

TERMS OF REFERENCE¹

Evaluation of the UNEP project “Green Growth Knowledge Platform”

For more information and CV submission please contact Elisa Calcaterra, Evaluation Officer, UNEP at elisa.calcaterra@unep.org

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1. Project rationale

1. In the Rio+20 Conference outcome document, “The Future We Want”, governments acknowledged the importance of promoting green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication and called for the development of platforms to contribute to coordinating and providing information on green economy tools, best practices, models and methodologies. The G20 Los Cabos Leaders’ Declaration highlighted the importance of facilitating knowledge sharing as a means of supporting the development and implementation of national green growth strategies and policies.
2. The GGKP aims to identify major knowledge gaps in green growth theory and practice and to facilitate the creation of a dynamic green growth community of practice by facilitating interaction through a global Advisory Committee and thematic Research Committees and by organizing Annual Conferences and technical workshops. The GGKP also intended to create a dedicated web-based platform for sharing knowledge, tools, data and good practices.
3. The GGKP was officially launched in Mexico City in January 2012 by its four founding partners: the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank.

2. Project objectives and components

4. As per paragraph 2, the GGKP aims to 1) identify major knowledge gaps and to address these through policy-oriented research by stimulating collaboration and knowledge sharing between its partners, scholars, practitioners, policymakers and the private sector; 2) deliver state of the art knowledge management that provides this community with the policy guidance, good practices, tools and data necessary to support a green economy transition.
5. According to the 2015 Impact Report, the GGKP measures (and therefore identifies) its overall impact through the number and quality of green growth research initiatives catalysed as a result of knowledge gaps identified by the GGKP; the number of practitioners and policymakers utilising GGKP knowledge products to develop and implement effective policy change on the ground; and the number of experts sharing green growth research and activities through the GGKP web platform, social media and events.
6. In order to achieve its mission, GGKP was structured around two outputs: a) knowledge gap analysis and research papers produced and made accessible online to catalyse an international green growth research agenda; and b) web-based knowledge platform launched and maintained to promote information sharing and learning and to build and facilitate a dynamic green growth community of practice.

3. Executing Arrangements

7. GGKP is a partnership between its four founding partners (see paragraph 3). Together, they form the **GGKP Steering Committee (previously referred to as “Council”)**, which is the principal governing and decision-making body of the GGKP and approves the GGKP strategy and overall work program. It also coordinates the production of joint reports, the organization of conferences and workshops and it helps to identify potential sources of funding. The Steering Committee also appoints members of the Advisory Committee and endorses its Chairs.

¹ TOR template version of September 2016

8. The **Advisory Committee** was intended to be comprised of 12-15 global experts and to act as a panel of advisers who provide strategic advice and guidance to the GGKP Steering Committee and the GGKP management team. In particular, they are meant to assist the Steering Committee in shaping new research agendas by recommending key topics, suggest potential sources of funding and identify relevant institutions and researchers. The Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet in person once a year at the GGKP Annual Conference.

9. **Research Committees**, which are convened by the Steering Committee, are responsible for designing and developing a research program associated with a particular Annual Conference theme. Research Committees may also be formed for GGKP research programs outside the context of an Annual Conference and were intended to be comprised of, to the extent possible, between four to eight members, representing GGKP Knowledge Partners and Advisory Committee members, and an appropriate mix of representatives from academic, practitioner, policymaking and donor communities. Most committees are reported to have been larger (approximately 10-15 members) and the evaluation should focus on the extent to which their composition was suitable to achieve the intended objective rather than numbers of representatives.

10. UNEP and GGGI jointly manage the GGKP and oversee day to day operations. The **GGKP management team** was intended to be staffed by GGGI and UNEP staff members and consultants. According to the Project Information Management System (PIMS), the only viable solution was to establish a virtual secretariat with GGGI staff dedicated to the initiative working from other locations (e.g. Seoul and Washington DC). The evaluation should consider to what extent this has proven efficient and, if not, whether any other solution may be considered. The Management Team is accountable to the GGKP Steering Committee and is responsible for the following functions:

- (i) Internal coordination
- (ii) External coordination
- (iii) Budget and operational management
- (iv) Research and knowledge management
- (v) Communications
- (vi) Outreach events

II. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

11. In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy² and the UNEP Programme Manual³, the Evaluation (TE) is undertaken at the end of the project (as defined in the current guiding project document) to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. It should however be noted that GGKP has already been successful in raising significant funds for a follow up phase. The evaluation will therefore contain elements of both a TE and a Mid-term Evaluation (MTE). The evaluation has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and the main project partners. The evaluation will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation, especially for the next phase of the project.

