



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Reference:	PIMS 3646/TMEEB
Country:	Turkey
Description of the Assignment:	International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of UNDP GEF Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey
Project:	PIMS 3646: Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey (EE Buildings) (PIMS 3646)
Period of Assignment/Services:	28 working days over the period from 1 October 2016 – 31 December 2016
Duty Station:	Home based (with 1 mission of min. 10 working days to Turkey) and 18 home-based days

*Proposal should be submitted by email to tr.icproposal@undp.org no later than **23 September**, COB. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.*

- **Background**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey (PIMS 3646).

For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

- **Scope of Work, Responsibilities and Description of the Proposed Analytical Work**

For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

- **Requirements for Experience and Qualifications**

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- At least a first degree in science or engineering with minimum six years of relevant energy related M&E professional experience or related field
- Demonstrated technical knowledge in energy efficiency, in particular of buildings and experience working on technical assistance projects related to energy efficiency
- Previous experience in evaluating technical assistance projects for international organizations, including GEF projects

- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
- Have exemplary written and oral communication skills in English, be fully IT literate
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on energy efficiency;
- Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures is an asset.
- Fluent in English both written and spoken.

- **Documents to be included when submitting the Proposals**

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

- Financial Proposal (please see section 5, below and Annex II)
- Personal CV, including past experience in similar projects and at least 2 references with their contact details¹

- **Financial Proposal**

The interested individual consultants must submit their financial proposals by following the guidance and the standard template provided in Annex II. Any deviation from the standard text may lead to disqualification.

- **Evaluation**

The evaluation will be based on cumulative analysis (i.e. technical qualifications and price proposal). The weight of the technical criteria is 70%; the weight of the financial proposal is 30%. Candidates that obtain a minimum of 70 pts out of a maximum 100 pts will be considered for the financial evaluation. Candidates that do not meet the minimum requirements will be disqualified.

Criteria	Maximum Points	Weight	Weighted Score
Technical	100	70%	70
General Qualifications	20	14%	14
General Professional Experience	30	21%	21
Specific Professional Experience	50	35%	35
Financial	100	30%	30

¹UNDP will contact directly with the provided names for reference check purposes without any prior notification to the applicant.

- **Annexes**

The following annexes are an integral part of this procurement notice. In case of any conflict between the provisions of the Annex III and the procurement notice and/or Annex I and/or Annex II, the provisions of Annex III are applicable.

- Annex I: Terms of Reference
- Annex II: Price Proposal Guideline and Template
- Annex III: General Conditions of Contract for Individual Consultants

ANNEX I – TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Introduction

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the “Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey (EE Buildings)” (PIMS 3646).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings (EE Buildings)			
GEF Project ID:	3646 (PMIS#)		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	3646 (PIMS#) 00059262 (Atlas ID)	GEF financing:	2,620,000	2,620,000
Country:	Turkey	IA/EA own:	60,000	60,000
Region:	RBEC	Government:	7,600,000	7,600,000
Focal Area:	CCM	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CC-SP1	Total co-financing:	7,300,000	7,300,000
Executing Agency:	DG for Renewable Energy under the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources	Total Project Cost:	17,580,000	17,580,000
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation (MoEU) Ministry of National Education (MoNE)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		30 July 2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: May 2014	Actual: December 2016

2. Objective and Scope

The project was designed to reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions in public buildings in Turkey by raising building energy performance standards, improving enforcement of building codes, enhancing building energy management and introducing the use of an integrated building design approach.

This is envisioned to be achieved by 1) Revising and enforcing building energy performance standards 2) Introducing integrated building design approach in Turkey 3) Promoting best energy practices in the building sector and 4) Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation.

