



## TERMS OF REFERENCE

- A. Job Title:** National Consultant to conduct the Terminal Evaluation of the NAP2  
**B. Duty Station:** Home based  
**C. Project reference:** Advancing Moldova's National Climate Change Adaptation Planning (phase 2)  
**D. Contract type:** Individual Contract (IC)  
**E. Contract Duration:** Up to 30 working days, during December 2024 – 28 February 2025

### F. Background:

#### **PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION**

**Project/outcome title:** NAP-2: Advancing Moldova's National Climate Change Adaptation Planning

**Country:** Republic of Moldova

**Implementing Partner:** UNDP

**Funding source:** Green Climate Fund

**Management Arrangements:** Direct Implementation Modality (DIM)

**UNDAF/Country Programme Outcome/s: UNDAF Outcome #3:** The people of Moldova, especially the most vulnerable, benefit from enhanced environmental governance, energy security, sustainable management of natural resources, and climate and disaster resilient development.

**STRATEGIC PLAN Outcome 2:** Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development.

**Atlas Project ID (Award ID):** 00104945

**Atlas Output ID (Project ID):** 00106296

**UNDP-GEF PIMS ID number:** 6098

**GCF ID number:** MDA-RS-003

**Date project document signed:** 19 June 2020

**Project Start date:** 20 July 2020

**Project End date:** 15 May 2025

**Project budget:** USD 2,110,400.75

Climate change is already profoundly impacting the conditions for resource availability and agricultural activities. Over the last decade, the country has experienced many extreme events, such as droughts and major floods, along with the cumulative effects caused by increased mean temperature and the uneven distribution of precipitation throughout the year, which have had negative consequences on the country's economy, and its population's wellbeing and health. Severe droughts are recurring more frequently, causing significant economic losses. The increasing scope and intensity of extreme events have also resulted in increased frequencies of high-risk situations. By 2050, an increase of 2–3°C in the average temperature, an additional 32 days that exceed the current maximum temperature by 10%, and another 12 days with zero precipitation are projected.

The Government sees the National Adaptation Planning (NAP) process as key to achieving the adaptation objectives outlined in its 2014 Climate Change Adaptation Strategy of the Republic of Moldova and its 2020 Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC), as well as the continued

mainstreaming of climate change considerations into its policies and budgeting processes. The proposed project supports the Republic of Moldova's Government in advancing the second cycle of its National Adaptation Planning process (known as NAP-2). The outcomes of the NAP-2 national adaptation planning processes are:

**Outcome 1:** To strengthen and operationalize the national steering mechanism for climate change adaptation (CCA);

**Outcome 2:** To improve the long-term capacity on planning and implementation of adaptation actions through CCA technologies.

**Outcome 3:** To improve the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation through the increased alignment of national development priorities in the priority sectors (forestry, health, energy, and transport).

The NAP 2 project contributes to UNSDCF (United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework), 2023-2027 strategic priority 4 (green development, sustainable communities and disaster and climate resilience. Additionally, the project will contribute to the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) Country Programme Output 3.3 (National and sub-national governments have improved capacities to integrate resilience to climate change and disasters into development plans and practices to reduce the population's vulnerability). Other than that, the project will contribute to the National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030" by ensuring resilience to climate change by reducing risks related to climate change and by facilitating adaptation in six priority sectors - agriculture, water resources, health, forestry, energy, and transport.

The preliminary work under the first cycle of the NAP (known as NAP-1) supported developing a NAP as a process, conceptualizing, and developing its elements, including the national steering mechanism and laid down the groundwork towards long-term adaptation planning. Despite the progress, significant gaps remain in integrating climate change considerations into many of the national priority sectors' development policies and their associated budget priorities. National appropriations for CCA remain limited.

The NAP-2 goals are being achieved within two parallel implementation tracks. The first track implemented by UNDP expands and deepens the national approach developed under the NAP-1 and strengthens synergies both vertically, at different levels of governance, and horizontally, between the sectors affected by climate change to reduce duplication of efforts, pool scarce resources for efficient use, and ensure a coherent and comprehensive approach to the integration of CCA responses into development planning. In contrast, the second track will focus on adaptation in the agriculture sector and will be concurrently implemented under FAO's auspices.

