**OUTCOME Evaluation in the Practice Area of energy and environment**

**Duty station**: home-based with mission to Kazakhstan

**Duration**: 30 days

**Type of contract**: IC

**Language required**: English and Russian

Application deadline: 06 July 2015

1. Background

According to the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Kazakhstan for 2010-2015, an outcome evaluation is to be conducted to assess the impact of UNDP’s development assistance in the Practice Area of Environment and Climate Change - outcome “The Government, industries and civil society take steps to adapt to climate change and mitigate its impact through energy efficiency measures and climate change adaptation policies” (the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and the Country Programme Document (CPD) for Kazakhstan for 2010-2015).

UNDP Outcome 3 is also an integral part of Environment Sustainability - one of three pillars under the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Kazakhstan for 2010-2015 with its outcome “By 2015, communities, national, and local authorities use more effective mechanisms and partnerships that promote environmental sustainability and enable them to prepare, respond and recover from natural and man disasters.” UNDP supports the Government of Kazakhstan in development and implementation of the comprehensive climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies that would enable the Government to move towards the Green Economy and utilize the potential of the Nurly Zhol Programme.

UNDP Country Office Kazakhstan (further referred to as UNDP) would like to evaluate its performance during 2010-2015 against the expected results in Outcome 3 and to receive an unbiased analysis of the effort-time ratio. These evaluation and analysis will help UNDP to draw the lessons learnt, and will be used to build up a more efficient strategy for next UNDAF 2016-2020.

With this regard, an Outcome Evaluation should show what has been and what has not been achieved, what the reasons for success or underperformance are and what improvements could be recommended for use in the next round of programmatic activities. The role of UNDP in assisting Kazakhstan in its development agenda should be particularly attenuated.

The outcome evaluation is conducted in 2015 towards the end of current programme cycle of 2010-2015 with a view to contributing to better and more effective performance in the next 2016-2020 programme.

1. BRIEF NATIONAL CONTEXT

In the past decade, Kazakhstan has been able to manage its oil-dependent economy prudently and is trying diversify its economic base. For this reason the Government of Kazakhstan has made a bold step to support economic development by introducing in 2015 a new economic stimulus package, *Nurly Zhol*. It represents a commitment to major investments in building new or modernizing the existing public infrastructure- regional and municipal roads, transport systems, housing, utilities- as well as developing small- and medium- businesses and creating jobs in non-oil sectors. This policy is one of the steps towards diversifying policy options for building greater societal and economic resilience.

Kazakhstan has already achieved many of its Millennium Development Goals (MDG) targets, especially in the areas of poverty reduction and education. The main ‘unfinished business’ in the MDGs lies in Goal 7 - achieving environmental sustainability. Even though the country had embraced the ‘green economy’ and ‘sustainability’ vision, it requires support from the UNDP to practically implement the green aspects of its economic diversification policy.

The UNDP Country Office during the 2010-2015 country programme cycle has emerged as a ‘partner of choice’ in supporting the Government in many of its development priorities, and especially in energy efficiency and climate change portfolio. This is evident from the fact that the number of government costs-shared projects has been increasing steadily during the past five years. In 2015, the share of the government cost-sharing constituted over 50% of UNDP budget, compared to only 4% at the beginning of the CPD cycle in 2010.

Based on this experience, the Government supported UNDP in the launch of joint programmes in Kyzylorda and Mangystau regions. The three local development programmes have demonstrated UNDP’s ability to advise the Government, and support the implementation of the *Nurly Zhol* policy, as well as other national policies such as the national Energy Efficiency 2020 (2011-2020) and the National Programme on Development for Regions (2014-2020).

Based on evaluations of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) projects, implemented by UNDP during the 2010-2015 period, UNDP is recognized by national and local partners as being at the forefront of promoting energy efficient technologies and sustainable transport solutions, through demonstration projects in energy efficient housing, modern lighting, and ‘green’ public transport options.

Since Kazakhstan is at the cross-roads in its development path and is seeking balance between “brown” and “green” development, the UNDP is launching its Energy Efficiency and Climate Change Outcome Evaluation. An independent analysis will help the UNDP to utilize its available resources and capacities more effectively and efficiently in next 2016-2020 programme cycle.

