will develop and present the preliminary findings of the evaluation to UNDP. The national evaluation expert is expected to support the lead evaluation expert in preparing and presenting the preliminary findings of the evaluation to UNDP.

***Draft Report:*** take lead role in developing the first draft evaluation reports for both projects. The responsibility for the submission of the draft evaluation report(s) to UNDP that will provide their feedback to the evaluation team through the international lead evaluation expert. The draft evaluation report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following[[3]](#footnote-4):

* Title and opening pages
* Table of contents
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the intervention
* Evaluation scope and objectives
* Evaluation methodology
* Data analysis
* Findings and conclusions
* Recommendations
* Report annexes.

***Final report*** - Based on the draft report and the comments provided by UNDP, the lead evaluation expert will provide the final report based on inputs by the national evaluation experts. The final report will provide the complete content as per the main outline proposed above. The final report must be approved by UNDP.

Considering COVID-19 pandemic challenges and constraints, especially when field missions are restricted, the evaluation team is expected to utilize remote data collection methods and ensure that a robust and utilization-focused methodology is implemented.

The suggested methodology should be compatible with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and UNDG Guidance. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/publications/4312151e.pdf>

The final evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘[*Ethical*](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)[*Guidelines for Evaluation*](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)*.’* The International Expert must address any critical issues in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers; for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain the security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

# DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

Specific tasks include the following with the timelines indicated (for each project separately):

* **Deliverable 1:** Inception report – submitted by the lead international evaluator with collective input of the national evaluators including the adjusted evaluation Methodology (including work-plan, evaluation tools, activities and deliverables), Evaluation matrix (including key criteria, indicators, and updated questions) based on the Desk Review of relevant project documents (by 10.05.2022)
* **Deliverable 2:** Draft Evaluation Report – submitted by the lead international evaluator with collective input of the national evaluators (by 05.06.2022)
* **Deliverable 3**: Final Evaluation Report – submitted by the lead international evaluator with collective input of the national evaluators, and by incorporating the feedback provided by UNDP (by 10.06.2022)
* **Deliverable 4**: An exit presentation on findings and recommendations (optional, 15.06.2022)

# V. Qualification Requirements

## KEY COMPETENCES

## Corporate Competencies:

* + Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards
  + Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP
  + Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
  + Treats all people fairly without favouritism
  + Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

## Functional Competencies:

* + Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in team
  + Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities
  + Strong organisational, coordination and time management skills
  + Ability to organise tasks independently and assume responsibility
  + Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
  + Ability to work under pressure and tight deadlines
  + Ability to adapt solutions and proposals to specificities of client organizations.

# REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

## Education:

## Experience:

* Postgraduate university degree in relevant field (development, environment, management, engineering or similar).
* At least 8 years’ of demonstrated experience in project design and management, project monitoring and evaluation in development project
* Experience from at least 5 relevant assignments (evaluation of development project /programmes)
* Experience in areas of interest of the project (energy efficiency, environment, climate change, infrastructure development, air pollution control)

## Language skills:

Excellent oral and written proficiency in English. Knowledge of local languages is considered an asset

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

*(Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)*

**Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

**Financial Proposal:**

* Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
* For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates is Skopje, which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination *(Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.)*
* The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

**All application materials should be submitted via email** at the following address ONLY: [***tanja.trpevska@undp.org***](mailto:tanja.trpevska@undp.org)indicating the following reference in the subject line **International Expert – Final Project Evaluation of the ‘Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje’ and ‘Building Municipal Capacity for Project Implementation projects’*,* by 12h, 25 April 2022.** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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. Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70%) in the technical evaluation shall be considered for the financial evaluation. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Technical Criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum points**  **70** |
| Educational background (Postgraduate university degree in relevant field (development, environment, management, engineering or similar) – max 15 points | 15 |
| Years of experience in areas of interest of the projects (energy efficiency, environment, climate change, infrastructure development, air pollution control) (min. 8 required) – max 25 points   * 8 years = 18 points * 9-10 years = 20 points * 10+ years = 25 points | 25 |
| Experience in project evaluation in development sectors, especially in areas of relevance to the project (development, environment, energy, climate change, infrastructure development) (minimum 5 assignments) – max of 30 points   * 5 assignments = 16 points * 6-8 assignments = 25 points * 8+ assignments = 30 points | 30 |

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://on.undp.org/t7fJs>.

**UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality, and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.**

**Annex 1a. BMCPI: Expected Results (from ProDoc)**

The expected results of the project are in line with the Sustainable Development Goals, the Partnership for Sustainable Development: United Nations Strategy (2016-2020), the UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021) and the UNDP Country Programme Document (2016-2020). They are also aligned with national strategic documents such as the Work Programme of the Government for 2017-2020, the Programme for Sustainable Local Development and Decentralization 2015-2020, the Strategy for Regional Development 2009-2019, and the Public Administration Reform Strategy 2018-2022.

The project has three main outputs:

* 1. **Creation of a clear and simple index of municipal development**

The Municipal Development Index will be calculated for all Macedonia’s municipalities in line with a simple but robust methodology, and publicly available in both published and online formats.

*Indicative activities:*

* Design of the Index, including determination of key and non-key indicators; weight attribution; and formula calculation
* Research and assessment on data availability and plans to collect new/missing data
* Consultations with peers, partners and the public
* Data collection, processing and calculation of the Index
* Public presentation of the Index

Preparation of policy recommendations based on the Index, especially for balanced regional development

**2.** **Functional analysis of the local governance system to enhance development capacity**

Functional analysis carried out; findings and recommendations presented to national, regional and local partners; and support provided with implementation.

Specific activities for municipalities and regional development centres include:

* Agreement on functional analysis methodology aligned with MISA approach
* Data collection and processing, quantitative and qualitative analysis
* Preliminary findings presented and consulted with the partners and other interested parties
* Finalization of the study, presentation of the findings and recommendations to the public
* Work with pilot municipalities/regional development centres to implement recommendations

Specific activities for the Bureau for Regional Development (BRD) and the MLSG would include:

* Conducting a functional analysis aimed at reaching a clear understanding of BRD and MLSG functions, identifying gaps and overlaps, and recommending internal structural changes;
* Supporting the BRD and MLSG in adapting their internal organizations according to the recommendations from the functional analysis; and
* Supporting the BRD and MLSG in improving the operational flow of work processes, aiming at higher efficiency in creating policies and monitoring their implementation in coordination with an array of other government bodies.

**3. Establishment of a “technical documentation fund” for local development projects**

“Technical documentation fund” established through formal decisions as a UNDP managed fund. Internal procedures and documents designed and approved by the Project board.

*Indicative activities:*

* Research and analysis of the (potential) sources of funding for local development projects requiring technical documentation
* Assignment of the Fund management responsibilities
* Transfer of knowledge and experience on sustainable urban/rural planning and development (drawing, if and where relevant, from the experience of the Swedish International Centre for Local Democracy and other good practices) to municipal/regional counterparts
* Snapshot review of the existing local development strategies, programmes and priority lists, in order to identify priority development projects and classify them according to maturity, and eligibility for Government’s and other sources of funding
* Design and approval of Fund’s statutes, documents and forms: eligibility of applicants and types of documentation to be co-financed; evaluation criteria; co-financing rates; calls for applications and application forms, methods of communication; grant agreements; reporting procedures and forms; and other requirements
* Communication to the potential beneficiaries – national and local public presentation events
* Launch of a call for applications (for individual municipalities or for a group of municipalities through inter-municipal cooperation)

Tendering and preparation of technical (and other) documentation

Mobilization of resources to ensure sustainability of the Fund

Compilation and sharing of lessons learned and good practices

**TOR ANNEXES:**

**Annex 1b. Tackling Air Pollution: Expected Results (from ProDoc)**

The project is structured around four main components with sub-components and activities described below.