12. In addition to the evaluation criteria outlined in section 5, below, the evaluation will address the **strategic questions** listed below. These are questions of interest to UNEP and the GGKP partners and to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution:

1. To what extent are green growth knowledge products delivered by GGKP being used and applied by practitioners and policymakers in the promotion of policies and actions that support a green economy transition (as per key outcome and impact indicator presented in the impact report, pg 8)⁴?
2. To what extent is the GGKP leading to the development of other green growth research initiatives as a result of knowledge gaps it has identified?
3. To what extent should the GGKP consider expanding its partnership to other stakeholder groups, such as private sector actors or civil society groups?
4. To what extent should the GGKP consider expanding its focus to supporting collaboration on in-country projects?

² <http://www.unep.org/eou/StandardsPolicyandPractices/UNEPEvaluationPolicy/tabid/3050/language/en-US/Default.aspx>

³ http://www.unep.org/QAS/Documents/UNEP_Programme_Manual_May_2013.pdf

⁴ A key impact indicator for which the evaluation should present any emerging evidence is the following « Practitioners and policymakers utilising GGKP knowledge products to develop and implement on the ground policy change »

2. Evaluation Criteria

(Supplementary information on approaches is available in the Approaches Guidance document)

A. Strategic Relevance

The evaluation will assess, in line with the OECD/DAC definition of relevance, ‘the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor’. The evaluation will include an assessment of the project’s relevance in relation to UNEP’s mandate and its alignment with UNEP’s policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Under strategic relevance, an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

1. Alignment to the UNEP Medium Term Strategy⁵ (MTS) and Programme of Work (POW)

The evaluation should assess the project’s alignment with the MTS and POW under which the project was approved and include reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant MTS and POW.

2. Alignment to UNEP and Donor Strategic Priorities

Donors’ strategic priorities will vary across interventions. UNEP strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building⁶ (BSP) and South-South Cooperation (S-SC). The BSP relates to the capacity of governments to: comply with international agreements and obligations at the national level; promote, facilitate and finance environmentally sound technologies and to strengthen frameworks for developing coherent international environmental policies. S-SC is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between developing countries.

3. Relevance to Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the intervention is suited or responding to the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries, sub-regions or regions where it is being implemented. In the case of GGKP, the evaluation should focus on the added value of the platform for country level actors if a country is covered.

4. Complementarity with Existing Interventions (UNEP and other founding partners)

An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project mobilization, took account of ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same sub-programme, other UNEP sub-programmes, or being implemented by other agencies) that address similar needs of the same target groups. The evaluation will consider if the project team, in collaboration with Regional Offices and Sub-Programme Coordinators, made efforts to ensure their own intervention was complementary to other interventions, optimized any synergies and avoided duplication of effort. Specific examples for GGKP include the UNEP Green Economy Initiative, and the relevant green economy and green growth work programmes of the GGKP founding organizations. Linkages with other interventions should be described and instances where UNEP’s comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

As GGKP is the result of a core partnership among the four funding partners, a brief review of its strategic relevance and complementarity to other partners’ key strategic documents should also be presented.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders’ participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

B. Quality of Project Design

The quality of project design is assessed using an agreed template during the evaluation inception phase, ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established. This overall Project Design Quality rating is entered in the final evaluation ratings table as item B.

Factors affecting this criterion may include (at the design stage):

⁵ UNEP’s Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UNEP’s programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UNEP’s thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes.

⁶ <http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf>

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

C. Nature of External Context

At evaluation inception stage, a rating is established for the project's external operating context (considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval). This rating is entered in the final evaluation ratings table as item C. Where a project has been rated as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, the overall rating for Effectiveness may be increased at the discretion of the Evaluation Consultant and Evaluation Manager together. A justification for such an increase must be given.

D. Effectiveness

1. Achievement of Outputs

The evaluation will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs (products and services delivered by the project itself) and achieving milestones as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any *formal* modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. The achievement of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their usefulness and the timeliness of their delivery.

The evaluation will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision⁷

2. Achievement of Direct Outcomes

The achievement of direct outcomes is assessed as performance against the direct outcomes as defined in the reconstructed⁸ Theory of Change. Direct outcomes are the first-level outcomes expected to be achieved as an immediate result of project outputs. The evaluation should report evidence of attribution between the intervention and the direct outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UNEP's contribution should be included.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Communication and public awareness
- Catalytic role and replication

3. Likelihood of Impact

Based on the articulation of longer term effects in the reconstructed TOC (i.e. from direct outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact – see Annex 2), the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. The Evaluation Office's approach is outlined in detail in the Approaches Guidance available on the EOU website, www.unep.org/evaluation. Essentially the approach follows a 'likelihood tree' from direct outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC held. Any unintended positive effects should also be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described.

⁷ In some cases 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping provided by UNEP.

