

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Background

In the course of the last 10 to 15 years both the scope and impact of the wicked problem known as climate change have become increasingly apparent. Many international development organisations and agencies have been at the forefront of efforts to tackle global warming and to deal with the consequences. According to a recent OECD report: “The climate crisis is rapidly altering the systems that underpin life on Earth. It multiplies existing threats to development while creating new obstacles and will influence how countries develop for the rest of this century and beyond. The risks are greatest for the world’s poorest and most vulnerable people” (OECD, 2019).

Mitigation of climate change entails reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions into the atmosphere, since the increased concentration of these gases (notably CO₂) is causing steady increases in global average temperatures. The science of climate change has been thoroughly investigated and documented, in particular since the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) at the end of the 1980s. Scientific evidence underpins the efforts to devise and agree on measures to deal with adaptation to a warmer planet and to encourage mitigation through GHG emissions reductions. Emerging from the UN Rio Conference on sustainable development in 1992, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is the principal global forum for negotiations to this effect. Determining legally binding GHG emissions reductions amongst the group of highly industrialised, high emitters (the so-called annex I countries) culminated in the drafting and ratification of the Kyoto Protocol of the UNFCCC in 2005.

In 2015 the United Nations agreed the Agenda 2030 defining the sustainable development goals (SDGs) and – after lengthy negotiations – the conference of the parties to the UNFCCC finally reached an agreement at the 21st session in Paris in 2015 on steps to be taken by all countries to curb emissions. The cornerstone of this agreement and of current global efforts to mitigate climate change are so-called intended nationally determined contributions (NDCs). Almost all signatories to the UNFCCC have submitted plans indicating emissions reduction targets. The idea is that each country develops policies and measures in all critical sectors on a voluntary basis, such that their emissions are cut back, thereby mitigating climate change. At the same time many of the NDCs include outlines (and cost estimates) of adapting to higher global temperatures.¹

Estimates indicate that the emissions reductions defined in the first set of NDCs will lead to a global average temperature increase of around three degrees Celsius relative to the pre-industrial level. Higher ambitions (targets) for emissions reductions are therefore of fundamental importance, since climate change has a profound impact on all dimensions of development. Slow progress towards the objectives of the Paris agreement – notably the aim to restrict the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius – will put Agenda 2030 at risk, including the pledge to leave no one behind.² Global GHG emissions are

¹ All NDCs are found at: <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NDCStaging/Pages/All.aspx>

² A special report of the IPCC (2018) examined the prospects and opportunities for restricting temperature increase to 1.5 degrees C.

continuing to rise, while the impacts are increasingly severe, particularly for the poorest and most exposed communities in the least developed countries. A global “green transformation” is called for.

The costs of reducing emissions are also estimated in many first generation NDCs, with an indication that the provision of international financial assistance would result in higher levels of ambition (deeper cuts). High income countries had already announced a target of 100 billion USD to finance the transition to “low carbon, climate resilient economies.” Thus, increasing the provision of finance for climate change mitigation has been another cornerstone of the international “post-Paris process.”³

Substantial Danish contributions to a wide range of international initiatives aiming to tackle climate change began in the early 2000s. Funds have been available for projects and programmes aimed at supporting both mitigation and adaptation in developing countries, channelled both as bilateral assistance and as contributions to multilateral agencies, funds and development banks, as well as to non-governmental organisations. The first Danish climate change and development action programme was approved in 2005.

Danish climate change finance – commitments and disbursements reported to the UNFCCC, 2013-18 (million DKK)

| | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | Average 2013-2018 |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Commitments | Mitigation | 229 | 471 | 192 | 259 | 376 | 397 | 321 |
| | Adaptation | 81 | 0 | 89 | 394 | 581 | 462 | 268 |
| | Cross-cutting | 1,336 | 1,257 | 793 | 203 | 304 | 295 | 698 |
| | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total climate-specific | 1,646 | 1,728 | 1,074 | 857 | 1,261 | 1,154 | 1,287 |
| Disbursements | Mitigation | 392 | 492 | 296 | 346 | 414 | 587 | 421 |
| | Adaptation | 202 | 171 | 107 | 248 | 346 | 418 | 249 |
| | Cross-cutting | 665 | 788 | 762 | 691 | 583 | 470 | 660 |
| | Other | 33 | 33 | 43 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| | Total climate-specific | 1,292 | 1,484 | 1,208 | 1,293 | 1,352 | 1,474 | 1,351 |

Source: 4th biennial Report to UNFCCC, January 2020.