The purpose of the four-year Planning lies in reducing climate change related risks throughout Moldova by strengthening institutional and technical capacities that support integrated CCA planning and programming. In NAP-2, this was planned to be achieved within two parallel implementation tracks; where each track corresponds to a separate submission to the GCF:

- The first track, implemented by UNDP, expands and deepens the national approach developed under the NAP-1; strengthening synergies both vertically, at different levels of the governance, and horizontally, between the sectors affected by climate change to reduce duplication of efforts, pool scarce resources for effective use, and ensure a coherent and comprehensive approach to the integration of CCA responses into development planning, investment planning, and monitoring.

- The second track, implemented by FAO, focuses on the development of a sector adaptation plan in the agriculture sector (Ag-SAP) to improve the integration of agriculture development and responsiveness to a changing climate while improving food security for Moldova's population.

Specifically, this project supports Track 1, expansion of national level coordination and activities. Key activities center on:

- Strengthening and operationalizing the national steering mechanism for CCA in Outcome 1;
- Improving the long-term capacity on planning and implementation of adaptation actions through CCA technologies in Outcome 2; and
- Improving the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation through the increased alignment of national development priorities, in the priority sectors in Outcome 3.

The project has suffered additional delay due to COVID-19.

The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Moldova with an impartial assessment of the results of NAP2's intervention. UNDP commissions programme evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to development results at the country level as articulated in UNDP's Country Programme Document (CPD). These are evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.

The UNDP Office in Moldova is commissioning this independent evaluation on the NAP2 project to capture evaluative evidence of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and incorporation of gender and other cross-cutting issues to assess the achievement of projects results against what was expected to be achieved. The evaluation will ascertain how beneficiaries have benefited from the project interventions and what lessons could be learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

#### **G. Objective:**

To support UNDP Moldova to provide a comprehensive and objective assessment of the NAP2: covering its entire implementation period from July 2020 to May 2025. This evaluation is being conducted to ensure accountability, assess achievements, and extract valuable lessons for future programming. The findings will inform key stakeholders including UNDP, central governments and the Green Climate Fund on the Project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The results of the evaluation will guide decision-making and planning for future interventions aimed at fostering economic, territorial, and social cohesion in Moldova's focal regions.

#### **H. Scope of work and expected outputs:**

The evaluation comes at a critical juncture as the Project is nearing completion (in May 2025), providing an opportunity to reflect on its overall success and challenges. Given the Project's objectives to update Moldova's climate adaptation strategy, develop sector-specific action plans, and create a knowledge management portal to support climate change adaptation efforts across key sectors, the evaluation will assess to what extent these objectives have been achieved. Furthermore, it will evaluate how cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, climate resilience, and human/child rights were integrated into the implementation process.

#### **Who will use the evaluation results and how:**

1. **UNDP** will use the evaluation to measure Programme outcomes, enhance their approaches for future projects, and scale up successful initiatives.
2. **Green Climate Fund** will utilize the findings to assess the effectiveness of EU-funded interventions and decide on potential future collaborations in Moldova.
3. **Local and Central Governments** will leverage the insights to improve governance, service delivery, and national adaptation planning in line with international strategies.
4. **Civil Society** will use the lessons learned to enhance their involvement in future climate change adaptation initiatives and sector-specific action plans.

This evaluation is particularly essential as it aligns with the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, ensuring that the Project's results are effectively captured, while also providing the necessary evidence for scaling up similar initiatives or refining strategies for Moldova's climate and disaster resilient development in the coming years. The lessons learned from this evaluation will shape the next steps for fostering sustainable, inclusive, and green development in the Republic of Moldova.

This final evaluation is essential to ensure accountability, extract lessons, and assess the Project's overall achievements. The final findings will be presented to central authorities, UNDP, and the **Global Climate Fund**.

The international consultant will collaborate closely with one local consultant, ensuring comprehensive evaluation coverage across both regions.

## **I. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the Project and the following key questions will guide the final programme evaluation:

### **a) Relevance/coherence – (The design and focus of the project)**

- How well has the project aligned with government and agency priorities?
- To what extent has the method of delivery selected for NAP-2 been appropriate to the development context?
- Has NAP-2 project been successful in influencing national policies on climate change adaptation?
- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent was the project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), SDGs, and GCF strategic programming?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the design?
- To what extent were perspectives of men and women who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, considered during project design processes?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

**b) Effectiveness – (The management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery)**

- What evidence is there that the programme has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening? What factors have contributed to achieving, or not, intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Has the NAP-2 programme been effective in helping improve climate change adaptation planning in Moldova?
- To what extent have outcomes been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement? To what extent were the project outputs achieved, considering men, women, and vulnerable groups?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have the programme partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome? What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- What were the positive or negative, intended, or unintended, changes brought about by the work of NAP-2?
- What contributing factors and impediments enhanced or impeded NAP-2 performance?
- To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women, and/or a human-rights based approach?