**Component 1: Develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the pilot area and a coordination platform to tackle air pollution**

*Sub-component 1.1: Development of a comprehensive monitoring system for the pilot area*

Activity 1.1.1 Improvements to the existing monitoring system to measure air pollution by extending the network of monitoring stations and setting up an IoT and machine learning-based IT platform

Activity 1.1.2 Develop a monitoring system and an online platform for collecting and visualising data

Activity 1.1.3 Continued monitoring of the contributions to the air pollution by repeating heating study at the end of the project to include both small companies and households

*Sub-component 1.2 Modelling of air pollution sources*

Activity 1.2.1 Source apportionment modelling – Identify specific geographical areas in which investing in mitigation measures will have the greatest impact

*Sub-component 1.3 Implementation of a coordination platform*

Activity 1.3.1 Learning exchange and linkages with other initiatives to inform a long-term plan of action – Convening stakeholders, donors and relevant actors to implement necessary changes identified

In summary, the expected results under Component 1 will include:

* The development of a comprehensive monitoring system for the pilot area achieved by upgrading the current network, by developing an online platform to collect and visualise data, and by repeating the heating study;
* The modelling of air pollution sources through a source apportionment study;
* The implementation of a coordination platform which will creates synergies and linkages with other initiatives to inform a long-term plan of action.

**Component 2: Implement regulatory changes necessary to transitions towards a lower emission household energy system**

Activity 2.1.1 Assistance to support legislation changes – ecodesign adoption and implementation to eliminate poorly performing wood stoves / solid fuel heaters

Activity 2.1.2 Assistance to support legislation changes – waste management (promote recycling of plastic)

Activity 2.1.3. Regulatory impact assessment – cost-benefit, social, environmental, and gender impact for regulatory changes

**Component 3: Demonstration of measures that address the causes of pollution for household heating to show proof of concept**

Activity 3.1.1. Establishment of partnerships with all relevant stakeholders from private and civic sectors and formalization of the partnership with the Municipality of Aerodrom.

Activity 3.1.2 Selection of intervention neighbourhood

Activity 3.1.3. Energy audits and co-design of energy-efficient measures, less-polluting heating systems and yard/area improvements with selected stakeholders

Activity 3.1.4 Financing of interventions: subsidy for thermal rehabilitation for individual houses combined with redesign / installation of new heating elements, rubbish removal and yards arrangements where needed

Activity 3.1.5 Redesigning the model of municipal subsidies for the most the vulnerable categories of population

The key expected results of Component 3 are:

1. Functional model for building of low-emission districts and later low-carbon cities.
2. Subsidy model for low-income families to replace the current first-come first-served models of the City and municipalities which does not give desired results and cannot be used by low-income families
3. Model for provision of subsidies for better off families to replace their inefficient stoves with solar systems or other less-polluting technologies, through empowering retailers to design and offer affordable and attractive packages.

**Component 4: Build public awareness**

Activity 4.1. Identification of target audiences, barriers and level of awareness, and desired attitude change

Activity 4.2. Co-design and implementation of behavioural-changing activities with the interested stakeholders

Activity 4.3 Transfer of Swedish outstanding residential low-emissions and sustainable living practices in the country.

These activities and results need to be accomplished within a Sida budget of app. **USD 2,056,766.76**, and additional UNDP co-funding of **USD 65,000**.