The table above shows the breakdown of public climate change finance from 2013 to 2018, including all funds provided through a range of multilateral, bilateral and regional channels. The current evaluation will focus on assessing projects, programmes and contributions to organisations categorized as “mitigation” including “cross-cutting” (see also “scope”, below). If both mitigation and adaptation are targeted, then the category “cross-cutting” is applied. However, it may be difficult to determine the

³ For an overview of the flows of all forms of climate change finance both public and private, see the study by the Climate Policy Initiative (CPI, 2018). Note also that the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD set up a system of “Rio markers” tracking the flow of funds associated with the three conventions agreed in 1992, including climate change. According to the OECD funding for mitigation aims to stabilise “GHG concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system by promoting efforts to reduce or limit GHG emissions or to enhance GHG sequestration.”

relative contribution to these distinct objectives, where for example a natural resource management scheme may be beneficial both in terms of emissions reductions and in terms of strengthening community resilience (adaptation).

An important Danish mechanism for providing finance to tackle climate change is the so-called “Climate change envelope” (CE), set up in 2008. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) and the Ministry of Climate, Energy and Utilities (MCEU) share responsibilities for this mechanism, notably through selection of projects and recipients (partners). A major evaluation of the CE was published in 2015 and constitutes a baseline for the current evaluation.⁴

In addition to identifying the need for formalized planning and reporting frameworks, the 2015 CE evaluation recommended setting up consistent monitoring, evaluation and learning systems. To this effect a set of guiding principles for the CE were approved (Danida/MoFA, 2016). These included a theory of change for the CE, focusing on two objectives: emissions reductions (mitigation) and resilient development (adaptation). Thus, while support for improved water resource management as well as land use and agriculture were identified as priorities for adaptation, mitigation funding would focus on renewable energy, energy efficiency, planning and grid management. In this way, the theory of change underpinned what were considered to be the main strengths of Danish international assistance.

Between 2016 and 2019, funding for initiatives to tackle climate change was largely based on a revised Danish development and humanitarian assistance strategy, “the World 2030” (Danida/MoFA, 2017). This did not include climate change as a priority theme. However, it was specified that climate change considerations would be taken into account in focusing on sustainable growth both in poor and middle-income countries as well as in addressing instability and fragility in poor, conflict prone countries. The SDGs approved in 2015 constituted the guiding framework for Danish development assistance. As shown in the table above climate change funding flows declined in this period.

As mentioned above, at the end of 2019 the OECD issued a report emphasising the urgent need to align development assistance with climate change action. Enhancing “concerted and coherent action towards low emissions, climate resilient development pathways” was highlighted. In this context, the current evaluation is intended to deepen understanding of the dynamics of climate change mitigation in developing countries, where technical assistance and the mobilisation of international finance play important supporting roles. It is essential to assess the results of support provided. As Danish commitments to tackling the global warming challenge are renewed, as new targets for emissions reductions are proposed and as new legislation is enacted, there is scope for an intensive learning process leading to enhanced mitigation actions.

Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are threefold, covering both accountability and learning purposes:

- to document achievements in terms of assisting developing countries to mitigate climate change through the provision of Danish support in the period from 2013, both through the climate change envelope and through other development assistance channels;

⁴ The evaluation (Danida/MoFA, 2015) included two country studies (Kenya and Vietnam) and two thematic reviews of “climate finance” and “energy sector initiatives”, as well as focused assessments of two partners: the World Bank and CARE Denmark. It is also important to note that a follow up evaluation of Danish support for climate change adaptation is currently underway (2019-20).

- to analyse the outcomes of climate change mitigation funding, with due consideration of the opportunities and barriers at both national and global levels;
- on the basis of the lessons learned from the evaluation, to provide recommendations pertaining to future funding priorities.

Outputs

The following outputs (deliverables) are anticipated:

- an inception report including a portfolio update and analysis of climate change mitigation funding, a thorough outline of the evaluation methodology and work programme, a review of the evaluation questions in an evaluation matrix, etc.
- four brief (20-25 page) country case study reports;
- a preliminary findings paper for discussion in the evaluation reference group (see below);
- a draft main report and a final version (not exceeding 50 pages plus annexes).