**c) Efficiency – (Of Project Implementation)**

- Are the approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework of NAP-2 relevant to achieve the planned outcomes?
- To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)?
- Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that NAP-2 has in place help to ensure that activities and outputs were managed efficiently and effectively?
- Were alternative approaches considered in designing the programme?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**d) Sustainability**

- What is the likelihood that the NAP-2 project interventions are sustainable?
- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, considering the necessary capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.) and the development or implementation of a sustainability strategy, including capacity building for key national stakeholders?

- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs, potentially affecting project beneficiaries (men and women) in a negative way?
- What opportunities for financial sustainability exist?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs and the long-term benefits for men, women, and vulnerable groups?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures within which the project operates pose risks to the sustainability of its benefits?
- How has the project supported the government of Moldova in developing the institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) in order to ensure self-sufficiency after project closure?
- Are there any social or political risks that may impact the sustainability of project outputs and its contributions to the country programme outcomes?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to enable primary stakeholders to carry forward the results on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights, and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders (men, women, vulnerable groups) support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies which include a gender dimension?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability in order to support female and male project beneficiaries as well as marginalized groups?

**e) Impact**

- What has happened as a result of the project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people (w/m) have been affected?
- Were there contributions to changes in policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, including observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.)?
- Were there contributions to changes in socio-economic status (income, health, well-being, etc.)?
- Discuss any unintended impacts of the project (both positive and negative) and assess their overall scope and implications.
- Identify barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long term impact; Assess any real change in gender equality, e.g. access to and control of resources, decision-making power, division of labor, etc.

**f) Human rights:**

- To what extent poor, women, men and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups have benefited from the implementation of the NAP 2 Project?

**g) Gender Equality:**

- To what extent has the Project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Did any unintended effects emerge for women, men or vulnerable groups?

**h) Disability:**

- What proportion of the beneficiaries of a Programme were persons with disabilities?

The evaluation team will include a summary of the main findings of the evaluation report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.

A section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the evaluation findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses, and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GCF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

The evaluation report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GCF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the evaluation team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.

It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

**J. Methodology:**

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation will follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials and staff, donors, beneficiaries from the interventions, and community members.

The evaluation will be guided by norms and standards of the [United Nations Evaluation Group \(UNEG\)](#) and will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the 'UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results' and 'Integrated Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations'.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders and the Evaluation Team.

The evaluation should apply a mix of qualitative and quantitative processes and methodologies. The Evaluation Team is expected to provide evidence-based information, through rigorous triangulation, that is credible, reliable and useful.

**Methods** to be used by the evaluator to collect and analyse the required data shall include but not limited to:

- **Desk review** of relevant documents (e.g. annual progress reports, project document, annual work plans, result oriented reports, etc.).
- **Interviews** with the Senior Management and Programme staff of UNDP; Briefing and debriefing sessions with the Government, as well as with other partners.
- **Interviews with partners and stakeholders** (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved and what strategies they have used), specifically but not limited to:
  - Central government ministries and institutions
  - Local governments
  - Civil Societies
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.
- **Gender and human rights lens.** All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues.

All interviews with men and women should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

The consultant is particularly encouraged to use participatory methods to ensure that all stakeholders are consulted as part of the evaluation process. They should take measures to ensure data quality, reliability and validity of data collection tools and methods and their responsiveness to gender equality and human rights. Gender and human rights lens. All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human/child right issues.

#### **K. Evaluation products (deliverables):**

UNDP expects the evaluation products described below. The schedule of deliverables is described in section L.

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report will include the evaluation methodology, work plan, ad evaluation matrix. It will be produced after a desk review and preliminary discussions with UNDP and before any formal evaluation activities begin (*Please refer to Annex 1 for the templated of the Inception Report*).
- **Evaluation debriefings.** A summary of key findings will be presented to UNDP Immediately following the site visits and interviews.
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length).** A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested (*Please refer to Annex 2 for the template of the Evaluation Report*).



