



TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Post title:	International Consultant for the Final Evaluation of UNDP-GEF project "Improving Energy Efficiency in Residential Buildings in the Republic of Belarus"
Type of contract:	Individual Contract
Assignment type:	International Consultant
Country / Duty Station:	Home Based with one mission of at least 10 working days (not including travel and weekend days)
Expected places of travel (if applicable):	Minsk, Belarus and 2 other cities in the Republic of Belarus (Mahiliou and Hrodna)
Languages required	English
Starting date of assignment:	1 st February 2018
Duration of Contract:	40 working days over a 4 months period of 1 st February 2018 – 30 th June 2018
Duration of Assignment:	40 working days
Payment arrangements:	Lump-sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results)
Administrative arrangements:	UNDP will organize the logistics and travel to Minsk, Belarus and any travel within the Republic of Belarus
Evaluation method:	Desk Review and Interviews of Short-Listed Candidates

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Poleev', is located at the bottom right of the page.

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 *UNDP-GEF project: "Improving Energy Efficiency in Residential Buildings in the Republic of Belarus"* (PIMS # 4290).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Improving Energy Efficiency in Residential Buildings in the Republic of Belarus			
GEF Project ID:	4290		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00077154	GEF financing:	4.5	4.5
Country:	Republic of Belarus	IA/EA own:	0.4	0.4
Region:		Government:	4.3	3.2
Focal Area:	Energy, Infrastructure, Transport and Technology	Other:	23.0	11.7
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	27.3	14.9
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	32.2	19.8
Other Partners involved:	Energy Efficiency Department; Ministry of Architecture & Construction	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		July 31, 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: Dec 30, 2016	Actual: June 30, 2018

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to *reduce the energy consumption and related GHG emissions with the focus on new residential buildings by introducing new performance based building design and construction standards with related energy certification scheme(s) and by ensuring their effective implementation and enforcement. By this, the energy consumption of new buildings is sought to be cut by at least 70% compared to the existing building stock constructed before 1993 and by 40% compared to the buildings erected in accordance with the current construction norms and thermal standards in place. The project's principal outcomes were to support the (i) strengthening of the legal and regulatory framework; (ii) training of local experts and other key stakeholders; (iii) construction of three EE demo buildings to test and gain practical experience on different EE solutions; and (iv) related outreach and dissemination of the lesson learnt. The TE is to cover the entire programme, both the UNDP and the GEF components.*

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 method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluators are 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 (fill in 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 inception report shall be completed and submitted prior to the evaluation mission to the Republic of Belarus. The draft and final evaluation report shall be completed after the evaluation mission to the Republic of Belarus.

The evaluator will assess the following categories of project progress.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addressed country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design and if there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within the project timeframe?
- Has the project achieved its global environmental benefits in terms of tonnes of CO2 that have been reduced (direct and indirect GHG emissions) as defined in the project document?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code the results in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ²	Baseline Level ³	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁴	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵	Achievement Rating ⁶	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 3:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 4:							
Outcome 3:	Indicator 5:							
Outcome 4:	Indicator 6:							

Indicator Assessment Key

Green = Achieved	Yellow = On target to be achieved	Red = Not on target to be achieved
------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Were changes made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Did the project employ one or more international technical advisors and did this help to advance the ability of the project to meet the overall project objective?
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project implementation, identify the causes and examine if they were resolved.
- Has the work planning been carried out in a manner which is consistent with the project document and with the project workplan or are there significant deviations?

² Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

³ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴ If available

⁵ Colour code this column only

⁶ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Were work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

iv. Mid-Term Review

- Examine the extent to which the recommendations from the mid-term review have been taken into account by the project and the extent to which the project has successfully carried out adaptive management in a timely manner following the mid-term review;
- Examine the extent to which, if mid-term review recommendations were not taken into account, the reasons why these recommendations were not taken into account and discuss and analyse the reasons why as well as the impact that this has had on the overall success of the project.

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 Regional Technical Adviser based in Istanbul and other key stakeholders.

The evaluator is expected to spend 10 working days (not including travel or weekends) in the Republic of Belarus, as part of this assignment.