This objective is envisioned to be achieved by four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Improved energy efficiency in new and existing buildings through stronger regulations, institutions and implementers;

Key Questions include:

- To what extent have the activities of the project led to improved new legislation, including the adoption of Minimum Building Energy Performance Standards (MBEPs)
- To what extent have the activities of the project led to improvement in legislation, including the adoption of nearly Zero Energy Buildings approach in the public sector in Turkey
- To what extent have the activities of the project led to improved legislation and regulations to facilitate the introduction and implementation of an energy management information system (EMIS) for public buildings across all Turkey
- To what extent have the activities of the project led to capacity improvement of the building inspectors

Outcome 2: Cost-effective energy efficiency solutions showcased and promoted through "Integrated Building Design Approach (IBDA)" approach;

Key Questions include:

- To what extent have the activities of the project lead to full adoption of Integrated Building Design Approach (IBDA) for all new public buildings in Turkey

Outcome 3: New tools developed and introduced to facilitate compliance with higher energy efficiency standards; and

Key Questions include:

- What new tools have been developed by the project to facilitate compliance with higher energy efficient standards (e.g – renewable energy technologies tool, others) and how useful are these tools? To what extent are they being used and helping the government of Turkey with compliance with higher energy-efficiency standards?
- To what extent the infrastructure of the website (bep.gov.tr) has been developed

Outcome 4: Building energy consumption, energy savings, and other results of the project monitored, evaluated, reported and disseminated.

Key Questions include:

- To what extent has the project managed to successfully replicate and implement the energy management information system (EMIS) and national buildings database from Croatia?

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

3. Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method² for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is required to conduct a field mission to Ankara and/or İstanbul for a minimum of 10 full working days (not including travel days) to meet as many project partners and stakeholders as possible. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, DG for Renewable Energy (Executing Agency),
- Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation (MoEU)
- Ministry of National Education (MoNE)
- UNDP Turkey Country Office
- UNDP Project Manager and Project Team
- Project Managers of other UNDP GEF EE projects in Turkey,
- UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre – Regional Technical Advisor on Climate Change
- Ministry of Development
- Ministry of Finance
- Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (GEF OFP)

In the event that a second 1-2 day mission to Ankara is required at the end of the assignment to present the final findings and report, this should be by mutual agreement and the additional cost of this mission

² For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

will be covered by the UNDP CO in case it is required. The days for this mission will be as part of the original 28 days.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and final lessons learned study and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

4. Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

5. Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

6. Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

7. Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) improvements in ecological status as measured through the achievement of significant greenhouse gas emission reductions, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.³

8. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

9. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Turkey with the advice and support of the UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The Project

³ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

10. Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 28 working days (of which a minimum of 10 working days will take place in Turkey) according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Estimated Completion Date
Preparation	3 working days	<i>October 2016</i>
Evaluation Mission	10 working days	<i>November 2016</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	13 working days	<i>End of November 2016</i>
Final Report	2 working days	<i>15 December 2016</i>

11. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Mission to Turkey	Travel to Turkey for meetings with all project stakeholders	October 2016	UNDP CO to arrange travel and accommodation for the Evaluator
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

12. Place of Work

The assignment is home-based with minimum one travel to Turkey depending on the project needs, as well as, the duties and responsibilities of the consultant. It is estimated that one mission of up to ten working

days will be needed to Ankara and/or Istanbul. Ten working days in Ankara and/or Istanbul do not include travel days which should be outside of the 10 full working days to be spent in Ankara and/or Istanbul. The timing and duration of all missions are subject to the pre-approval of UNDP.

The costs of missions will be borne by UNDP. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
- Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item is subject to the following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
- covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

13. Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator. The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International Evaluator will be responsible for finalizing the report following comments from UNDP and other stakeholders. The International Evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation of the project and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- At least a first degree in science or engineering with minimum six years of relevant energy related M&E professional experience or related field
- Demonstrated technical knowledge in energy efficiency, in particular of buildings and experience working on technical assistance projects related to energy efficiency
- Previous experience in evaluating technical assistance projects for international organizations, including GEF projects
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
- Have exemplary written and oral communication skills in English, be fully IT literate
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on energy efficiency;
- Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures is an asset.
- Fluent in English both written and spoken.

14. Evaluator Ethics

The International Evaluation Consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#).

15. Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
20%	Approval of Inception Report by UNDP Turkey
50%	Approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
30%	Approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Important Assumptions
Objective of the Project: To reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions in buildings in Turkey by raising building energy performance standards, improving enforcement of building codes, enhancing building energy management and introducing the use of an integrated building design approach	Average total energy consumption (for heating, cooling, ventilation and lighting) in new residential and non-residential buildings	Residential: 200 kWh/m ² /year Non-residential: 321 kWh/m ² /year	Non-residential: 193 kWh/m ² /year for buildings built with IBDA	National energy statistics and project GHG monitoring system	Costs of EE and RE technology and materials do not cause to considerable increases in the overall costs of new building constructions
	Cumulative CO ₂ emission reductions from new buildings to be built during project lifetime (2010-2015) against the baseline	0 tCO ₂	2 million tCO ₂		Dynamics of construction of new buildings remain within the forecast range Integration of IBDA principles for new public buildings is achieved Integration of IBDA into urban transformation can hugely increase the GHG savings
Outcome 1: Improved energy efficiency in new and existing buildings through stronger regulations, institutions and implementers	The content and status of new policies, programs, and implementers supporting implementation of EE and RE in buildings	Legislation, institutions, and implementers to support enhancement of building energy efficiency needs to be strengthened	New legal and regulatory provisions, strengthened institutions, and better supporting compliance checking, enforcement and outreach programs adopted for enhanced EE in buildings	Official publications and project's Mid-Term and Final evaluations	Continuing commitment of the key public authorities and government entities to develop and implement effective EE buildings policies and practices Adequate data will be available from the market
Output 1.1 Existing legislative framework on building energy efficiency improved	Analyses and recommendations reports	Existing "Building Energy Performance (BEP)" Regulation is not in line with international best practices	BEP Regulation analyzed and compared to other relevant international codes (e.g. EU EPB Directive, etc.) and revisions proposed	Updated legislation and regulation documents referencing to new standards and framework system for	Studies and activities welcomed by relevant institutions, other stakeholders and EECB

	Content, acceptance, and status of the Certification Systems	No MEPS exist for buildings	Reference building approach under the Building Energy Performance (BEP) Regulation analyzed and revisions proposed Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS) for new buildings developed and proposed	building energy performance Project reports	
Output 1.2 Framework for an Information System on Building Energy Consumption developed	The availability and the reliability of the required data No. of buildings for sample to be improved Energy savings and GHG emission reduction potentials identified	Existing databases under relevant public authorities are not comprehensive with respect to building data and energy consumption data No single database covers all the required indicators for evaluation of building energy performance & building energy consumption There is no similar feasibility study which relies upon factual data identifying the real energy saving data	Methodology, indicators and benchmarks for framework developed Pilot database for sample buildings developed Feasibility study on potentials for sample buildings refurbishment to improve energy performance developed	Monitoring reports and continuous evaluation of the impact of the information system Relevant public authorities internalize and integrate the proposed framework approach Benchmarks on building energy efficiency available through database and from other countries/programmes	Acceptance and cooperation on the part of the various government agencies to use a universal database Willingness of the targeted public authorities, and implementers to benefit from the training and the supporting studies Reliable and adequate amount of data collected
Output 1.3 Supporting the implementation of Energy Efficiency Strategy for the building sector	Analysis and recommendations report Implementation support programme and action plan	Existing EE Strategy does not have any action plan and/or implementation programme	Implementation support programme and action plan for improvement of EE strategy for buildings sector developed	Project Progress Reports Submission of plans and programmes to the relevant public bodies	Acceptance and cooperation on the part of the various government agencies to develop implementation support programme and action plan for the EE Strategy for buildings sector