- **Evaluation report review (audit) trail.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, as outlined in these guidelines. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report** (as per Annex 2 template).
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/ or evaluation reference group** (if required).
- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant to maximise use.

### Language requirements

All documentation related to the assignment shall be in English.

### L. Schedule of deliverables:

Deliverables	Tasks for the National Consultant	Indicative timeline
<b>Deliverable 1</b> Inception Report and evaluation matrix (as per template in Annexes)	Background materials collected and analysed. Provide inputs to methodology and work plan (7 w.d.)	17 January 2025
<b>Deliverable 2</b> Report on Summary key findings presented to UNDP	Organize Field visits and meetings with relevant parties (9 w.d.)	25 January 2025
<b>Deliverable 3</b> Draft evaluation report (as per template in Annexes)	Provide input to the draft evaluation report (developed by international consultant) (10 w.d.)	By 15 February 2025
<b>Deliverable 4</b> Final evaluation report & Relevant knowledge products	Support IC to finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders, Evaluation Report and lessons presented (4 w.d.)	By 28 February 2025
<b>Total 30 days</b>		

Exact deadlines will be mutually agreed upon contract signature.

Required formats for the inception reports, evaluation reports and other deliverables are included in the annexes of the TOR.

### M. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The **Evaluation Team** to be set consist of an International Consultant and one National/local consultant. The International Consultant will be responsible for coordinating the evaluation process, ensuring that all activities are aligned with the evaluation objectives and timelines and quality control and adherence of all deliverables to evaluation standards. Members of the evaluation team must not have been associated with the Project's formulation, implementation or monitoring.

***The national consultants will be expected to conduct the following tasks:***

- Collection of background materials upon request by International Consultant;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodology, work plan and Evaluation report outlines upon request by International Consultant;
- Assist to the International Consultant in desk review of materials;
- Assist the International Consultant in developing the mission agenda and establishing meeting with relevant stakeholders;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP representatives;
- Arranging field visits and assisting the International Consultant in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites, provision of interpretation in communication with beneficiaries when required;
- Assist the International Consultant in elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Participate in briefings with UNDP representatives;
- Assist the International Consultant in developing the first draft of the Evaluation report;
- Assist the International Consultant in finalization of the Final Evaluation Report through incorporating suggestions received.

The evaluation will be fully independent, and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analysing data for the evaluation.

#### **N. Evaluation ethics**

Evaluations in UN agencies are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) "[Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#)". The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners. Violation of confidentiality requirement may result in immediate termination of the contract. The evaluator will be held to the highest ethical standards.

#### **O. Institutional/Implementation arrangements**

While the evaluation will remain fully independent, the assignment shall be performed in close coordination with the UNDP Climate Change, Environment & Energy Cluster Lead and the Programme Manager.

Thus, the Programme will provide the Consultants the necessary information (including core data) and materials for the fulfilment of the assignment, including the required support for organizing the necessary meetings/interviews and interacting with the relevant institutions and stakeholders. The supervision along with the deliverables 'quality assurance and their approval will be carried out by the Climate Change, Environment & Energy Cluster Lead. All the deliverables shall be submitted in English, in electronic format.

Before submission of final deliverables, the consultants will discuss the draft documents with the parties involved, so that the final products reflect their comments.

## **P. Financial arrangements**

The financial proposal shall specify a total **lump sum** amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including the daily fee, taxes, and number of anticipated working days, transport costs, etc.).

## **Q. Qualifications and skills required:**

### I. Academic Qualifications:

- University degree in social sciences, environment, economics, political studies, or other relevant field.

### II. Years and sphere of experience:

- At least 5 years of experience project management and/or implementation.
- At least 3 assignments in project evaluation and/or monitoring and evaluation, and/or strategic planning.

### III. Competencies:

- Proven knowledge on monitoring and evaluation and final evaluation of programme/project/activities.
- Demonstrated knowledge in the area of climate change and national climate promise.
- Strong knowledge of social – economic development in relation to climate change adaptation.
- Strong communication and interpersonal skills.
- Fluency in Romanian is required, knowledge of English and Russian will be an asset.

Proven commitment to the core values of the United Nations respecting differences of culture, gender, religion, ethnicity, nationality, language, age, HIV status, disability, and sexual orientation, or other status. **Please mention in CV if you belong to the group(s) under-represented in the UN Moldova and/or the area of assignment.**

UNDP Moldova is committed to workforce diversity. Women, persons with disabilities, Roma and other ethnic or religious minorities, persons living with HIV, as well as refugees and other non-citizens legally entitled to work in the Republic of Moldova, are particularly encouraged to apply.