The international evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to each of the demonstration pilot projects including Minsk, Mahiliou and Hrodna, i.e., the following project sites: (i) *Standard one-entrance 19-storey 133-apartment large-panel residential house with 9.42 thousand square meters of living area*; (ii) *Standard four-entrance 10-storey 180-apartment semi-frame panel residential house with total living area of 13.89 thousand square meters*; (iii) *Standard three-entrance 10-storey 120-apartment residential house being constructed of brick partition crosswalls with the outer walls made of foam concrete blocks and with total living area of 10.34 thousand square meters*.

The mission is expected to start and end in Minsk and have the following estimated breakdown: 2 days in Minsk followed by 2 days in Mahilou (including travel) followed by 2 days in Hrodno (including travel) followed by 4 days in Minsk meaning that the 10 days are made up of 2+2+2+4 = 10 working days. Weekends should not be counted as working days meaning that working days are Monday-Friday only which means that the evaluation mission should be for a period of 2 weeks. This tentative breakdown can be changed provided that the overall number of days spent in the Republic of Belarus stays at 10 working days.

In the event, that it is agreed between the UNDP project manager and the international and national evaluators it might be possible to split the mission into 2 missions, provided that the total number of days remains at 10 working days (not including travel days). Example: International Evaluator decides to undertake 1 mission of 7 working days (not including weekends) and one mission of 3 working days.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (i) *Project Manager, other project staff members and key experts*; (ii) *UNDP CO Programme Analysts and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub Regional Technical Advisor on Climate Change Mitigation*; (iii) *Energy Efficiency Department of State Standardization Committee as the national implementing agency*; (iv) *Ministry of Architecture & Construction*; (v) *Ministry of Housing & Communal Services*; (vi) *RUE "Institute of Housing – NIPTIS after S. Ataev"*; (vii) *MAPID JSC*; (viii) *RUE "GrodnoGrazhdanProject Institute"*; (ix) *GrodnoZhylStroy LLC*; (x) *Unitary Enterprise "Mogilevsky UKS"*; (xi) *RUE "StrojTechNorm"*; (xii) *chairmen of Associations of Owners of houses in Minsk and Hrodna*; (xiii) *Belarus National Technical University – Construction and Energy Faculties*. The evaluation team is encouraged to request additional

interviews, so the team should thereby meet with additional key stakeholders during the mission to Republic of Belarus.

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 evaluators consider useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluators for review is included in [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](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will cover, at a minimum, 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	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:	

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.

Specifically, the final evaluation will:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions, as they were carried out.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Review whether the project has had the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds.
- Provide detailed inputs to the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: has the co-financing been used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Has the Project Team met with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

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 Agency (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 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) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.⁷

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**. It is suggested that the number of recommendations does not exceed 15 in total.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Republic of Belarus. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 40 days, over a 4-month period from 1st February 2018 to 30th June 2018, according to the following plan:

⁷ 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](#)

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation (Inception report, which includes an Evaluation methodology compiled and a work plan to be prepared and submitted)	4 days	Feb, 2018
Evaluation Mission (Mission to Belarus conducted, including briefings by Project Team and UNDP CO, in-country field visits, all necessary interviews with partners and key stakeholders, data collection, and de-briefings for UNDP CO). Please note that these 10 days are working days and do not include travel days or weekends.	10 days	March, 2018
Travel Days – days required for travel to and from the Republic of Belarus	2 days	March 2018
Draft Evaluation Report (Drafting of the evaluation report completed, and the draft sent for comments. Circulation and other types of feedback mechanisms for reviewing and commenting on the draft completed, and comments received)	18 days	Apr, 2018
Final Report (Finalization of the evaluation report with due account of comments received on the draft report)	6 days	June, 2018
Total	40 days	

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception report	Clarifications on timing and method of evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	International evaluator submits the Inception Report to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings based on desk review and results of evaluation mission	End of evaluation mission	International evaluator prepares, submits and presents a report on Initial Findings to project management and UNDP CO.
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	International evaluator drafts the full evaluation report and sends it to CO. The report is reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs.
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft and no later than 30 th June 2018	International evaluator prepares the revised Final Evaluation Report and sends it 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.*

