

## **International Consultant on Renewable Energy for Mid-Term Review of UNDP GEF De-risking Renewable Energy Investment project**

### **UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference**

#### **BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:** home-based with 1 mission to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

**Application Deadline:** 28 February 2020

**Category:** Energy and Environment

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Assignment Type:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** (estimated 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020)

**End Date:** 31 August 2020

**Duration of Initial Contract:** app. 25 working days over a period of four months from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020 to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2020

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** Estimated 25 effective person-days during the four-month period from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020 to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2020 (15 effective person-days home based and 10 effective person-days on field mission to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan)

#### **BACKGROUND**

**A. Project Title:** 00101058 UNDP-GEF “De-risking Renewable Energy Investments”

#### **B. Introduction**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full -sized project titled “De-risking Renewable Energy Investment” (DREI), PIMS 5490 implemented through the *UNDP Kazakhstan*, which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started on *19 February 2018* and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document “[Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)”.

#### **C. Project Background Information**

The objective of the project is to promote private sector investment in renewable energy in Kazakhstan to achieve Kazakhstan’s 2030 and 2050 targets for renewable energy. The project targets both large-scale and small-scale renewable energy. The goal of this project is to achieve energy market transformation in Kazakhstan by significantly scaling-up the deployment of renewable energy in electricity generation, from a 0.77% share of renewable energy to a 10% share by 2030, which makes for 10-fold increase in renewable energy-based energy generation to be facilitated by the project. In large-scale renewable energy, the project will promote Kazakhstan as a prime destination for international investment. Technologies will include wind energy and solar photovoltaic (PV). In small-scale renewable energy, the project will promote investment in “RES for urban life”, on-grid small-

scale renewable energy applications, targeting urban households and businesses; and “RES for rural life”, both on-grid and off-grid small-scale renewable energy applications, targeting farms and rural SMEs. Technologies may include solar PV (roof-top), solar water heating and small-scale wind. The project will promote the latest business and finance models for small-scale RES developers (for example, third-party ownership models). The design and implementation of this project make use of the ‘Derisking Renewable Energy Investment’ (DREI) methodology developed by UNDP, which is a model for quantitative and qualitative comparison of the cost-effectiveness of different public instruments in promoting renewable energy investment.

There are three components to achieve this objective. These are:

- Project Component 1: Large-Scale Renewable Energy: Policy and Financial Derisking Measures;
- Project Component 2: Renewable Energy for Life: Policy Derisking;
- Project Component 3: Renewable Energy for Life: Financial Derisking and Incentives;

The UNDP-GEF DREI Project team is located in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan. There are 3 full time and 1 part time project staff in Nur-Sultan. The primary beneficiaries are the, Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The GEF Grant for the Project budget is \$4,510,000 with over 50,910,000 in co-financing from national partners.

#### **D. Objectives of the MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR consultant will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.

#### **E. MTR Approach & Methodology**

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the project team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>1</sup> ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR<sup>2</sup> Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: the Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Ministry of Ecology, Geology and Natural Resources

<sup>1</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

<sup>2</sup> For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/get\\_handbook.html](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/get_handbook.html), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Renewable Energy trading platform KOREM JSC, RE Association, entrepreneurs development Fund Damu, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area and the Project Board.

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

## **F. Detailed Scope of the MTR**

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See [the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#) for extended descriptions.

### **i. Project Strategy**

#### Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

#### Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

## ii. Progress Towards Results

### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; color code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

| Project Strategy  | Indicator <sup>3</sup>     | Baseline Level <sup>4</sup> | Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported) | Midterm Target <sup>5</sup> | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>6</sup> | Achievement Rating <sup>7</sup> | Justification for Rating |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Objective:</b> | Indicator (if applicable): |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |                          |
| <b>Outcome 1:</b> | Indicator 1:               |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |                          |
|                   | Indicator 2:               |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |                          |
| <b>Outcome 2:</b> | Indicator 3:               |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |                          |
|                   | Indicator 4:               |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |                          |
|                   | Etc.                       |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |                          |
| <b>Etc.</b>       |                            |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |                          |

### Indicator Assessment Key

|                 |                                  |                                   |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

## iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>4</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>5</sup> If available

<sup>6</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>7</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?

- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

#### Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

#### Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

#### **iv. Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

##### Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

##### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>8</sup>

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and which aims to improve the project over the second part of the project life time. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance for conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for UNDP-GEF project "De-risking Renewable Energy Investment"**

| Measure   | MTR Rating                                       | Achievement Description |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Project Strategy</b>                                 | N/A  |                         |
| <b>Progress Towards Results</b>                         | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |                         |
|   | Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |                         |
|   | Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |                         |
|   | Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |                         |
|   | Etc.   |                         |
| <b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b> | (rate 6 pt. scale)                               |                         |

<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

|                       |                    |  |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--|
| <b>Sustainability</b> | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--|

### G. Timeframe

The total duration of the MTR will be 25 days over a time period of 4 months starting on 1st May 2020 and ending on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2020. The assignment includes one 10 days mission to Kazakhstan. This mission is envisaged to take place in June 2020. The time elapsed shall not exceed four months from when the consultant(s) is/are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

| TIMEFRAME                         | ACTIVITY  |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| February 2020                     | Application closes  |
| 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2020       | Select MTR Team   |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> May 2020          | Start date of the Contract  |
| Early May 2020                    | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)   |
| 15th May 2020                     | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report  |
| Early June 2020                   | Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- to be submitted prior to the MTR mission |
| Before 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2020 | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits                                   |
| Before 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2020 | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission       |
| 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2020        | Preparing draft MTR report  |
| 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2020        | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report            |
| 15 <sup>th</sup> August 2020      | Preparation & Issue of Management Response  |
| 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2020      | Expected date of full MTR completion  |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

### H. Midterm Review Deliverables

| # | Deliverable                               | Description  | Estimated Duration to Complete | Timing                     | Responsibilities  |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 1 | <b>MTR Inception Report</b>               | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review                | 5 w.d.                         | End May 2020               | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management                   |
| 2 | <b>Mission to Kazakhstan Presentation</b> | Initial Findings   | 10 w.d                         | Before end of June 2020    | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit                  |
| 3 | <b>Draft Final Report</b>                 | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | 5 w.d.                         | 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2020 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |



|          |                      |  |        |                              |                                |
|----------|----------------------|--|--------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>4</b> | <b>Final Report*</b> | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | 5 w.d. | 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2020 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |
|----------|----------------------|--|--------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders (i.e – Russian).

## **I. MTR Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *SDU Unit of the UNDP CO Kazakhstan*.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## **J. Team Composition**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national team expert, from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

## **K. Payment Modalities and Specifications**

20% - at submission and approval of the Inception Report, prior to the mission to Kazakhstan

50% - following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report, following the mission to Kazakhstan

30% - following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## **L. Duty Station**

Home based with one mission to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan (15 effective person-days home based and 10 effective person-days on field mission to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan). It is expected that this mission should take place before the end of June 2020.

### **Travel:**

- BSAFE security course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>

### **Consultant Independence:**

- The consultants cannot be involved in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

## **M. Required Skills and Experience**

### **a) Competencies:**

#### **Corporate competencies:**

- 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 favoritism;
- Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

#### **Functional competencies:**

- Excellent communication skills
- Demonstrable analytical skills

### **b) Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

#### **Education:**

- A Master's degree in economics, energy management, policies in the area of environmental protection or other closely related field.

#### **Experience:**

- Recent experience (within 5 years) with result-based management evaluation methodologies required
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios required
- Experience in adaptive management
- Experience working with the GEF evaluations required
- Experience working in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and Caucasus in renewable energy and energy efficiency field required, in evaluation of project implementation
- Work experience in renewable energy and energy efficiency field for at least 5 years required
- Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis and demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender
- Project evaluation experience in international organizations. Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered as an asset

#### **Language skills:**

- English is the working language of the UNDP-GEF Project and required. The ability to communicate in Russian is an advantage.

## N. Scope of price proposal

This is a lump sum contract for the entire contract which includes the total cost of carrying out the assignment, through to the end of the assignment. The interested candidate must submit his/her financial proposal in USD, using UNDP template form. The financial proposal should include all the expert's expenses, including his fees, travel expenses\* and etc. necessary for obtaining the above results within the Terms of Reference. Payment will be made in tranche after the approval of the report, based on the above results and the signing of the Certificate of payment for the result by the Commissioning Unit.

*\*Please be noted that in financial proposal the living allowances should be lower or equal to UN daily subsistence allowances, but under no circumstance should they be higher.*

## O. Evaluation of Applicants

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as: a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (CV desk reviews, methodology evaluation and interviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Initially, the candidates' applications will be shortlisted based on the following qualification criteria of the applicant:

- A Master's degree in economics, energy management, policies in the area of environmental protection or other closely related field **(5 points)**;
- Experience working in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and Caucasus in renewable energy and energy efficiency field required, in evaluation of project implementation **(5 points)**.

The top 5 shortlisted candidates will be admitted to technical desk review evaluation.

The top 3 candidates received 70% of points in desk review and methodology evaluation (criteria A-F) would be invited for an interview. Only candidates who receive 70% or more of points in technical evaluation (Criteria A-I) will be considered for financial evaluation.