Scope of work and evaluation questions

The full portfolio of climate change mitigation projects and programmes including support channelled through international and non-governmental organisations since 2013 will constitute the basis for the evaluation. Thus, analyses will include consideration of:

- funds from the climate change envelope (CE), provided for both bilateral projects and programmes and through multi-lateral channels, as well as grants to NGOs and finance mobilized through the Investment Fund for Developing Countries (IFU).
- non-CE bilateral and multilateral development assistance funding, with a focus on projects, programmes and initiatives categorized as “principal” with respect to climate change (using the Rio markers).

An updated overview of climate change mitigation funding will be prepared in the inception phase using data available. This will include grants to projects and programmes through the CE and through bilateral development assistance in a range of countries as well as projects supported through the IFU instruments, notably the Danish Climate Investment Fund (DCIF).⁵ The overview will describe support to several multilateral agencies and funds, notably the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) of the multilateral development banks. Furthermore major programmes such as the “sustainable energy for Africa facility” (SEFA) at the African Development Bank and support to organisations such as the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) will be considered. Funding has also been provided to various specialized organisations and think tanks whose efforts are important with respect to mitigation, not least in the energy sector. Finally the portfolio includes grants to Danish non-governmental organisations.

Four country case studies will be carried out in order to inform the evaluation about the results of climate change funding and to pinpoint the critical issues associated with reducing GHG emissions in developing countries. The countries selected are all associated with Denmark as partners in global climate change mitigation efforts, with contrasting “development and carbon profiles”, geo-historical

⁵ An evaluation of the Investment Fund for Developing Countries (IFU) was completed in 2019 (Danida/MoFA, 2019).

characteristics, political economies, etc. In each of these four countries the evaluation will focus on the outcomes of assistance provided for climate change mitigation initiatives, identifying successes, failures, obstacles and opportunities. Due consideration will be given both to bilateral initiatives as well as projects and programmes funded by key multilateral and non-governmental partners in each country (particularly where Denmark is a stakeholder, e.g. in the Green Climate Fund).

Ethiopia

The Ethiopian government has indicated a long-term goal of becoming carbon neutral and the targets specified in the NDC are ambitious.⁶ A climate resilient green economic growth strategy has been developed. Emissions reductions are envisaged through measures introduced in a range of sectors including forestry, agriculture and land use, industry, transport and buildings. Expansion of hydropower and investment in the electricity grid are high priorities.

Ethiopia is one of Africa's poorest countries; the World Bank estimated per capita income in 2018 of 772 USD. Since 2013 Danish development assistance has been increasingly significant, with major grants for projects and programmes both through the CE and through bilateral assistance. These include funds for the development of renewable energy (wind power). The energy sector is targeted through a strategic sector cooperation (SSC) agreement.

Indonesia

GHG emissions from forestry and land use change as well as from the energy sector through coal, oil and gas exports are significant in Indonesia. Through the NDC the government has pledged major commitments to mitigation, conditional on receiving international finance. Reduced deforestation and the promotion of renewable energy are on the agenda.⁷

Considerable Danish development assistance was channelled to Indonesia in the period from 2004 to 2018. This included an environment sector support programme (ESP) in three phases, targeting environmental policy making and management, the energy sector (both renewables and energy efficiency) as well as land use and forestry. Through this programme, Denmark became a partner in efforts to develop climate change mitigation policies. The energy sector in Indonesia is targeted through a strategic sector cooperation (SSC) agreement.

South Africa

The South African NDC indicates that GHG emissions will peak between 2025 and 2030. An integrated resource plan envisages a shift from coal as the main source of power generation towards renewables and gas, as well as a halt to the expansion of nuclear power. Carbon taxes were approved in 2019.⁸

⁶ According to the Paris equity check, a 3 percent reduction in GHG emissions between 2010 and 2030 in Ethiopia will result in per capita emissions of 1.2 tCO_{2e}.

⁷ Estimates by the Paris equity check reveal that with business as usual Indonesian emissions will increase by 3 percent between 2010 and 2030, reaching a per capita level of 3.6 tCO_{2e}.

⁸ The Paris equity check indicates that GHG emissions in South Africa will decline by 13 percent from 2010 to 2030, reaching a per capita level of 4.1 tCO_{2e}.