**Annex 2. Indicative Evaluation Questions**

Below are listed the key indicative ***Evaluation Questions,*** to guide the evaluation, based on the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The list of questions is not exhaustive and therefore the team of experts under the supervision and guidance of the lead international expert, will be expected to adjust the list and submit it as part of the Inception Report. The final list of questions and the evaluation methodology will be discussed and agreed with the UNDP and the project team.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Key indicative questions for both projects** | **Specific for BMCPI** | **Specific for Air Pollution** |
| **RELEVANCE** | * To what extent the project was designed, to respond to the analysis made at the project design phase and (if relevant) to the changing context? * To what extent did the project respond to the emerging key needs of partners and beneficiaries? * Did the project’s theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the project approach is expected to produce the desired change? * Have any changes been made to the project’s design during the implementation? If yes, did they lead to significant improvements? * To what extent did the pandemic affect the relevance of the project to the beneficiaries? Did the modifications made to implementation in pandemic circumstances influence the relevance of the project to the beneficiaries? | * Are the key project areas/results (TDF, MDI, FA) expected to remain relevant in future? What actions need to be taken to ensure continued relevance of the key project results? * Did and (if so) how did the project use the capacity development opportunities aiming at stakeholders? What adjustments in the implementation approach should be considered for their improved use in the future? |  |
| **EFFICIENCY** | * To what extent did the project achieve the results in its proposed timeline? * Have all implementing partners used human resources provisioned for this project to their maximum efficiency? * How well did the project collect and use data to monitor results? How timely was data collection? What challenged incurred and what lessons can be used for the future? * How the Covid-19 restrictions and protective measures affected the efficiency of the implementation? * Overall, did the project’s management arrangements and implementation strategy provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently? * Is there any duplication of efforts? Were coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined? * What are the key lessons learnt on the implementation efficiency to be considered in a possible follow-up project phase? | * How did the MDI model evolve in response to data availability and verification of data relevance by stakeholders, as well as the new census data? * How does the overall cost-efficiency of intervention look like (per key project components – MDI, FA, TDF)? | * How cost-effective is the component related to the implementation of a low emission district concept? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the concept? |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | * To what extent did the project achieve its intended objectives? * How effective was the cooperation among supporting and implementing partners? * What challenges arose during implementation, and how did the Project Team respond to these challenges? * How effective and clear the project’s targeting strategy was in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? * To what extent did the project complement work with different agencies, have a strategic coherence of approach? * How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere and be considered for possible follow-up interventions? * With the view to Covid-19 circumstances, to what extent the online activities conducted to respect the social distance, were effective, versus the classical face to face ones? * What are the lessons learnt from the implementation that can be used for future possible crisis situations (e.g., pandemic, economic, security crisis) * ? * What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified? | * What lessons can be used to improve effectiveness of MDI, FA and TDF as part of a possible follow-up complementary project. |  |
| **SUSTAINABILITY**  **/ OWNERSHIP** | * To what extent the achieved results are likely to sustain over time? What are the factors that enable or impede the sustainability of the results? * How strong the commitment of the beneficiaries and stakeholders is to sustain the results of the project? * What, if any, catalytic effects did the project have (financial and non-financial)? * Has the ownership of actions been transferred to the targeted project audience? * Do beneficiaries have the capacity to take over the results of the project, to maintain them and can they use the learning from the project in their future initiatives? * How has the project strengthened the capacity of project stakeholders? * Has the project sought and achieved synergies with other projects (within and outside UNDP’s portfolio) and how has this impacted project sustainability? * To what extent has the project explored and taken advantage of co-funding from other sources? | * What possible next steps should be taken to replicate, scale-up and ensure sustainability of the key results (MDI, FA, TDF)? |  |
| **IMPACT** | * What has been the positive and negative, intended, and unintended, long-term effects of this project? * What follow-up projects/initiatives need to be considered to ensure enhanced impact, replication and/or scaling-up of project results? * What pre-conditions need to be met (e.g., among) stakeholders for better impact? * Are there project components with more limited impact that should be re-evaluated/reconsidered/phased out in future interventions? | * What possible contextual changes could favor greater impact and what contextual changes could dimmish impacts of the project’s three main areas of intervention (MDI, FA, TDF) | * Are there project components with more limited impact that should be not be considered in future interventions but rather implemented by relevant ministries/municipalities? |
| **GENDER** | * To what extent were gender considerations mainstreamed throughout the project? Was gender mainstreaming underpinned by appropriate budget allocations specific to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE)? * How has the pandemic affected or hindered the participation and contribution of women and girls in this project in general? * Are there any gender mainstreaming lessons to be considered as part of a possible follow-up intervention in the key project areas? | * How were the gender mainstreaming requirements addressed in the project’s three key components (MDI, FA, TDF) |  |

