Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

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 (TE) upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *“Green Urban Lighting”* UNDP-GEF Project (PIMS #4669) under implementation by UNDP Armenia CO.

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4742 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* | |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 4669 | GEF financing  (in cash): | 1.6 | 1.6 | |
| Country: | | Armenia | Government  (in kind): | 0.32 | 0.32 | |
|  | |  | IA/EA own  (in cash): | 0.12 | 0.12 | |
|  | |  | IA/EA (in kind): | 1.0 | 1.0 | |
|  | |  | Local Administration  (in cash): | 7.055 | 9.17 | |
| Region: | | Europe and Central Asia |  |  |  | |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change |  |  |  | |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | CCM-2  *Outcome 2.1* Appropriate policy, legal and  regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced-*Outcome 2.2* Sustainable financing and  delivery mechanisms  established and operational | Total co-financing: | 8.495 | 9.17 | |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia | Total Project Cost: | 10.095 | 11.89 | |
| Other Partners involved: | | Yerevan Municipality, other partner municipalities | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 15 November 2013 | |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  November 2017 | | Actual:  November 2018 | |

Objective and Scope

The “Green Urban Lighting” project was designed to save energy and to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by increasing energy efficiency of municipal lighting in the cities of Armenia via implementation of municipal investment programs and national policies. The project is in compliance with the national priorities to strengthen the economic and energy independence of the Republic of Armenia by promoting resources efficient and climate resilient growth. Collectively, these components contribute to putting in place cornerstone policy instruments at both the municipal and national level, supported by technical, policy-related, educational, and financial measures to raise capacity, reduce investor risk, and help assure successful implementation. These activities contribute to UNDP’s goal of increasing access to sustainable energy services by introducing regulatory and institutions frameworks, promoting technology transfer.

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.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has 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](#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 expected to conduct a field mission to *Yerevan, Armenia,* including the project sites in selected partner towns*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Nature Protection, State Urban Development Committee, Municipality of Yerevan, other selected partner municipalities, Yerevan Municipal Illumination CJSC, Armenian Territorial Development Fund.

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 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](#Annex_B) of this Terms of Reference.

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](#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](#Annex_D).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| 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** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |
| **5. Impact:** | ***rating*** |  | rating |
| Environmental Status Improvement |  |  |  |
| Environmental Status Reduction |  |  |  |
| Progress towards status change |  |  |  |
| **Overall Project Results** | | |  |

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(s) 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 Agencies  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

Impact

The evaluator 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) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Armenia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluators to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, provide interpreter for full period of the mission, and transportation support for demonstration sites visits, etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *20* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4* days *(recommended: 2-4)* | *May 2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *7* days (*r: 7-15)* | *June 2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *7* days (*r: 5-10*) | *July 2018* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days *(r: 1-2*) | *August 2018* |

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 |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 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 ([*Annex H*](#Annex_H)).

EVALUATORS COMPETeNCIES and QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Education: degree in energy, environment, economics, climate change or similar;
* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience;
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF procedures and requirements;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas: Energy Efficiency in Lighting Systems, Energy Conservation; Lighting sector regulatory framework;
* Knowledge of the CIS, Eastern Europe lighting sector specifics.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluator will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a Code of Conduct ([Annex E](#Annex_E)) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *60%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English (with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. The application should contain a brief description of the work approach and a proposed methodology for the assignment. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**Criteria for evaluation of the proposal**