Danish involvement in South African environmental policies and the energy sector has a long history, dating back to the 1990s. For the purposes of the current evaluation, the grants provided through the Danish Energy Partnership Programme (DEPP) since 2014 are particularly important. Supporting South African efforts to increase power generation through renewables and promote energy efficiency form the basis of these programmes and a new phase is currently in the pipeline.

Vietnam

The Vietnamese NDC indicates projected emissions reductions of around eight percent relative to the business as usual trend, achieved through reducing the energy intensity of GDP and increasing forest cover. Various policies and legislation pertaining to energy efficiency have been developed. Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD+) has also been high on the agenda.⁹

A Danish funded climate change mitigation and adaptation programme was undertaken from 2008, with an emphasis on increasing the efficient use of energy in industrial production. For the purposes of the current evaluation, the grants provided through the Danish Energy Partnership Programme (DEPP) since 2014 are particularly important. Supporting Vietnamese efforts to increase power generation through renewables and promote energy efficiency form the basis of these programmes and a new phase is currently in the pipeline.

International organisations

In addition to the country case studies, the evaluation will include consideration of funding for two international organisations providing technical assistance for promoting the “energy sector transition”: the energy sector management programme (ESMAP) of the World Bank and the International Energy Agency (IEA). Several CE grants have been given to these organisations since 2013, for amounts totalling around 39 million DKK (IEA) and 32 million DKK (ESMAP). The main aim is to strengthen the organisations’ efforts with respect to the energy transition, with a particular emphasis on reducing fossil fuel use. Given the significance of the energy sector transition in terms of Danish priorities, it will be important to conduct a lightweight assessment of the outcomes of the support provided.

Finally, the evaluation will include consideration of support for two organisations which are of particular and contrasting interest: the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and “Verdens Skove.” While it is not intended to conduct evaluations of these organisations, it will be important to assess the ways in which Danish climate change mitigation concerns and priorities are reflected in the initiatives funded through such partners. On the one hand, there have been substantial Danish contributions to the GCF totalling over 400 million DKK since 2014. Thus, it will be worthwhile including consideration of the progress made by the Fund, particularly in the light of the 2019 “forward looking performance review.” On the other hand and at a very different scale, it will be useful to examine the approach to low carbon development promoted by a Danish NGO (operating in a number of countries including Ethiopia), particularly in terms of “citizen engagement” in climate change mitigation and in advocacy. A total of around 23 million DKK was granted to Verdens Skove between 2014 and 2016.

⁹ Estimates published by the Paris equity check indicate that per capita GHG emissions in Vietnam will increase from 2010 to 2030, reaching a per capita level of 6.0 tCO₂e.

Evaluation questions

On the basis of the above, four main evaluation questions have been identified:

EQ1: Taking into account the strategic objectives of development cooperation and the guiding principles for the CE, what are the main results of Danish funding for climate change mitigation since 2013?

- A sub-question to be examined in this context concerns how effective and informative are the methods and the indicators used to monitor and to document results.

EQ2: How has climate change mitigation funding responded to the aims and needs defined by developing countries in nationally determined contributions (NDCs), leading to measurable GHG emission reductions and to pro-poor low carbon development?

- A sub-question to be explored in this context concerns targeting mitigation funding towards countries with significant emissions reduction potential (in order to “support ambitions and close gaps”);
- Another sub-question pertains to the focus on renewable energy and energy efficiency in the CE and the need to pursue significant emissions reductions in other sectors. Are there options to be considered in the future?
- A third sub-question concerns the leverage of private investment in emissions reduction schemes. Are there opportunities for low carbon development strategies, which would be attractive for investors in low-income developing countries?

EQ3: How has climate change mitigation funding contributed to transformational change and the sustainable development goals in a manner consistent with Danish comparative advantages and opportunities and in terms of influencing global agendas for climate action?

- A sub-question to be explored in this context concerns the choice of partners supported through Danish climate change mitigation funding. Going beyond business as usual, what options are available for contributing to global transformational change?
- Another sub-question concerns the theory of change underpinning the funding for climate change mitigation. Is the theory of change developed in 2015-16 fit for purpose and what modifications might be proposed?

EQ4: what are the main lessons learned from climate change mitigation funding that can determine strategic directions and operational considerations in the coming years?

- Answering this question will lead to the formulation of prioritised recommendations arising from the evaluation.