1. Evaluation PURPOSE

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation will be to assess how UNDP’s environment programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions. The purpose of the proposed evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to fine-tune the current UNDP environment programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the the next programmatic cycle.

1. Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover UNDP outcome 3 (Table 1.) under current CPAP period 2010-2015. This outcome evaluation will assess progress towards the outcome, the factors affecting the outcome, key UNDP contributions to outcomes and assess the partnership strategy. The evaluation will also assess the portfolio alignment and its relevance to the UNDAF 2010-2015.

Table 1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 3:** The Government, industries and civil society take steps to adapt to climate change and mitigate its impact through energy efficiency measures and climate change adaptation policies | | |
|  |  |  |
| Projects to be evaluated under the Outcome | | |
|  | Demonstration of improvement of energy efficiency of public buildings at the example of the School No.25 | |
|  | Removing barriers to energy efficiency in municipal heat and hot water supply | |
|  | Promotion of Energy-Efficient Lighting in Kazakhstan | |
|  | Energy efficient design and construction in residential sector | |
|  | City of Almaty Sustainable Transport | |
|  | Assistance to the Republic of Kazakhstan in strengthening interregional cooperation for the promotion of green growth and the implementation of the Astana “Green Bridge” Initiative | |
|  | Development and probation of the Housing-Municipal Building Maintenance Services’ Modernization and Management Model for small populated areas to ensure safety,  improve quality of life of the population and contribute to the environmental protection | |

**Outcome status***:* Determine whether there has been progress made towards achieving the targets in Outcome 3 and identify the challenges to the attainment thereof. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the Outcome.

**Underlying factors***:* Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the Outcome. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the relevance and nature of outputs, degree of stakeholders’ and partners’ involvement in the completion of outputs, and implementation strategies employed by the projects and UNDP.

**Strategic Positioning of UNDP**: Examine the distinctive characteristics and features of UNDP’s environment programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a reliable partner. UNDP’s position will be analyzed in terms of communication, i.e. how UNDP articulates the need for its presence in the country, how UNDP meets partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, how UNDP mobilizes resources for the benefit of the partners. A specific attention should be given to the UNDP’s comparative advantages over other development organizations in Kazakhstan.

**Partnership strategy***:* Ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. Specific attention should be given to how new partnerships were formed, level of stakeholders’ participation and efficiency of the partnerships. Examine the partnership among the UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field. The Evaluation will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the Outcome to the country needs, hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in environment.

**Lessons learnt:** Identify lessons learnt, best practices and related innovative ideas and approaches in relation to the management and implementation of activities. Lessons learnt is the critical aspect of the Outcome Evaluation as it will be use to design a better implementation strategy for the programmatic cycle.

The consultants will pay particular attention to the following:

**a) Relevance**

* Extent to which UNDP support is relevant to Kazakhstan’s low carbon development agenda and environmental priorities as articulated in the National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2030, Nurly Zhol Programme, sectoral development programs of relevant line ministries and the UNDAF.
* Relevance of programme and project design in addressing the identified environmental priority needs in CPAP 2010-2015.
* Extent of the progress towards the achievement of the targets in the Outcome.
* Extent of UNDP’s contribution to mainstreaming the Outcome’s targets in the national programmes.

**b).Efficiency**

* How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the portfolio, what could be improved and how UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the Portfolio.
* Roles, engagement and coordination among the stakeholders.
* Synergies and leveraging with other programmes in Kazakhstan.
* Extent of synergies among UNCT programming and implementation.

**c) Effectiveness, results and sustainability**

* Extent of UNDP’s effectiveness in producing results aligned with CPAP.
* Extent of UNDP achievement in national partners’ capacity development, advocacy on environmental issues and climate change related policymaking.
* Contributing factors and impediments and extent of the UNDP contribution to the achievement of the outcomes through related project outputs;
* Extent of UNDP partnership with civil society and local communities to promote environmental awareness in Kazakhstan.

**d) Sustainability**

* Extent to which UNDP established mechanisms ensure sustainability of the policymaking interventions
* Extent of the viability and effectiveness of partnership strategies in relation to the achievement of the outcomes.
* Effective use of Environment portfolio to support appropriate central authorities, local communities and civil society in climate change related agenda in a long term perspective.
* Possible areas of partnerships with other national institutions, NGOs, UN Agencies, private sector and development partners.