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Only candidates obtaining a maximum of 70% of the total technical points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective**  To remove barriers to energy-efficient lighting in Armenia, by means of technical assessment, facilitation of financing, and development and implementation of municipal programs and national policy | Quantity of energy saved and GHG emissions avoided | Street lighting:  40 GWh of electricity consumed for street lighting in 2011, accounting for about 16,000 tons of CO2 emissions.  Average fixture power consumption is 210W in 2011.  Residential lighting:  550 GWh consumed for residential lighting in 2011, accounting for about 220,000 tons of CO2 emissions. | Direct energy savings of 1.2 GWh per year from demonstration projects (474 tonnes of CO2 emissions)  Direct energy savings of 20 GWh per year from replication of demonstration projects via municipal programs (8000 tonnes of CO2 emissions).  Indirect energy savings of 125 GWh per year from implementation of national lighting policy (50,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions) | Municipality data  Pilot project monitoring reports.  Audit reports | Achievement of these targets depends on adoption and timely implementation of municipal programs and national policies, which in turn require sufficient political will and financing. |
| **Outcome 1**  Municipal energy audits, technical capacity-building and awareness raising | Methodology for energy/lighting audit  Number of municipal lighting systems energy audits conducted  Number of specialists and agency representatives trained  Public media exposure | Lack of methodology for assessing energy efficiency in lighting  Municipalities are not aware of energy saving potential in lighting sector  No specialized training or training materials on EE lighting is offered in Armenia  Limited broadcasting of information on EE lighting | By the project midterm methodology established  At least 10 comprehensive audits of public lighting (including pilots) completed in Yerevan and other cities  At least 20 specialists from private sector and municipalities are trained on EE lighting and energy audit  Media releases on outcomes of each pilot. Awareness raising materials available for general public | Project annual reports  Audit reports  Project annual reports  Public outreach materials and publications  Project web-site | Not observed |
| **Outcome 2**  Demonstration projects  *Pilot projects yield cost-effective energy savings, raising the confidence of investors and decision-makers about EE lighting* | Efficiency and energy savings of installed EE lighting  Share of LED in demo-projects | The majority of fixtures in municipal outdoor lighting sector incorporate inefficient 250W HPS lamps or 400W mercury-vapor lamps.  The indoor lighting sector is dominated by inefficient incandescent lamps and fluorescent tubes. | At least five demonstration projects on a number of efficient lighting technologies completed for indoor, outdoor and street lighting.  Direct energy savings of up to 0.95 GWh per year by completion of all pilots (subject to final selection of pilot size and technologies)  100% LED for outdoor (park) and indoor lighting pilots  40% LED included in street lighting pilots | Project reports and audits | Fulfillment of the target will depend on planning (e.g. final selection of pilot size and technologies), financing, and implementation according to strict timetables agreed upon by the project and its partners. |
| **Outcome 3**  Replication via municipal programs and associated financial instruments  *Municipal lighting programs lead to widespread deployment of EE lighting and associated energy savings* | Municipal programs for EE public lighting  Financial commitments for energy-efficient municipal lighting | Municipal programs for EE public lighting are desired but not comprehensively designed, financed, nor implemented | Municipality of Yerevan develops and adopts program for upgrades of municipal lighting  Similar programs are adopted in other cities of Armenia  Establishment of financing mechanism for Yerevan (e.g. revolving fund)  Support in preparation of funding proposals (including tenders for ESCOs) for cities of Armenia | Municipal plans on EE lighting upgrades  Established separate account/budget line in Yerevan Lighting Company for funding of EE lighting projects/upgrades.  Number of investment proposals applied for funding | Adoption of municipal programs requires sufficient funds from municipal budgets and/or public and private sources of financing |
| **Outcome 4**  National policies, codes, and standards on lighting  *New national policies mandate significantly greater energy efficiency and ensure product quality for lighting, particularly in residential buildings* | Existence of regulations that mandate improved energy efficiency of lighting products and installations | There is no regulation on energy performance of lighting products in Armenia | Proposed improvement to existing Law on Energy Efficiency addressing minimum energy performance requirements for lighting appliances  A national phase-out plan of conventional incandescent lighting is adopted  Other adopted policies and standards supporting the phase-out  New criteria (including performance and life cycle costs) for incorporation in state procurement procedures for lighting applications are developed | Revised legal and normative documents  National program  on phase out of incandescent lighting  Technical specifications for ensuring MEPS for public procurement of lighting equipment | Adoption of national policy requires sufficient political will and addressing of stakeholder concerns about lighting quality, cost to consumers, and mercury containment. |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluator

* GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
* Project Inception Report
* Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
* List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board, and other partners to be consulted
* Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
* Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
* Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
* Project budget and financial data
* Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
* UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
* UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
* UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
* 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? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| 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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 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 | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

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 Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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 rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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) * 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 * 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 RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of Improving Energy Efficiency in Buildings (UNDP PIMS #4669)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author | # | Para No./ comment location | Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report | TE team response and actions taken |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)