## **R. Documents to Be Included When Submitting the Proposals**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/ information to demonstrate their qualifications:

- Signed and filled-in Offeror's letter to UNDP confirming interest and availability for the individual contractor (IC) assignment, incorporating financial proposal in Annex 2, with the detailed breakdown of costs supporting the all-inclusive financial proposal (in USD, specifying a total requested amount per working day, including all related costs, e.g. fees, phone calls, transport costs etc.);
- Proposal (Motivation Letter): explaining why they are the most suitable for the work including previous experience in similar Projects (please provide brief information on each of the above qualifications, item by item, including information, links/copies of documents that prove participation in similar assignments);

- Curriculum Vitae including records on past experience in similar projects/assignments and concrete outputs obtained.

**Important notice:** The applicants who have the statute of Government Official / Public Servant prior to appointment will be asked to submit the following documentation:

- a no-objection letter in respect of the applicant received from the Government, and;
- the applicant is certified in writing by the Government to be on official leave without pay for the entire duration of the Individual Contract.

A retired government official is not considered in this case a government official, and as such, may be contracted.

### S. Evaluation

Initially, individual consultants will be **short-listed** based on the following minimum qualification criteria:

- Advance degree in social sciences, environment, economics, political studies, or other relevant field.
- At least 5 years of experience project management and/or implementation.
- At least 3 assignments in project evaluation and/or monitoring and evaluation, and/or strategic planning.
- Citizen of Republic of Moldova

The short-listed individual consultants will be further evaluated based on the following methodology:

#### **Cumulative analysis**

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- responsive/ compliant/ acceptable, and
- having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight – 60% (300 pts);

\* Financial Criteria weight – 40% (200 pts).

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 210 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Points Obtainable
<b>Technical</b>		
Advance degree in social sciences, environment, economics, political studies, management or other relevant field	<i>Bachelor – 5 pts; Master's –10 pts</i>	10

At least 5 years of experience in project management and/or implementation	<i>Up to 5 years – 0 points, 5 years – 5 points, each additional year – 5 points up to max. <b>40 pts</b></i>	40
At least 3 assignments in project evaluation and/or monitoring and evaluation, and/or strategic planning	<i>Up to 3 comprehensive studies/evaluations – 0 points, 3 studies/evaluations – 10 points, each additional study/evaluation – 10 pts. Up to max. <b>40 pts</b></i>	40
Experience in working with UN agencies is agencies and other development partners leading teams.	<i>Each assignment – 5 pts, up to max <b>10 pts</b></i>	10
<p><b>Interview</b> (demonstrated technical knowledge and experience; communication/ interpersonal skills; initiative; creativity/ resourcefulness).</p> <p><b>Only the first 5 applicants that have accumulated the highest technical score shall be invited to the interview.</b></p>		
Proven knowledge on monitoring and evaluation and final evaluation of programme/project/ activities	<i>Fair up to 15 pts., Good up to 20 pts.; very good up to <b>50 pts</b></i>	200
Demonstrated knowledge in the area of climate change and national climate promise	<i>Fair up to 15 pts., Good up to 20 pts.; very good up to <b>50 pts</b></i>	
Strong knowledge of social – economic development in relation to climate change adaptation	<i>Fair up to 15 pts., Good up to 20 pts.; very good up to <b>50 pts</b></i>	
Strong communication and interpersonal skills	<i>No – 0 pts., to some extent – up to 10 pts., extensive experience / good skills – up to <b>20 pts</b></i>	
Fluency in Romanian is required, knowledge of English and Russian will be an asset.	<i>Romanian – 10 pts; English – 5 pts; Russian – 5 pts, max. <b>20 pts</b></i>	
Belonging to the group(s) under-represented in the UN Moldova and/or the area of assignment	<i>No – 0 pts, to one group – 5 pts, to two or more groups – <b>10 pts</b></i>	
<b>Maximum Total Technical Scoring</b>		<b>300</b>

<b>Financial</b>	
<p>Evaluation of submitted financial offers will be done based on the following formula:  <b><math>S = F_{min} / F * 200</math></b>  <b>S</b> – score received on financial evaluation;  <b>Fmin</b> – the lowest financial offer out of all the submitted offers qualified over the technical evaluation round;  <b>F</b> – financial offer under consideration</p>	<b>200</b>

Winning candidate

The winning candidate will be the candidate, who has accumulated the highest aggregated score (technical scoring + financial scoring).