<p>Output 1.4 Capacity of building inspectorates in regard to energy efficiency regulations and enforcement strengthened</p>	<p>Analysis and recommendations report</p> <p>Guide booklet prepared and disseminated</p> <p>Number of trainers trained</p>	<p>Existing legislation do only consider heat insulation issues regarding energy performance of new private buildings</p>	<p>Building inspection regulation and relevant energy efficiency codes analyzed and reported</p> <p>Recommendations proposed including energy efficiency checklists for new private buildings</p> <p>Guide booklet for building inspectors prepared and disseminated</p> <p>Trainings delivered to trainers of building inspectors</p>	<p>Project Reports including trainings reports.</p> <p>Issued certificates</p>	<p>Acceptance and cooperation on the part of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism to integrate energy efficiency aspects to building inspection system.</p> <p>Willingness of the targeted public authorities and inspectorates to benefit from the training and the supporting studies</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Cost-effective energy efficiency solutions showcased and promoted through Integrated Building Design Approach (IBDA) and trainings</p>	<p>Adoption and diffusion level of IBDA</p> <p>Implementation of IBDA demonstration constructions</p>	<p>Limited knowledge and application of IBDA</p>	<p>Cost effective energy efficiency solutions are demonstrated through IBDA demonstration buildings</p> <p>IBDA is promoted through trainings and awareness raising activities</p>	<p>Issued Building Energy Performance Certificates for new buildings</p> <p>Calculations on the basis of the assumed baseline development</p> <p>Official energy stats</p> <p>Issued Building Energy Performance Certificates for demonstration buildings</p>	<p>Continuing commitment of the key public authorities and government entities to adopt and integrate IBDA into policies and practices for new buildings designs and construction</p>
<p>Output 2.1 IBDA for Turkish climatic conditions developed and followed in design of new public buildings</p>	<p>Adoption and use of IBDA for new constructions in different sectors</p>	<p>Limited application of IBDA</p>	<p>IBDA guidebook prepared</p> <p>IBDA implementation strategy and action plan developed</p> <p>IBDA proposed for use in all new public buildings as of 2015</p>	<p>Strategy and implementation plan for IBDA endorsed by stakeholders;</p> <p>Decision of the government on use of IBDA in public buildings</p>	<p>Willingness of the government to accept and implement the IBDA strategy</p>

<p>Output 2.2 IBDA promoted to building sector professionals and key stakeholders</p>	<p>Universities adopting IBDA into curricula</p> <p>Number of architects and engineers trained according to IBDA principles to make use of available material (guidebook, etc.)</p>	<p>No comprehensive design approach like IBDA in existing curricula</p> <p>Limited knowledge or use of IBDA</p>	<p>IBDA incorporated into architectural and engineering curricula in at least one pilot university</p> <p>Trainings for architects, engineers and building sector professionals (<i>e.g. ministries, municipalities, chambers of architects/engineers, private firms</i>) delivered</p>	<p>Incorporation of IBDA into curricula</p> <p>Guidebook on IBDA for architects and engineers</p> <p>Delivery of trainings</p>	<p>Interest of the universities to cooperate in the development, organization and dissemination of IBDA and EE principles</p>
<p>Output 2.3 Demonstration buildings implemented according to IBDA design and construction principles</p>	<p>Energy performance of IBDA enhanced demo buildings</p>	<p>New school/office buildings (whose average total energy consumption figure is around 321 kWh/m²/yr) are neither designed and built with IBDA nor enhanced with EE and RE technics</p>	<p>Submitted designs meet and exceed the total energy requirements for school/office buildings</p> <p>Five IBDA demonstration buildings of approx. 30,000 m² commissioned and received A-class energy performance certificates in line with BEP regulation</p>	<p>Demonstration buildings' planning and construction documentation</p> <p>Review of prototype energy efficient designs</p> <p>Project reports,</p> <p>Monitoring reports for energy consumption of the five demonstration buildings</p>	<p>Demonstration buildings are built as designed</p> <p>User behavior does not cause a significant deviation from energy performance targets for demonstration buildings</p>
<p>Outcome 3: New tools developed and introduced to facilitate compliance with higher energy efficiency standards</p>	<p>Monitoring and verification processes are in place and disseminated effectively among key stakeholders</p>	<p>No monitoring system for building energy performance</p> <p>No analysis tool for RE in new buildings</p>	<p>New tools are developed for analysis and monitoring purposes, financial mechanisms</p>	<p>Project progress reports</p>	<p>Continuing commitment of the key public authorities and government entities to disseminate and provide training in use of new tools for RE and EE in buildings</p>