⁸ UNEP staff are currently required to submit a Theory of Change with all submitted project designs. The level of 'reconstruction' needed during an evaluation will depend on the quality of this initial TOC, the time that has lapsed between project design and implementation (which may be related to securing and disbursing funds) and the level of any changes made to the project design. In the case of projects pre-dating 2013 the intervention logic is often represented in a logical framework and a TOC will need to be constructed in the inception stage of the evaluation.

The evaluation will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects. Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards.⁹

Ultimately UNEP and all its partners aim to bring about benefits to the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-term or broad-based changes. However, the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the high level changes represented by UNEP's Expected Accomplishments, the Sustainable Development Goals¹⁰ and/or the high level results prioritised by the funding partner(s) and key implementation partner(s).

The GGKP Impact Report and Annual Reports¹¹ should be used to the extent possible for the analysis of the likelihood of impact and suggestions provided on to strengthen the impact monitoring framework currently being used by GGKP.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Communication and public awareness
- Catalytic role and replication

E. Financial Management

Financial management will be assessed under three broad themes: completeness of financial information, communication between financial and project management staff and compliance with financial management standards and procedures. The evaluation will establish the actual spending across the life of the project of funds secured from all donors. This expenditure will be reported, where possible, at output level and will be compared with the approved budget. The evaluation will assess the level of communication between the project manager and the fund management officer as it relates to the effective delivery of the planned project and the needs of a responsive, adaptive management approach. The evaluation will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UNEP's financial management policies. Any financial management issues that have affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision

F. Efficiency

Under efficiency, the evaluation will assess the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at a lower costs compared with alternatives. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The evaluation will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The evaluation will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe.

The evaluation will give special attention to efforts by the project teams to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency. The evaluation will also consider the extent to which the management of the project minimised UNEP's environmental footprint.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation

⁹ Further information on Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards (ESES) can be found at

¹⁰ A list of relevant SDGs is available on the EO website www.unep.org/evaluation

¹¹ Available at http://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/sites/default/files/Impact_Report.pdf

G. Monitoring and Reporting

The evaluation will assess monitoring and reporting across three sub-categories: ‘project reporting’; ‘monitoring design and budgeting’ and ‘monitoring implementation’.

1. Project Reporting

UNEP has a centralised Project Information Management System (PIMS) in which project managers upload six-monthly status reports against agreed project milestones. This information will be provided to the Evaluation Consultant by the Evaluation Manager. Some projects have additional requirements to report regularly to funding partners and this will be supplied by the project team. The evaluation will assess the extent to which both UNEP and donor reporting commitments have been fulfilled.

2. Monitoring Design and Budgeting

Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART indicators towards the achievement of the projects outputs and direct outcomes. The evaluation will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation.

3. Monitoring Implementation

The evaluation will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. It will also consider how information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensuring sustainability. The evaluation should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

H. Sustainability

Sustainability is understood as the probability of direct outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved outcomes. Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. As GGKP is a knowledge platform, this section should assess the extent to which the sustainability of the key outcome (Green growth knowledge products are used and applied by practitioners and policymakers in the promotion of policies and actions that support a green economy transition) is ensured by the policies and actions adopted and to what extent the continuation of GGKP is necessary for this process to continue, either in other countries/geographical areas or as new knowledge is produced, requiring modified actions. Because of the nature of GGKP, the evaluation should assess the extent to which any existing sustainability strategy linked to a time or fact horizon has been developed or whether there are any emerging issue such a strategy should include.

1. Socio-political Sustainability

The evaluation will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of project direct outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to use the knowledge products to support a green economy transition. GGKP as a whole intends to increase individual capacity through its platform and seminar series, but it is not a standard capacity building project, with this in mind, the evaluation will consider whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

2. Financial Sustainability

Some direct outcomes, once achieved, do not require further financial inputs, e.g. a decision to formally revise a policy (as a partial result of increased access to knowledge). However, in order to derive a benefit from this outcome further management action may still be needed e.g. to undertake actions to enforce the policy. Other direct outcomes may be dependent on a continuous flow of action that needs to be resourced for them to be maintained, e.g. continuation and updating of the GGKP platform as a means to achieve the intended outcome. The evaluation will assess the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be

sustained. Secured future funding is only relevant to financial sustainability where the direct outcomes of a project have been extended into a future project phase. The question still remains as to whether the future project outcomes will be financially sustainable.

3. Institutional Sustainability

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether GGKP is facilitating institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. which are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Communication and public awareness
- Catalytic role and replication

I. Factors and Processes Affecting Project Performance

(These factors are rated in the ratings table, but are discussed as cross-cutting themes as appropriate under the other evaluation criteria, above)

1. Preparation and Readiness

This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project. The evaluation will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular, the evaluation will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements.

2. Quality of Project Management and Supervision

For GGKP, 'Project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP to the management team and partners.

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including Advisory Committee etc.); communication and collaboration with UNEP colleagues; risk management; use of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution.

3. Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation

Here the term 'stakeholder' should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs and target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UNEP. The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning and expertise.

4. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity

The evaluation will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Within this human rights context, the evaluation will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UNEP's Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment.

In particular, the evaluation will consider to what extent project design, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration the need to support the mainstreaming of gender into green growth planning and implementation, e.g. by creating, as per project document, a specific thematic page aimed at increasing the understanding of the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in green economy, the creation of a specific committee and the inclusion of gender sensitive approach in all analysis and outreach. To the extent possible, the evaluation should assess the extent to which there is any emerging evidence of gender aspects being

mainstreamed into green growth policies and actions taken as a result of increased access to knowledge facilitated by GGKP.

5. Country Ownership and Driven-ness

The evaluation will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies / policy makers, understood as the level of use of the knowledge products by this group of stakeholders, which is key to achieve the outcome. The evaluation will consider the involvement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices. This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long term impact to be realised.

6. Communication and Public Awareness

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The evaluation should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively and whether any feedback channels were established. As the GGKP is a knowledge sharing platform, the evaluation will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

7. Catalytic Role, Replication and Scaling Up

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role or promoted replication and/or scaling up. Playing a catalytic role and supporting replication and scaling up are all examples of multiplier effects i.e. ways in which the benefits stemming from the project's funded activities are extended beyond the targeted results or the targeted implementation area.

More specifically, the *catalytic role* of UNEP interventions is embodied in their approach of supporting the creation of an enabling environment and encouraging partners/others to work towards common environmental goals. A catalytic role can be demonstrated through replication or scaling up. *Replication* refers to approaches being repeated or lessons being applied in different geographic areas or among different target groups. *Scaling up* refers to approaches being adopted on a much larger scale. Both replication and scaling up are often funded by other sources. Piloting innovative approaches and demonstrating how new knowledge can be applied is a common method used to stimulate replication and justify the scaling up of efforts. Fundamentally, all these roles imply cost-savings in the sense that effective approaches, evidence or knowledge gaps (in the specific case of the GGKP) have been established that can be applied/filled by others or elsewhere, without the duplication of investment or effort.

As GGKP specifically aims to play a catalytic role, the evaluation should present any emerging evidence of this process and the extent to which the GGKP is being successful in catalysing action by others in order to achieve its stated outcome. For this reason, this section should provide supporting information to explain the extent to which the GGKP is successfully delivering results which ensure that it is effective in achieving its mission (it should therefore be closely linked to the analysis presented in section D).

III. Evaluation Deliverables and Logistics

A. Reports and deliverables

13. The evaluation team will prepare:

- **Inception Report:** (see Annex 3 for Inception Report outline) containing an assessment of project design quality (Annex 4), a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, evaluation framework and a tentative evaluation schedule.
- **Preliminary Findings Note:** typically in the form of a powerpoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings. In this case, preliminary findings will also be presented to the GGKP Steering Committee, Management team and, if possible, the Advisory Committee to foster the participation of the four funding partners and to receive strategic feedback.

- **Draft and Final Evaluation Report:** (see Annex 5 for Evaluation Report outline) containing an executive summary that can act as a stand alone document; detailed analysis of the evaluation findings organised by evaluation criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.
- **Evaluation Bulletin:** a 2-page summary of key evaluation findings for wider dissemination through the EOU website.

B. Logistical arrangements

14. This TE will be undertaken by one independent evaluation consultant contracted by the UNEP Evaluation Office. The consultant will work under the overall responsibility of the UNEP Evaluation Office and will consult with the EO on any procedural and methodological matters related to the evaluation. It is, however, the consultant's individual responsibility to arrange for his/her travel, visa, obtain documentary evidence, plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The UNEP Project Manager and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultant to conduct the evaluation as efficiently and independently as possible.

C. The Consultants' Team

15. For this evaluation, the evaluation team will consist of one consultant. The consultant should have a degree in environmental economics or related field, 10 years of technical / evaluation experience, including of evaluating large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach; a broad understanding of green growth and green economy concepts as well as previous experience evaluating knowledge platforms and multi-partner initiatives.

16. By undersigning the service contract with UNEP/UNON, the consultant certifies that he/she has not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, he/she will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project's executing or implementing units.

D. Schedule of the evaluation

17. Table 3 below presents the tentative schedule for the evaluation.

Table 3. Tentative schedule for the evaluation

Milestone	Deadline
Inception Mission – 2 days (Geneva)	February 2016
Inception Report	15 March 2016
Telephone interviews, surveys etc.	15 March 2017
Note on preliminary findings and recommendations	30 March 2017
Zero draft report	30 April 2017
Draft Report shared with UNEP Project Manager	10 May 2017
Draft Report shared with management team	20 May 2017
Draft Report shared with stakeholders	30 May 2017
Final Report	30 June 2017