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 1000 points:

| Criteria  | Weight % | Min.passing points | Max. points |
|---|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| Criterion A - (desk review) Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios | 5%       | 35                 | 50          |

|  |             |            |             |
|--|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Criterion B – (desk review) Experience with adaptive management  | 5%          | 35         | 50          |
| Criterion C - (desk review) Work experience in renewable energy and energy efficiency field for at least 5 years required  | 20%         | 140        | 200         |
| Criterion D - (desk review) Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis and demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender  | 10%         | 70         | 100         |
| Criterion E - (desk review) Project evaluation experience in international organizations. Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset | 15%         | 105        | 150         |
| Criterion F - (methodology/ Brief Description of Approach to Work) Demonstrable analytical skills, language skills   | 10%         | 70         | 100         |
| Criterion G - (interviews) Recent experience (within 5 years) with result-based management evaluation methodologies  | 20%         | 140        | 200         |
| Criterion H - (interviews) Experience working with the GEF evaluations   | 15%         | 105        | 150         |
|  | <b>100%</b> | <b>700</b> | <b>1000</b> |

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation.

#### **P. Application Process**

The following documents only in **PDF** should be attached to the application (proposal) and sent by e-mail to the following address: [procurement.kz@undp.org](mailto:procurement.kz@undp.org) indicating **Ref.2020-013** in the e-mail subject no later than **15.00 (Nur-Sultan time zone) 28 February, 2020:**




- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability and Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per UNDP template provided;
- Detailed personal CV, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) and other supporting information confirming that the Candidate meets the qualification requirements;
- Brief Description of Approach to Work.
- Copies of higher education diplomas and other relevant documents.

***Due to the technical features of e-mail, the size of the file/s should not exceed 9 Mb per e-message.***

*Please make sure you have provided all requested materials. ONLY fully submitted applications would be considered!!!*

*The type of Contract to be signed and the applicable UNDP Contract General Terms and Conditions, as specified in TOR, can be accessed at <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html>*

*Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.*

| CONFIRMED AND APPROVED BY:                            |   |                  |
|---|---|------------------|
| Syrym Nurgaliyev/Project Manager<br>Name/Title        | <br>Signature | Date: 11.02.2020 |
| Arman Kashkinbekov/Head of SDU<br>Name/Title          | <br>Signature | Date: 11.02.2020 |
| John O'Brien/Regional Technical Advisor<br>Name/Title | <br>Signature | Date: 11.02.2020 |

## **ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the UNDP-GEF "De-risking renewable energy investment" Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

## ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report<sup>9</sup>

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
  - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
  - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - MTR team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
  - Project Information Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
  - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
  - Concise summary of conclusions
  - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
  - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
  - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
  - Structure of the MTR report
3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
  - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
  - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
  - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
  - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
  - Project timing and milestones
  - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (*12-14 pages*)
  - 4.1 Project Strategy
    - Project Design
    - Results Framework/Logframe
  - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
    - Progress towards outcomes analysis
    - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
  - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
    - Management Arrangements
    - Work planning
    - Finance and co-finance
    - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
    - Stakeholder engagement
    - Reporting

---

<sup>9</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability**
  - Financial risks to sustainability
  - Socio-economic to sustainability
  - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
  - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)**
  - 5.1 Conclusions**
    - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
  - 5.2 Recommendations**
    - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
    - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
    - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- 6. Annexes**
  - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
  - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
  - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
  - Ratings Scales
  - MTR mission itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
  - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
  - Signed MTR final report clearance form
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)



## ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

| Evaluative Questions  | Indicators  | Sources   | Methodology  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>   |   |   |  |
| (include evaluative question(s))  | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
| <b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>  |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
| <b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</b> |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
| <b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants<sup>10</sup>****Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>10</sup> [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

| Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) |                                |  |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 6   | Highly Satisfactory (HS)       | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5   | Satisfactory (S)               | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.   |
| 4   | Moderately Satisfactory (MS)   | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.   |
| 3   | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.   |
| 2   | Unsatisfactory (U)             | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.   |
| 1   | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)     | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.   |

| Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating) |                                |  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 6  | Highly Satisfactory (HS)       | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5  | Satisfactory (S)               | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.   |
| 4  | Moderately Satisfactory (MS)   | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.   |
| 3  | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.  |
| 2  | Unsatisfactory (U)             | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.   |
| 1  | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)     | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.   |

| Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating) |                          |   |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| 4  | Likely (L)               | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3  | Moderately Likely (ML)   | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review        |
| 2  | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on                            |
| 1  | Unlikely (U)             | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained   |

**ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**  
*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UN*

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:</b> |             |
| <b>Commissioning Unit</b>                             |             |
| Name: _____   |             |
| Signature: _____                                      | Date: _____ |
| <b>UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor</b>            |             |
| Name: _____   |             |
| Signature: _____                                      | Date: _____ |