		<p>Training materials need significant upgrading</p> <p>Financial mechanism for EE in buildings is limited</p> <p>Existing website and tools for bep.gov.tr and BEP-TR systems need upgrading</p>	<p>Training materials revised/developed</p> <p>Existing websites and tools updated</p>		
<p>Output 3.1 “Monitoring, Inspection and Verification (MIV)” methodology and tools for Building Energy Performance regulation developed</p>	<p>Availability of required data for evaluation of building energy performance</p> <p>Level of compliance with BEP legislation in practice</p>	<p>No monitoring, inspection and verification system</p> <p>Limited compliance with BEP regulation</p>	<p>Methodology and toolkit for MIV system developed and proposed</p>	<p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Written Verification Procedure, sample test reports</p>	<p>MIV methodology and tools for building energy performance is consistent and well-understood by key stakeholders</p>
<p>Output 3.2 Training materials on energy management and energy auditing for buildings developed and trainings delivered.</p>	<p>Training materials</p> <p>Number of trainees</p>	<p>Existing training materials for energy managers need comprehensive revision</p> <p>No training materials for energy auditors</p>	<p>Existing training materials for energy managers updated</p> <p>Training materials for energy auditors developed</p> <p>Trainings delivered</p>	<p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Training reports</p>	<p>Continuing commitment of the key public authority to disseminate and deliver trainings for energy management and energy auditing in buildings</p>

<p>Output 3.3. Financial mechanisms/tools to promote “Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy” in buildings surveyed and/or developed</p>	<p>Number of funding agencies, banks, and ODA donors seek to support EE buildings in Turkey</p>	<p>No or limited market growth of EE buildings due to reality and perception of cost-to-benefits inequity</p>	<p>Review on financing mechanisms available for EE Buildings in Turkey</p> <p>Appropriate finance mechanisms showcased (e.g. standardized Energy Performance Contracting schemes developed)</p> <p>Software tool for economic assessment of use of renewable energy in new buildings developed</p>	<p>Anecdotal information received through surveys of banks, lenders, and funders</p>	<p>Key funding institutions and/or government of Turkey agree on financing mechanisms</p>
<p>Output 3.4 Building Energy Performance website infrastructure improved</p>	<p>New website with support modules</p> <p>Number of visitors using new website</p>	<p>Poor bep.gov.tr website</p> <p>No software module for central heating cost sharing system</p> <p>No online discussion platform for Energy Performance Certificate users</p> <p>No integration of bep.gov.tr website and BEP-TR software and database</p>	<p>New bep.gov.tr website developed</p> <p>Software module for central heating cost sharing system developed</p> <p>Online discussion platform for Energy Performance Certificate users developed</p> <p>Integration of bep.gov.tr website with BEP-TR software and database created</p> <p>bep.gov.tr website administrators trained</p>	<p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Training reports</p>	
<p>Outcome 4: Building energy consumption, energy savings, and other results of</p>	<p>The status of recommendations</p>	<p>Insufficient institutional mechanisms in place to</p>	<p>Project recommendations to ensure institutional sustainability adopted</p>	<p>Project mid-term and final evaluation reports</p>	<p>Successful completion of the project activities</p>

the project monitored, evaluated, reported and disseminated	contributing to institutional sustainability	ensure sustainability of project results		Annual project progress reports GHG assessment reports	Adequate data will be available from the stakeholders and the market
Output 4.1 Methodology for monitoring and measuring project savings due to revised regulations, IBDA implementation and promotion, and newly developed new tools	Acceptance and reliability of the methodology and tools for monitoring and measuring the project impacts	No baseline information on the market, energy, GHG or financial impacts of EE, BEP compliance, or IBDA	An accepted monitoring and assessment methodology for key stakeholders	Monitoring methodology and plan Project progress & monitoring reports including GHG assessment analyses	Ongoing monitoring and recording of the impact of the project and barriers faced
Output 4.2 Preparing “Mid-term” and “Final” project reports; Calculating and sharing energy savings and GHG emission reductions achieved through the project	Mid-term and final evaluation reports provided with quantified and qualified results and impacts	No consolidation of the results and lessons learned	Mid-term and Final project reports consolidating the results and lesson learned from the implementation of the project	Project progress reports; mid-term and final evaluation reports	Ongoing monitoring and recording of the impact of the project and barriers faced
Output 4.3 Project results, outputs and lessons learned are effectively disseminated along with key awareness-raising measures on energy efficiency in buildings	Websites developed Information and dissemination material produced Target groups reached Number of users visiting websites	No specific communication and outreach strategy formed	Project communication strategy developed and implemented Project website developed IBDA website developed Dissemination material produced for awareness raising	Project outreach report	Key messages for the target groups are effectively communicated and diffused Key messages internalized by the target groups