**Annexes:**

Annex 1: Inception Report Template  
Annex 2: Evaluation Report Template

## Annex 1: Inception Report Template

### Inception report content

1. **Background and context**, illustrating the understanding of the project/ outcome to be evaluated.
2. **Evaluation objective, purpose and scope**. A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
3. **Evaluation criteria and questions**. The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed, as well as a proposed schedule for field visits.
4. **Evaluability analysis**. Illustrates the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) approaches, and the implications for the proposed methodology.
5. **Cross-cutting issues**. Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate **gender considerations**, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure the inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
6. **Evaluation approach and methodology**, highlighting the conceptual models to be adopted, and describing the data collection methods,<sup>1</sup> sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments, and protocols; and discussing their reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan.
7. **Evaluation matrix**, identifying the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered through the selected methods. (see table 1 below)
8. A revised **schedule of key milestones**, deliverables and responsibilities, including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
9. Detailed **resource requirements**, tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP and UNICEF, such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites
10. **Outline of the draft/ final report** as detailed in the guidelines, and ensuring quality and usability (outlined below). The agreed report outline should meet the quality standards outlined in these guidelines and the quality assessment requirements outlined in section 6.

Table 1: Sample evaluation matrix

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

## Annex 2: Evaluation Report Template

### UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the areas of content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should include the following:

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:
  - Name of the evaluation intervention.
  - Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
  - Countries of the evaluation intervention.
  - Names and organizations of evaluators.
  - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
  - Acknowledgements.
  
2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports (non-GEF)<sup>3</sup> on second page (as one page):

Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title		
Quantum ID		
Corporate outcome and output		
Country		
Region		
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
Total committed budget		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation		
Funding source		
Implementing party <sup>4</sup>		

Evaluation information	
Evaluation type (project/outcome/thematic/country)	



programme, etc.)		
Final/midterm review/ other		
Period under evaluation	Start	End
Evaluators		
Evaluator email address		
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion

3. **Table of contents**, including boxes, figures, tables, and annexes with page references.

4. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**

5. **Executive summary (four/ five page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

- 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 aspects of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.

6. **Introduction**

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention being evaluated (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention).
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the intended users.

7. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy / theory of change.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNSDCF 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, theory of change) 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.

- Include data and an analysis of **specific social groups** affected. Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, vulnerable/ marginalized groups, leaving no one behind.
  - 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 (men and women) for each component.
  - Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
  - Describe the context of the **social, political, economic, and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates, and explain the challenges and opportunities those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
  - Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic, theory of change) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).
8. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.
- **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population and geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were or were not assessed.
  - **Evaluation objectives.** The report should spell out the types of decisions the evaluation will feed into, the issues to be considered in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
  - **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used<sup>5</sup> and explain the rationale for selecting those particular criteria.
  - **Evaluation questions.** The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to those questions address the information needs of users.
9. **Evaluation approach and methods.**<sup>6</sup> The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the time and money constraints, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped to answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. **The report should specify how gender equality, disability, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholder groups.** The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description of methodology should include discussion of each of the following:
- **Evaluation approach.**
  - **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders met) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
  - **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used, describe the sample size and characteristics, the sample selection criteria; the process for selecting the sample (e.g. random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
  - **Data collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their

appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.

- **Performance standards:**<sup>7</sup> the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g. national or regional indicators, rating scales).
  - **Stakeholder participation:** who participated and how the level of involvement of men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
  - **Ethical considerations:** including the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).<sup>8</sup>
  - **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
  - **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed, as well as any steps taken to mitigate them.
10. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report should also discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.
11. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect gender equality and women's empowerment, disability and other cross-cutting issues, as well as possible unanticipated effects.
12. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment as well as to disability and other cross-cutting issues.
13. **Recommendations.** The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should

address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects. Recommendations regarding disability and other cross-cutting issues also need to be addressed.

14. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested in the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context, outcomes, even evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report. Gender equality and women's empowerment, disability and other cross-cutting issues should also be considered.
15. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
  - TOR for the evaluation.
  - Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
  - List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
  - List of supporting documents reviewed.
  - Project or programme results model or results framework.
  - Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators.
  - Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation signed by evaluators.