


Terms of Reference	United Nations Development Programme	
--------------------	--------------------------------------	---

Title: Independent International Consultant for conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP/GEF project

Project: Support to the Sustainable Transport in the City of Belgrade

Reporting to: UNDP Portfolio Manager,

Duty Station: Home-based, one mission to Belgrade

Duration: 2 months, estimated 25 working days in a period of 60 calendar days (including 5 working days in Belgrade, Serbia) (output based consultancy)

Starting date: October, 2014

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

Background

a. Purpose

The Terminal Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP CO Serbia as the Implementation Agency for the project "Support to the Sustainable Transport in the City of Belgrade" and it aims to determine whether the project has met its objectives accordingly, to document the lessons learned and best case practices, and to recommend the most appropriate next steps to ensure the sustainability of results.

b. Objective

This terminal evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects.

The evaluator should seek the perspectives of the different project stakeholders, mainly in the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, the City of Belgrade (Secretariat for Transport and Belgrade Land Development Agency) UNDP CO, members of the Project Board, and other project stakeholders, and ensure such perspectives are duly reflected in the evaluation.

More specifically the purpose of the TE is:

- To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document and other related documents;
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
- To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project;
- To assess the progress towards achievement of the outcomes;
- To assess the sustainability of the project's interventions;
- To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management;

- To assess project relevance to national priorities;
- To provide lessons learned for the future.

c. Background Information

The evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy (<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>) and the UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures (<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>).

Project Background

Belgrade, as with many cities today, faces a multitude of challenges related to congestion, noise, air quality issues, health, safety, quality of life and the problem with a multitude of diverting policies in the field of urban transport. On the global level, the challenge of climate change and its environmental, health and economic impacts is strongly connected to transport and unsustainable mobility behavior. These challenges are the driving forces behind recent calls for powerful measures to address Sustainable Transport. This Project is one of the pioneer attempts in Serbia to address these challenges and issues at wider scale.

The City of Belgrade's institutions - the Land Development Agency and the Secretariat for Transport - are identified as the main partners and beneficiaries of the project. Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection is main national counterpart that oversees the implementation of the project through nominated National Project Director. The project design is conceived in such a way to stimulate and support the main partners in their operations targeting the improvement of the sustainable urban transport in the City of Belgrade.

The official start date of the project was 9th February 2011 when an Inception Workshop was held in Belgrade. The Inception Workshop invited not only these key project stakeholders but also other international institutions and donors present in the Country in order to discuss widely the issues of urban transport and sustainability in the context of how this project can best assist to promote Sustainable Transport in the City of Belgrade. The Workshop resulted in recommendations brought by unanimity of the both partners; the Project manager and the GEF Regional Technical Adviser that the Project Document was designed quite some time ago and that many of the activities prescribe for actions are either outdated, or already performed. In additions, participants believed that given the limited budget of the project it makes more sense to focus on fewer activities and outputs. Over an open discussion during the Workshop, an accord was achieved that the Project Document was to be revised during the inception period by proposing actions that are fully in line with the overall project objectives, contributing to reduction of emissions from urban transport in the City of Belgrade.

This was subsequently achieved and the revised project outcomes were defined within the Inception Report, approved at the first Project Steering Board meeting held on 21 April 2011.

Project Objective and Outcomes

The UNDP Project to Support the Sustainable Urban Transport in the City of Belgrade is financed through the Global Environmental Facility. The project budget amounts to 950,000 USD and has duration of four years.

The overall objective of the project is to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions in the City of Belgrade by

improving the public transport scheme, increasing the participation of cyclists in the traffic and provide the policy framework for sustainable urban transport development of the city of Belgrade.

The outcomes of the project shall be achieved through the implementation of four main activity groups and the subsequent delivery of expected results.

The first activity is developed around the planning process for the Sustainable Urban Transport Plan.