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *one international and one national evaluators*. The international evaluator is designated as the team leader and will be responsible for the entire evaluation and respective evaluation deliverables mentioned above in line with this ToR, with inputs from the project. The national evaluator will provide assistance to the international evaluator in line with a separate ToR focusing on a baseline and stocktaking report, a stakeholders consultation report and detailed comments into draft evaluation report. Both consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating technical assistance projects for UNDP or other organizations or governments. Experience with UNDP and GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The International Evaluator (the Evaluation Team leader) must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum *seven* years of relevant professional experience;
- Advanced university degree (at least the Master level);
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies demonstrated by an example of evaluation of at least one other UNDP project funded by GEF in the past seven years;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) such as environment, climate change, energy, engineering, economics, law, international relations and/or business/management demonstrated by at least 3 relevant publications and/or evidences in professional experience records (e.g., certifications, awards, inventions, membership of professional associations and ad-hoc panels, lecturing, training, participation in exhibitions and professional events, presentations, etc.);
- Experience in mid-term or final performance evaluation of at least one international and/or regional projects funded by multilateral agencies in the past seven years;
- Experience in performance evaluation of such projects in the Europe or/and CIS region is preferred;
- Familiarity with regulations in EU and CIS region in the field of energy efficiency, demonstrated by at least one relevant publication (report, article, invention, presentation, etc.), is preferred but not required;
- Familiarity with Belarusian regulations and standards in the field of energy efficiency, demonstrated by at least one relevant publication (report, article, invention, presentation, etc.), is an asset;
- Excellent written and spoken English is a must;
- Working knowledge of written and spoken Belarusian or Russian is an advantage;
- Strong report writing skills and experience in writing and presenting reports to a high professional level (an example of reports and presentations that include graphs, pictures, diagrams, figures and other illustrative tools to enhance the reporting quality shall be provided).

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants 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'

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing and upon completion, submission and acceptance of the Inception report
40%	Following evaluation mission to the Republic of Belarus and upon submission and approval of the 1 ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report, which takes into account and addresses all the comments that have been provided by both the Government stakeholders, UNDP Project Manager, UNDP Belarus, and UNDP IRH

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply to tenders.by@undp.org on or before December 1, 2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications in English. The application should contain a letter of intent together with a current and complete CV in English and a financial proposal for this position. Thus, the following documents are required:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price (including travel related costs) as per the template provided by UNDP;
- CV or a Personal History Form (P11 form), including information about past experience in similar assignments and contact details for referees;
- Other documents in support of evidences about qualification and professional experience.

Please kindly read IC procurement notice indicating evaluation criteria, and full list of documents to be submitted. UNDP will consider only complete applications for the position.

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.

Manager: _____ Alexandre Grebenkov

(signature here)

Date: 21/12/2017

Employee: _____ Roland Wong

(signature here)

Date: _____

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: 3.1: Country's capacity to mitigate and adapt to the climate change strengthened					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: GHG emission (tons of CO2 equivalent) into the atmosphere.					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF's Strategic Programme #1 of GEF-4 on "Promoting Energy-Efficient Buildings and Appliances".					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective ⁸ To reduce the energy consumption (imported fuel) and related GHG emissions with the focus on new residential buildings.	Number of buildings designed and constructed in accordance with the new energy efficiency standards.	0	At least 10% (around 80 buildings) of all new residential multi-storey buildings, for which the design is started during the last year of the project are integrating new EE measures into their design with the target of reducing their combined, annual energy demand for space heating and hot water below 60 kWh/m ² .	Project monitoring reports and final evaluation. As applicable, post project market monitoring and evaluations	Suggested EE measures are adopted by the design institutes and construction companies into the design of new buildings.
	Amount of reduced CO ₂ emissions compared to the projected baseline	0	"Lifetime" reduction of 220,000 tons of CO ₂ eq resulting from the energy saving in buildings, for which the construction has started or which have adopted into their design new energy efficiency elements that reduce the energy consumption for heating and hot water in the residential buildings below the current thermal standards in force.	Project monitoring reports and final evaluation.	See above