**Annex 3a - Materials/ documents/ reports produced within the project Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje**

1. Project Document and Project Budget

2. Annual Progress Report for 2020 and Annual Work Plan 2021

3. Annual Progress Report for 2021 and Annual Work Plan 2022

4. Responsible Party Agreement with Goce Delcev University from Stip – Project Document and Project Budget

5. Progress reports from Goce Delcev University (financial and narrative)

6. Survey on household heating practices 2021

7. Development of the correspondence tables for the Rulebook on Labelling of Energy-Related Products

8. Assessment of the awareness and knowledge of the retailers who are selling heating devices, the citizens of Lisiche and the civil society organizations on air pollution issues

9. Report from the energy efficiency research and heating practices of micro and small companies in Skopje

10. Analysis of the possibilities for improvement of the existing and development of new models for air pollution reduction subsidies -how to create available subsidies for socially/economically vulnerable categories of citizens

**Annex 3b - Materials/ documents/ reports produced within the project Building Municipal Capacities for Project Implementation**

1. **Project Document**
2. **Project progress reports (narrative & financial)**
3. **Municipal Development Index (MDI)**

* Conceptual framework for municipalities
* Final report:Update and improvement of the Municipal Development Index

1. **Functional Analysis (FA)**

* Functional Analysis of the Ministry of Local Self-Government
* Policy paper on decentralization reform
* Report for internal organization and systematization
* Rulebook for internal organization and systematization
* Piloting of FA at local level, 4 municipalities (Vevcani, Veles, Berovo, Gostivar) and 2 regions (Southeast & Northeast), Report on finding and recommendation

1. **Technical Documentation Fund, TDF**

* Application form for technical documentation (first and second Call)
* Guidelines for applicants
* Sample technical documentation (for municipalities, regions, health care centers)

**Annex 4 - List of recommended Partners/Beneficiaries for interview:**

**For the Air Pollution project:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Stakeholder** | **Role** |
| **1.** | Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning | * air monitoring network maintenance and reporting; * protection of air, waters, soil, flora, fauna, and ozone; * restoration of polluted areas of environment; * proposing measures for solid waste management; * physical planning; * physical informative system; * supervision within its competencies; |
| **2.** | Ministry of Economy | * securing energy stability and safety; * development of energy policies, including renewables and energy efficiency strategies and plans, and development of respective laws; * providing subsidies for energy efficiency measures and installation of solar panels; * improvement of conditions for development of the industry; * clustering and the involvement of Macedonian companies in the network of global supply chains; * development of entrepreneurial sector, creation and integration of a single market in the EU, |
| **3.** | Ministry of Labour and Social Policy | * creation of the social policy of the country, with focus on the most vulnerable groups; * provision of financial assistance to the temporary unemployed people; * provision of different types of financial assistance for most vulnerable categories of the population, such are: families with no or very low income, care for persons with disabilities, elderly with illness, etc.; * creation and implementation of policies on mainstreaming gender equality; * social protection of children, youth, women and the people with disabilities; |
| **4** | Ministry of Finance | * creating stable public financing and stable macroeconomic framework; * providing an enabling environment for continuation of the process of economic reforms and acceleration of the economic growth; * contributing to better welfare and improvement of the living standard of the Macedonian citizens. |
| **5.** | City of Skopje/Municipalities of Skopje agglomeration | * protection of the environment, nature and space regulation: measures for protection and prevention of water, atmosphere and land pollution, protection of nature, protection against noise and ionizing radiation; * urban and rural planning: urban planning and issuing of technical documentation for construction and issuing construction permits; regulation and maintenance of construction land; * local economic development: local economic development planning; determining development and structural priorities; running the local economic policy; support for the development of small and medium-sized enterprises and entrepreneurship at local level and in that context participation in the establishment and development of a local network of institutions and agencies; promotion of partnership; * provision of subsidies for replacement of inefficient stoves; * potential direct and/or parallel funding; * complementary projects that will create synergies; |
| **6** | Intergovernmental Group on Air Pollution | * the overarching political platform, providing a high-level support for the development and realization of the activities related to mitigation of the air pollution * ensuring input and feedback from the respective ministries, private sector and CSOs that are part of the group |
| **7** | CSOs | * awareness raising, communication and education activities; * knowledgeable about environment protection issues; * partner in co-design of innovative solutions that will increase resilience and improve environment protection. * participating in experimenting and testing prototype services and solutions;   • support the scaling the successful prototype solutions into larger projects |
| **8** | University “Goce Delcev”, Stip | * responsible party for the monitoring component of the project * knowledge sharing |
| **9** | Academia | * knowledge sharing |
| **10** | Private sector | * potential partner for implementation of measures |
| **11** | Energy Auditors/  Association of Energy Auditors | * knowledge and experience on energy audits |
| **12** | Donors | * potential partners for expansion of the programme * technical knowledge and experience |