Urban mobility issues are complex and cannot be successfully solved by simple transport plans. They require radical new policy instruments together with an integrated approach to mobility and the design of the cities. Sustainable Urban Transport Plans (SUTP) are the foundation upon which a new approach to transport can be built by embracing radical new policies and facilitating the necessary integration of transport, urban and economic planning. Preparing the SUT planning phase is one of the four outputs and one of the most important ones. The planning process for a SUT plan is an equally important segment of the entire project cycle and provides a basis to build the rest of the activities upon. As one of the four main outcomes of this Project is a completed planning process for launching the preparation of the Sustainable Urban Transport Plan (SUTP). The objective of the Planning process of a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan is to provide the stakeholders (the Belgrade Land Development Agency and the Directorate for Urbanism) with a mature and well-elaborated process to advance sustainable urban transport planning in Belgrade. This objective is accomplished within the frame of this project. The final product shall ensure that the urban transport systems of Belgrade meet society's economic, social and environmental needs whilst minimizing their undesirable impacts on the economy, society and the environment.

Promoting cycling presents the second activity of the Project.

Protection of the environment and the pursuit of energy security lie in the heart of the European transport policy by promoting also the co-modality. The transport policy that Serbia is to follow is calling upon increased use of green modes of transport and balanced participation of all modalities, without decrementing one on the account of the other. These imbalances are mostly expressed in the urban areas and Belgrade is a good example of that. The cycling and walking modes of transport are not taken into account by the strategic urban development documents and not addressed in practice adequately. Significant attention was paid through this project in promoting the cycling transport mode by involving all sides into campaigns, public open events, competitions. The cyclists received the first digital cycling maps (GPS) to facilitate and stimulate the two-wheel commuting. The awareness of the public authorities is raised and priorities start being put on the side of these green modes of transport, equally by safeguarding their rights and safety as well as investing into the needed infrastructure. Moreover, two cycling routes were marked in order to connect city center and suburban recreational areas in Belgrade (Avala mountain and Bojcinjska forest), as well to improve safety of cyclists.

Building on the education and awareness of the youngest population on the green modes of mobility implemented through the third activity.

Mobility isn't simply an essential component of the competitiveness of the industries and services; it is also an essential citizen right. And the practice worldwide shows that the parents in the attempt to enjoy this right but also protect their children are using mostly the private car as transportation mean. The project proves to be a pioneer in supporting the sustainable urban mobility, by changing the behaviour and habits of the parents, teachers and children through demo projects by involving several schools, organizing "pedibuses"-group walking for primary school pupils, marking the safe routes to schools.

Enhancing the capacities of the professional drivers in eco-driving and creating a pool of trainers presented the fourth activity.

Eco-driving improves road safety as well as the quality of the local and global environment and saves fuel and costs. All three benefits are important for furthering eco-driving. Eco-driving is a fuel-efficient, adaptive and safe way of driving. Training in eco-driving teaches car drivers to utilize vehicles differently

and bring out new potentials by adaptive driving including foreseeing traffic situations and economic ways of using gears and brakes. The capacity and knowledge of the public transport companies has been reinforced through this project. Eco-driving trainings were delivered to selected number of professional drivers working in the Urban Public Transport Enterprise "Beograd". In order to provide sustainability, the eco-driving education will be extended to the teachers from the High schools for transport. The goal is to achieve integration of eco-driving in driving school curricula and driving tests, establishment of minimum standards for contents and set up of eco-driving trainings and train-the-trainer seminars and establishment of an eco-driving infrastructure which will keep the approach alive after the end of the project.

Duties and Responsibilities

a. Scope of work

The evaluation will focus on the range of described aspects. In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria (relevance, effectiveness and efficiency) should be rated using the following divisions: *Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory*. All ratings given should be properly substantiated.

b. Methodology

The evaluation approach will combine methods such as documentation review (desk study); interviews; and field visits. All relevant project documentation will be made available to the consultant by the project management team, facilitated by UNDP. After studying the documentation the consultant will conduct interviews with all relevant partners including the key partners and beneficiaries. Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders will happen through circulation of initial reports for comments or other types of feedback mechanisms.

Throughout the period of the evaluation, the consultant will liaise closely with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF RTA, the concerned agencies of the Government and the counterpart staff assigned to the project. The consultant can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfill the task, the consultant however is not authorized to make any commitments to any party on behalf of UNDP or the Government.

Although the Evaluator should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

The Evaluator should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

The evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

The evaluators will assess the project concept and design. He/she should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation starting from the inception workshop.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the outcomes and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

The Terminal Evaluation will also cover the following aspects:

1. Progress towards Results

Changes in development conditions: Assess the way the project has contributed in supporting the business of the national partners in line with the project main objectives.

Measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before (i.e., baseline) and after (up-to-date) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions within the project boundaries to conditions in similar unmanaged areas.

Project strategy: how and why outputs in the project document and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

Sustainability: Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project boundaries, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainable financing strategy, design and implementation of novel financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the cross-cutting economic sectors, etc.

2. Project's Adaptive Management Framework

(a) Monitoring Systems

- Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
 - Do they provide the necessary information?
 - Do they involve key partners?
 - Are they efficient?
 - Are additional tools required?
- Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements².
- Apply the GEF Tracking Tools and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.

(b) Risk Management

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether

² See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures", available at <http://www.thegef.org/geff/node/4184>

the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted;

- Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
 - Is the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System appropriately applied?
 - How can the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen project management?

(c) Work Planning

- Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
 - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP/GEF requirements in terms of format and content
 - What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management?
- Assess the use of routinely updated workplans;
- Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
- Are the work planning processes result-based³?
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.

(d) Reporting

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management;
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

3. Underlying Factors

- Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors;
- Re-test the assumptions made by the project management;
- Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

4. UNDP Contribution

- Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
 - Field visits
 - Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
 - PIR preparation and follow-up
 - GEF guidance
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide⁴, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework;
- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

5. Partnership Strategy

- Assess how partners are involved in the project's adaptive management framework:
 - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
 - Using already existing data and statistics
 - Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies.

³ RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/ce/methodologies.htm>

⁴ The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP's intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/imoverview/progprojorg/?src=print>

- Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships;
- Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making; Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project;
- Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and should contain actionable recommendations.

The methodology to be used by the evaluator should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation review (desk study) - the list of reviewed documentation (note: it be made available to the Evaluator at the mission outset)

The consultant should also provide ratings of Project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria. Aspects of the Project to be rated for its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency are:

1	Implementation approach;
2	Country ownership/drivers
3	Outcome/Achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved).
4	Stakeholder participation/public involvement
5	Sustainability;
6	Replication approach;
7	Financial management and Cost-effectiveness;
8	Monitoring and evaluation

In assessing the project performance evaluators will use the rating scales corresponding with GEF Guidelines for evaluations (<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Policies-TEguidelines7-31.pdf>).

The following rating scale should be used for assessment of outcomes:

- a. **Highly satisfactory (HS).** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- b. **Satisfactory (S).** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- c. **Moderately satisfactory (MS).** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- d. **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU).** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- e. **Unsatisfactory (U).** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- f. **Highly unsatisfactory (HU).** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The key product expected from this evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- **Executive summary (2-3 pages)**
 - Brief description of the project
 - Context and purpose of the evaluation

- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- **Introduction (5 pages max.)**
 - Project background
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Key issues addressed
 - Methodology of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation
- **The Project and its development context (5 pages max.)**
 - Project start and its duration
 - Implementation status
 - Problems that the project seek to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Main stakeholders
 - Results expected
- **An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy (3-5 pages)**
- **Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance) (20 pages max.)**
 - Project formulation
 - Implementation approach
 - Country ownership
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
 - Implementation
 - Financial planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Execution and implementation modalities
 - Management by the UNDP country office
 - Coordination and operation issues
 - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
 - Results
 - Attainment of objective
 - Prospects of sustainability
- **Conclusions and recommendations (5-10 pages)**
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- **Lessons learned (3-5 pages)**
 - Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.

Deliverables and Timeline

It is expected that the evaluation will require an estimated input of 25 working days, to be completed within a period of 60 calendar days (which includes one 5-day mission to Belgrade), with the following deliverables due:

Deliverables	Deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inception report including work plan and evaluation matrix prepared and accepted 	10 calendar days from signing the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 Day Mission to Belgrade 	20 calendar days from signing of the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Evaluation Report on approximately 20 pages prepared and accepted 	35 calendar days from signing the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Evaluation Report presented to the Project Team, Implementing Partner and beneficiaries 	40 calendar days from signing the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Evaluation report (approx. 30 – 40 pages) with Executive Summary (3 pages max.) prepared and accepted by UNDP 	55 calendar days from signing the contract (5 days after receiving the comments on the final draft)

All payments will be made upon delivery, quality assurance and prior approval of outputs by UNDP and as per schedule above.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Serbia. UNDP Serbia will contract the evaluator on a lump-sum basis that includes the entire work assignment and production of all deliverables, and all costs related to the required 5 day evaluation mission to Belgrade. UNDP Serbia and Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Timeframe for submission of first draft of the report: 5 weeks upon signing the contract.