⁸ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

Outcome 1⁹ Strengthened legal and regulatory framework and mechanisms to enforce the legislation for improving the energy efficiency of the building sector.	Status of the national laws and other regulatory documents controlling the energy consumption of the newly constructed buildings.	Prescriptive thermal standards adopted in 2010 defining minimum mandatory U-values for the building envelope, corresponding to the average annual heat demand of 60 kWh/m ² for space heating of typical multi-apartment buildings and 120-130 kWh /m ² together with sanitary hot water preparation.	Revised minimum energy performance standards adopted for new construction and reaching a status of a law by the end of the project with a target of reducing the energy consumption of new residential buildings for space heating and hot water together below 60 kWh/m ² . An energy performance certification and labelling scheme for both new and existing buildings adopted and under implementation by the end of the project.	Official government publications and assumptions	Continuing commitment of the Government of Belarus to proceed with the suggested legislation.
Outcome 2 Enhanced capacity of the Belarusian specialists to implement and effectively enforce new energy efficiency standards and construction norms with the initial focus on new residential buildings.	Demonstrated capacity of the Belarusian building sector specialist to integrate new EE approaches and measures into the design of the buildings and to implement them in practice.	Non-integrated design of the buildings just complying with the current prescriptive thermal standards in force. Lack of capacity of the public authorities to effectively supervise and enforce the implementation of the planned new, overall energy performance based norms and standards.	Integrated, energy efficient building design approach together with buildings' overall energy performance based design principles adopted into the work of at least 30% of all local design institutes as well as into the curricula of all educational institutes in Belarus educating new architects and building construction and HVAC engineers. By the end of the project, at least 50 experts from each key professional group (see outputs 2.2-2.6) and 200 university students have taken and successfully passed courses on energy efficient building design and construction. Key public authorities responsible for supervision and enforcement of the planned new norms and regulations trained.	The curricula of the Belarusian educational institutes training architects and building construction and HVAC engineers. Design documents of new buildings submitted for review of the state authorities. Surveys and interviews conducted during project implementation.	Demonstrated value added of the suggested new approaches to the targeted professional groups.

⁹ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

Outcome 3: Implementation of demonstration projects for energy efficient buildings.	Status of the demonstration projects.	N/A	Each of the 3 demonstration buildings constructed on schedule and reaching the target for annual external energy demand for space heating and hot water equal or less than 60 kWh/m ² , and their energy consumption and other performance (living comfort etc.) monitored for at least one full year. The baseline costs of the 3 demo buildings is covered in full by the project's co-financing resources and the GEF financing for incremental EE measures won't exceed 15% of the total construction costs of each demo building.	Monitoring reports of the demonstration projects.	All the required agreements concluded and the design of the demo buildings completed in schedule during the first 18 months of project implementation and the construction completed by the end of the third year of project implementation.
Outcome 4: Documented, disseminated and institutionalized project results providing a basis for further replication.	Status of the planned public outreach activities. Status of the entity to follow up and continue the activities initiated by the project. Number of visit and downloads from the project website.	N/A	Planned public outreach activities successfully completed. An entity to follow up and, as applicable, to continue the activities initiated by the project has been designated with adequate resources to perform its work. At least 100 hits and 20 downloaded documents per month from the project website by outside visitors.	Final project report. Number of hits and downloads from the project website.	Project implementation successfully concluded.

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

1. General documentation
 - UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
 - UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
 - GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
 - GEF focal area strategic program objectives
2. Project documentation
 - GEF approved project document and Request for CEO Endorsement
 - Project Inception Report
 - Mid-term Evaluation Report
 - Annual work plans
 - Annual GEF Project Implementation Report (2013-2018)
 - CDRs
 - Financial audit reports
 - GEF Quarterly Reports
 - Project Steering Committee Minutes
 - Logs (Monitoring Logs, Offline Risk Logs, Lessons Learned Logs and Offline Issues Logs)
3. Other relevant documentation
 - Project Technical Reports by project experts
 - Project's Events Proceedings (including agenda and presentations/publications of conferences, workshops, trainings, etc.)
 - Selected relevant regulations in housing and construction sectors prepared and/or indorsed by the Project
 - Relevant printed documentation (brochures, flyers, booklets, briefs, publications, press releases, etc.) or visual materials (photo, video) in support of the Project's achievements and results.

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

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
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 3: Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2: Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1: Unlikely (U): severe risks	2: Relevant (R) 1: Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3: Significant (S) 2: Minimal (M) 1: Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> 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 Form¹⁰

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: _____

¹⁰www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹¹

- 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 Manual¹²)
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 rated¹³)
 - 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

¹¹The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹² UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹³ 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.

- 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: _____