Methodology, timing and reporting

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the Danida/MoFA evaluation guidelines (January 2018). The revised and updated OECD-DAC evaluation criteria will be applied as appropriate, including assessment of projects, programmes and contributions to organisations in terms of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.¹⁰

As noted above, during the inception phase of the evaluation the full portfolio of climate change mitigation projects, programmes and grants to partner organisations will be updated and consolidated. The evaluation team will have access to documents and reports pertaining to the specific grants. This will be used as the basis for drawing up survey and interview protocols, etc. Other relevant documents will also be examined at this stage.¹¹ It will be particularly important to examine how the findings and recommendations of the 2015 evaluation of the climate change envelope (CE) have been followed up.

Data collection, surveys and interviews will be undertaken by the evaluation team in accordance with a work programme to be specified in the inception report. Four country studies will be organised, ensuring that information is gathered about bilateral Danish development assistance as well as the key climate change mitigation initiatives funded by multilateral partners. Indicators will be determined to measure the outcomes, based on the theories of change and results frameworks used. The country studies as well as consultations with representatives of other international partners as identified above (“scope”) will constitute the basis for an assessment of the processes associated with mitigation funding, including the quality of project and programme preparation and implementation.

Consultations and interviews will also be carried out with all key stakeholders in Denmark. An online survey may also be conducted. The evaluation team will collect and organise all information and data gathered in the course of the country studies and other consultations to be included in the reports as appropriate. A tentative schedule for the evaluation is as follows:

| <i>Activity</i> | <i>Date/period</i> | <i>Responsible</i> |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Contract signed | June 2020 | ELK and ET |
| Inception, including work programme | July-September 2020 | ET |
| Draft inception report for discussion with ERG | September 2020 | ET & ERG |
| Main evaluation including country studies | October-December 2020 | ET |
| Draft findings for discussion with ERG | December 2020 | ET & ERG |
| Preparation of evaluation report | January 2021 | ET |
| Final report submitted | February 2021 | ET |
| Launch of report with seminar in Copenhagen | March 2021 | ELK |

ELK: The Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK) Department in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the Client); ET: Evaluation Team (the Consultant); ERG: Evaluation Reference Group.

¹⁰ See: OECD, 2019.

¹¹ Key references are outlined in an annex, below.

Organisation of the evaluation

Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK)

The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK) Department in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the Client). ELK will:

- Coordinate with all relevant evaluation stakeholders.
- Ensure that quality control is carried out throughout the evaluation process. In so doing, ELK may make use of external peer reviewers.
- Provide feedback to the evaluation team. Comment on draft versions of the inception report, the work plan, annual field visit reports and the summative evaluation report. Approve final reports.
- Organise and participate in meetings of the Evaluation Reference Group.
- Facilitate and participate in evaluation workshops, including possibly an open dissemination workshop towards the end of the evaluation.
- Organise presentation of evaluation results and follow-up on the evaluation for the internal Danida Programme Committee (the responsible department drafts the management response).
- Advise relevant stakeholders on matters related to the evaluation.

Evaluation Team

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the evaluation team will be applied. The Evaluation Team (the Consultant) will carry out the assignment based on the contract with the Client and will:

- Prepare and carry out the evaluation according to the terms of reference, the approved inception report, the OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines.
- Be responsible to the reference group and management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.
- Ensure that quality assurance is carried out and documented throughout the evaluation process according to the consultant's own Quality Assurance Plan (as described in the tender proposal).
- Report to the evaluation management regularly about progress of the evaluation.
- Organise and coordinate meetings and studies, and other key events, including debriefing sessions and/or validation workshops in the three countries selected for in-depth analysis.

The Team Leader is responsible for the team's reporting, proper quality assurance and for the organisation of the work. The Team Leader will participate in meetings of the Evaluation Reference Group and other meetings as required and upon request.

Evaluation Reference Group

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established and chaired by ELK. Other members of the ERG will include representatives of the Sustainable investments unit (GJL) at the MoFA and the Ministry of Climate, Energy and Utilities (MCEU) as well as the representatives of Danish embassies in Addis Ababa, Hanoi, Jakarta and Pretoria and other stakeholders. The mandate of the ERG is to

provide advisory support and inputs to the evaluation, e.g. through comments to draft reports. The reference group will work with direct meetings, e-mail communication and video-conferencing.