Based on the above analysis, provide recommendations on how UNDP should adjust its partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the Energy and Climate Change related portfolio fully achieves its outcomes in the next UNDAF 2016-2020 period.

1. methotology

**The Outcome Evaluation will involve all relevant stakeholders including but not limited to the UN, the governmental institutions, CSOs,** private sector, multilateral and bilateral donors, and beneficiaries.

An Outcome Evaluator will undertake a number of field visits to selected project sites and will convene briefing sessions with the UN and Government officials, as well as with donors and partners. All relevant data should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location) where possible.

Based on the objectives mentioned above, An Outcome Evaluator will propose a methodology and plan for the assignment that will be approved by UNDP senior management. It is recommended that the methodology should take into account the following:

**3.1. Desk Review**

1. Study UNDAF and the CPD/CPAP for a description of the intended outcome, the baseline for the outcome and the indicators and benchmarks used. Obtain information from the country office gathered through monitoring and reporting on the outcome. This will help to define whether change has taken place.
2. Validate information about the status of the outcome from contextual sources such as project evaluation reports. To do this, the consultant may use interviews or questionnaires during the evaluation that seek key respondents’ perceptions on a number of issues, including their perception of whether an outcome has changed.
3. Base the evaluation on a review of relevant analytical documents, including the UN progress reports. The current status of and degree of change in the outcomes shall be assessed against the Country Analysis and the baselines for the outcome and the indicators and benchmarks used in relation to UNDAF, CPD and CPAP, relevant project/program documents, progress and monitoring reports of projects/programs, contextual information from partners.
4. Study all relevant project reports, with a particular focus on the mission, progress. The project reports include the annual reports, respective project documents, Terminal and Mid Term evaluation reports, Annual Progress Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR). In additional, the evaluator could review project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.
5. Undertake a constructive analysis of the outcome formulationitself (and the associated indicators). This is integral to the scope of outcome evaluation. The consultant can and should make recommendations on how the outcome statement can be improved in terms of conceptual clarity, credibility of association with UNDP operations and prospects for gathering of evidence.
6. Conduct interviews with key informants including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used including focus group discussions.
7. Undertake field visits to selected sites, meet with all relevant UNDP staff and the Government officials, donors and partners.

**3.2. Primary Data collection**

Data will be mainly collected from the existing information sources through a desk review that will include the comprehensive desk review and analysis of relevant documents, information, data/statistics, triangulation of different studies etc. This phase will be comprised of:

* Interviews with all Key Informants and Players
* Questionnaires where appropriate
* Field Visits to project sites and partner institutions where appropriate

**3.3. Stakeholders**

The evaluator will meet the following main development actors involved in the implementation of the Outcome 3:

* UNDP Kazakhstan
* Ministry for Energy
* Ministry for National Economy and Budget Planning
* Ministry for Investment and Development
* Ministry for Internal Affairs, Committee for Emergency Response and Disaster Risk Reduction
* Akimat of KyzylOrda Oblast
* Akimat of Almaty
* NGOs

The list of the partners is not exhaustive and will be supplemented upon the beginning of the actual Outcome Evaluation.

1. outputs deliverables of the evaluation

The Outcome Evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

* Initial Work Plan
* Evaluation Inception Report
* Draft Outcome Evaluation Report
* Final Outcome Evaluation Report

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Initial Work Plan** | Proposed schedule of evaluation mission’s tasks, activities and deliverables | **To be submitted with expression of interest** | Outcome Evaluator to address the UNDP’s comments  UNDP CO to accept the Initial Work Plan if satisfied with the quality of deliverable. |
| **Evaluation Inception Report** | Should be prepared by the evaluator before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise (proposed methods, proposed sources of data, schedule of work) | Beginning of evaluation mission | Outcome Evaluator to address the UNDP’s comments  UNDP CO to accept the Evaluation Inception Report if satisfied with the quality of deliverable. |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Outcome Evaluator to address the UNDP’s comments  UNDP CO to provide comments on the Draft Evaluation Report |
| **Final Evaluation Outcome Report** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Outcome Evaluator to address the UNDP’s comments  UNDP CO to accept the Final Evaluation Outcome Report if satisfied with the quality of deliverable. |

Evaluation deliverables

The Evaluator will conduct a preliminary scoping exercise and come up with a short agenda (containing an evaluation matrix, evaluation protocols for different stakeholders, and a description of the methodology), to be discussed with the UNDP Country office and other stakeholders, before s/he start the evaluation itself.