**For the BMCPI Project:**

1. Ministry of Local Self-Government (MLSG)
2. Bureau for Regional Development (BRD)
3. Ministry of Information Society and Administration (MISA)
4. Association of the Units of Local Self-Government (ZELS)
5. Partner Municipalities[[4]](#footnote-5)
6. Partner regional development centeres (Polog and Vardar planning regions)
7. Ministry of Health (for 9 health care centers provided with technical documentation)
8. Key project experts

* Municipal Development Index (1)
* Functional Analysis (2)
* Technical Documentation Fund (2)

**Annex 5 - Evaluation matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key questions** | **Specific sub- questions** | **Data sources** | **Data collection methods/ tools** | **Indicators/ success standards** | **Methods for data analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex 6 - Outline of the evaluation report format**

1. Title and opening pages with details of the project/ programme/ outcome being evaluated and the evaluation team.

2. Project and evaluation details, including the project title, Atlas number, budgets and project dates and other key information.

3. Table of contents.

4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.

5. Executive summary, a stand-alone section of maximum four pages including the quality standards and assurance ratings.

6. Introduction and overview, explaining what is being evaluated and why.

7. Description of the intervention being evaluated, providing the basis for readers to understand the design, general logic, results framework (theory of change) and other relevant information of the initiative being evaluated.

8. Evaluation scope and objectives, to provide a clear explanation of the evaluation scope, primary objectives and main questions.

9. Evaluation approach and methods, describing in detail the selected methodological approaches and methods.

10. Data analysis, describing the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions.

11. Findings and conclusions, setting out the evaluation findings, based on analysis of the data collected, and the conclusions drawn from these findings.

12. Recommendations. The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make.

13. Lessons learned. As appropriate and when requested in the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation of the intervention.

14. All findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned need to consider gender equality and women’s empowerment, disability, and other cross-cutting issues.

15. Annexes. At a minimum these should include:

a. TOR for the evaluation.

b. Evaluation matrix and data collection instruments

c. List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited.

d. List of supporting documents reviewed.

**Annex 7 - Pledge of ethical conduct forms (sent as attachment)**

**Annex 8 - UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (sent as attachment), highlighting:**

* 1. • Inception report template (section 4)
  2. • Evaluation report template and expected content (Section 4)
  3. • Quality Assessment process (Section 6)

1. The selected evaluation experts will provide a list of updated draft evaluation questions which will be shared with UNDP and the Donor. The relevant comments will need to be incorporated in the final versions of the questions prior to the start of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. This is a starting/tentative methodology which can be adjusted as part of the Inception Report to be submitted by the lead international evaluation expert based on the input of the national evaluation experts. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. A more detailed outline of content of the evaluation report is provided in Annex 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Following the review of municipalities supported by the project (around 60), the evaluators will propose a sample of municipalities to be contacted/interviewed during the evaluation process. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)