The main tasks of the ERG are to:

- Comment on the draft inception report, draft findings papers and case study reports and the draft evaluation report with a view to ensure that the evaluation is based on factual knowledge about programmes and how they have been implemented.
- Support the implementation of the evaluation and promote the dissemination of the evaluation conclusions and recommendations.

Other key stakeholders may be consulted at strategic points in time of the evaluation either through mail correspondence or through participation in stakeholder meetings/workshops.

Composition and qualifications of evaluation team

The evaluation will be undertaken by a core team of three specialists in evaluation of climate change mitigation. The anticipated profile of the team leader will be an evaluation specialist with extensive knowledge of climate change policies and international development assistance. Two climate change specialists will also participate as team members.

Both specialists will be familiar with the implementation of development programmes and projects in the sphere of climate change mitigation. One of the specialists will be experienced in the assessment of energy sector development schemes. The other specialist will have particular knowledge of public and private climate change finance mechanisms and institutional capacity assessment.

In addition, and in order to undertake thorough assessments of the projects and programmes funded in the case countries, national climate change specialists with in-depth knowledge of each of the case countries can participate in the evaluation.

Tenderers may also decide to include personnel for additional functions, e.g. subject matter specialists.

The minimum requirements and wishes in relation to the composition and qualifications of the Evaluation Team are specified in Section B below.

Financial proposal

The total budget for the consultancy services is a maximum of DKK 3.5 million. This includes all fees and project related expenses required for the implementation of the contract, including surveys, field trips and workshops in Ethiopia, Indonesia, South Africa and Vietnam.

The tenderers financial proposal shall include all costs for fees and project related reimbursable expenses. It is the responsibility of the tenderer to ensure that the products and outputs specified above and all other tasks specified in these terms of reference are performed within the framework of the financial proposal and the specified ceiling amounts.

The cost of quality assurance (QA) should be included in the tenderer's overhead.

ELK will cover the expenditures incurred for preparing the final evaluation report for publication as well as any additional dissemination activities in Denmark as and if agreed upon.

Eligibility

The OECD-DAC evaluation principles of independence of the evaluation team will be applied. In situations where conflict of interest occurs, candidates may be excluded from participation, if their participation may question the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. Any firm or individual consultant that has participated in the preparation or implementation of the evaluated Danida programmes may be excluded from participation in the tender.

Tenderers are obliged to carefully consider issues of eligibility for individual consultants and inform the Client of any potential issues relating to a possible conflict of interest.¹²

Requirements for home office support

The Evaluation Team's home office shall provide the following, to be covered by the Consultants fees:

- General home office administration and professional back-up.
- Quality assurance (QA) of the consultancy services in accordance with the quality management and quality assurance system described in the tender. Special emphasis should be given to quality assurance of draft reports prior to the submission of such reports.

All QA activities must be properly documented and reported to ELK. ELK may request documentation for the QA undertaken in the process.

Annex – main background references in the public domain

CIF (2019): Transformational change in the Climate Investment Funds – summary of findings from an independent evaluation and evidence synthesis. CIF, Washington.

<https://climateactiontracker.org>

CPI (2018): Global climate finance – an updated view. Climate Policy Initiative, San Francisco.

Danida/MoFA (2015): Evaluation of Denmark's climate change funding to developing countries – main report and annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen.

Danida/MoFA (2016): Guiding principles for the Danish Climate Envelope. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen.

Danida/MoFA (2017): The world 2030 – development and humanitarian strategy. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen.

Danida/MoFA (2018): Evaluation guidelines. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen.

Danida/MoFA (2019): Evaluation of the Investment Fund for Developing Countries (IFU) – main report and annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen.

GCF (2019): Forward looking performance review of the Green Climate Fund – executive summary. GCF Independent Evaluation Unit, Seoul.

¹² See: Evaluation Guidelines (Danida/MoFA, 2018), Annex 1.

http://www.netpublikationer.dk/UM/evaluation_guidelines_january_2018/Index.html

IPCC (2018): Global warming of 1.5 degrees C – special report. IPCC, Geneva.

OECD (2019a): Evaluation criteria – adapted definitions and principles for use. OECD, Paris.

OECD (2019b): Aligning development cooperation and climate action – the only way forward. OECD, Paris.

<http://Paris-equity-check.org>

WRI (2017): Future of the funds – exploring the architecture of multilateral climate finance. World Resources Institute, Washington.