The key product expected from each outcome evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report that includes, but is not limited to, the following components:

* Title and Opening page
* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the intervention
* Outcome Results
* Conclusions and recommendations & Lessons
* Annexes

For more detailed information, please see the attached template in [Annex C](#_TOR_Annex_F:).

The report should present clear, well-structured and supported findings, and provide concrete and implementable recommendations. UNDP should be able to share it readily with partners and it should generate consensus around the finding and recommendations.

When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (or have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The draft and final evaluation reports are to be submitted in English.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date  (to be specified upon beginning of works) |
| **Desk review** | 5 days | October 2015 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 6 days | October-November 2015 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days | By the end of November 2015 |
| **Final Report** | 10 days | December 2015 |

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kazakhstan. The UNDP CO will contract the Outcome Evaluator and will ensure timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the Evaluator.

The Outcome Evaluator is an Independent Consultant who will report to the Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP Kazakhstan with delegated authority to the Evaluation Focal Point - Head of Energy and Environment Unit. Energy and Environment Programme Unit will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

* Evaluator will work home/office-based with presence in UNDP premises as needed for the desk reviews, and will make travel arrangements in coordination with UNDP CO to visit Kazakhstan.This position envisages one mission to Kazakhstan, Astana – 3 days, Almaty – 2 days, Kyzylorda region – 1 day.
* Dates of mission will be determined after contract signing.
* All travel expenses should be included in total contract amount.

evaluator Composition

The Outcome Evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar outcomes, projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum Master’s degree in environmental management, business administration, development economics, financial management
* Minimum 10 years of professional experience relevant to the sustainable development, climate change, energy efficiency and carbon emissions.
* Knowledge of the Central Asian economy and development priorities;
* Previous exposure to the international development organizations, in particular the UN.
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Excellent English writing and communication skills, excellent Russian reading comprehension.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing as an advance tranche |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO) of the final evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org>, by 6th July, 2015. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain an up-to-date complete C.V. in with indication of the e‐mail and phone contacts. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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 A: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

## Annex B: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. Inline with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[1]](#footnote-1)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

## 

## Annex C: Evaluation Report Outline[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Title and Opening page:   * Name of the evaluation intervention * Time-frame of the evaluation and date of the report * Country of the evaluation intervention * Names and/or organizations of evaluators * Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation * Acknowledgements   Table of contents – Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page reference.  List of acronyms and abbreviations |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated. * Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses. * Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods. * Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations. |
| **iii.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **iv.** | Description of the intervention   * Describe what is being *evaluated, who seeks to benefit*, and the *problem or issue* it seeks to address. * Explain the *expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies*, and the key *assumptions* underlying the strategy. * Link the intervention to *national priorities*, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other *programme or country specific plans and goals*. * Identify the *phase* in the implementation of the intervention and any *significant changes* (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation. * Identify and describe the *key partners* involved in the implementation and their roles. * Describe the *scale of the intervention*, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component. * Indicate *the total resources*, including human resources and budgets. * Describe the context of *the social, political, economic, environmental and institutional factors,* and the *geographical landscape* within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes. * Point out *design weaknesses* (e.g., intervention logic) or other *implementation constraints* (e.g., resource limitations). |
| **v.** | Outcome Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **vi.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the outcome/programme/projects * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **vii.** | Annexes   * ToR for the evaluation * Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview groups, observation protocols, etc) as appropriate * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of supporting documents reviewed * Code of conduct signed by evaluator |

Annex D: documents to be consulted

1. UNDAF 2010-2015
2. CPAP/CPD 2010-2015
3. Nurly Zhol Programme
4. Programme for Accelerated Industrialization
5. Sectoral Programmes
6. Project Progress Reports
7. Progress Mid Term and Final Reports
8. PIRs

1. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)