The tentative duration of respective activities is:

Activity	Timeframe and responsible party
Desk review	5 days by the Evaluator (home-based)
Briefings for evaluator with UNDP CO, UNDP Regional Center, Project Stakeholders + Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings	10 days by the Evaluator (5 days-home based, 5 days based in Belgrade, Serbia)
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other feedback mechanisms	5 days by the Evaluator (home-based)
Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)	2 days by the Evaluator (home-based)

Working Days:

The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Serbia are during mid-October/mid-November 2014. The evaluator is expected to invest approximately 25 working days over a period of 60 calendar days with a 5-day mission to Belgrade.

The Consultant is not entitled to any travel allowances and per diems as the payment in the framework of this contract will be made on a lump-sum basis.

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
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Demonstrates integrity by modeling ethical standards

Qualifications and Experience

Education:

Masters or equivalent in relevant field of transport, mobility, traffic engineering, civil engineering, urban planning, architecture

Work experience:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience, preferably in international/multilateral development context;
- Minimum 5 years of experience in management or implementation of projects related to transport and urban mobility issues;
- Prior proven experience as an evaluator of transport related projects (*please submit a proof for this requirement*);
- Experience in evaluating and monitoring technical cooperation and development activities and projects;

Knowledge

- Excellent understanding of Serbia's socio-economic situation
- Understanding of current policies and legislation on environment, climate change, transport and urban mobility
- Knowledge of EU environment, climate change and mobility policy will be an asset;
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Knowledge in the use of computers and office software packages and handling of web based monitoring systems

Personal qualifications

- Ability to deliver when working under pressure and within changing circumstances
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude
- Excellent interpersonal skills

Language:

Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English.

NOTE: The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement in the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, UNDP Serbia or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

6. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

The following are steps for on-line application:

Submit the application (as listed below) via UNDP web site www.rs.undp.org under the heading "Work with us/Vacancies":

The application should contain:

- Cover letter explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a brief methodology on how you will approach and conduct the work (based on or commenting on the requirements indicated in this TOR).
- Updated P11 form including latest experience in similar projects and updated contact details of referees (blank form can be downloaded from: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/P11.doc>).
- Financial Proposal* - should be provided in the document Offeror's Letter to UNDP confirming Interest and availability for the individual Contractor that could be found at downloaded from the following link: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/Confirmation.docx> (only PDF will be accepted). It shall specify a total Lump Sum Amount for the tasks specified in this announcement.

Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination, office costs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel.

Payments will be made to the consultant in two instalments as follows:

- 1) 30% of the lump sum amount will be done upon completion of deliverable 1 in TOR;

2) 70% of the lump sum amount upon satisfactory completion of the final report and following confirmation from UNDP that the consultant has delivered on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

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

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE SERVICES OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTORS could be found at the following link: [http://www.undp.org.rs/download/General Conditions IC.docx](http://www.undp.org.rs/download/General%20Conditions%20IC.docx).

Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.

Additional Information:

- Individual Contract (IC) will be applicable for individual consultants applying in their own capacity. If the applicant is employed by any legal entity, IC would be issued upon submission of Consent letter from the employer acknowledging the engagement with UNDP. Template of General Conditions on IC could be found on: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/General%20Conditions%20IC.docx>. 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 and confirmation of unpaid leave provided by the Government entity is required.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials

The criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness will be used for assessing the quality of the evaluation report:

- The report has to be written in clear language (English)
- The Executive Summary should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- The information in the report has to be complete, well structured and well presented
- The information in the report has to be reliable i.e. well documented and supported findings
- The information in the report has to address priority or strategic information needs
- Recommendations have to be concrete and implementable Human rights and gender equality perspective has been taken into account

The evaluation has to be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. Code of conduct is enclosed as Annex I and constitutes integral part of this ToR.

**ANNEX I
(Integral part of ToR)**

Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

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.

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.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. 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.

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.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