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

Project Documents

- Project document and its annexes;
- Midterm evaluation (MTE) and other relevant evaluations and assessments;
- Annual work plans endorsed by Steering Committee;
- Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs – CDR;
- Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR);
- Minutes of Steering Committee Meetings;
- Project consultant reports;
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Steering Committee, and other partners to be consulted;
- Project informative materials, knowledge products and technical reports all available on project website;
- Other upon request.

UNDP Documents

- Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF Documents

- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<p>Does the project's objective fit within the priorities of the local government and local communities?</p> <p>Does the project's objective fit within Turkey's national biodiversity conservation priorities?</p> <p>Does the project's objective fit GEF strategic priorities and operational principles?</p> <p>Does the project's objective support implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity? Other MEAs?</p>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<p>Is the project objective likely to be met? To what extent and in what timeframe?</p> <p>What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement?</p> <p>Is adaptive management being applied to ensure effectiveness?</p> <p>Is monitoring and evaluation used to ensure effective decision-making?</p>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<p>Is the project cost-effective?</p> <p>Are expenditures in line with international standards and norms for development projects?</p> <p>Are management and implementation arrangements efficient in delivering the outputs necessary to achieve outcomes?</p> <p>Was the project implementation delayed? If so, did that affect cost-effectiveness?</p>			

What is the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation?

To what extent is the project leveraging additional resources?

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends?

Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained?

Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained?

To what extent are the project results dependent on socio-political factors?

To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?

Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits?

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁴

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁶)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁷)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Relevant final stage GEF Tracking Tool
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____



ANNEX II – PRICE PROPOSAL GUIDELINE and TEMPLATE

The prospective Consultants should take the following explanations into account during submission of his/her price proposal.

- The lump sum price proposal should be indicated in US Dollars (USD).
- The price proposal should be indicated in gross terms and hence should be inclusive of costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa (if needed) etc.
- Assignment related travel and accommodation costs will be borne by the UNDP and should not be included within the price proposal.
- The cost and terms of reimbursement of all travel authorized by UNDP for Individual Contractors must be negotiated prior to travel.
- The cost of travels of the consultant may either be;
 - Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
 - Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following **constraints/conditions** provided in below table;
 - covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations,	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)		
--	--	--

- UNDP will not make any further clarification on costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa etc. It is the applicants' responsibility to make necessary inquiries on these matters.
- Please (a) copy the below text into a word processor, (b) indicate your price proposal as explained above, (c) do not change any part of the standard text (changing the standard text may lead to disqualification), (d) sign the document, (e) scan the signed version of the price proposal, and (f) send it as an attachment back to UNDP.



Price Proposal Submission Form

To: United Nations Development Programme

Ref: International Terminal Evaluation Consultant

Dear Sir / Madam,

I, the undersigned, offer to provide Professional Consulting Services as an Individual Contractor, to carry out the duties spelled out in the attached Terms of Reference for the lump sum of US\$ for 28 working days, of which I understand that the minimum number of working days to be spent in Turkey during the assignment is 10 full working days with a daily consultancy rate of..... US\$. Having examined, understood and agreed to the Procurement Notice and its annexes, the receipt of which are hereby duly acknowledged, I, the undersigned, offer to deliver professional services, in conformity with Annex I (Terms of Reference) of the Procurement Notice.

My ***lump sum price proposal*** for the Assignment is: USD

I confirm that my financial proposal will remain unchanged. I also confirm that the price that I quote is **gross**, and is inclusive of all legal expenses, including but not limited to social security, income tax, pension, visa etc., which shall be required applicable laws.

I agree that my proposal shall remain binding upon me for 60 days.

I understand that you are not bound to accept any proposal you may receive.

[Signature]

Date:

Name:

Address:

Telephone/Fax:

Email: