



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

**Terms of Reference**

**Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP GEF project**

**ESCO Moldova-Transforming the market for urban energy efficiency in Moldova by introducing Energy Service Companies**

---

Job title:	International Consultant on Energy Efficiency for Terminal Evaluation
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Assignment type:	International Consultant
Section/Unit:	Environment and Energy Cluster
Duty Station: (not including travel days)	Home based with one mission of 5 working days to Moldova
Languages required:	English
Starting Date:	18 June 2018
Duration of Assignment:	24 working days (17 home based, 2 travel days, 5 working days on mission) over the period 18 <sup>th</sup> June 2018 – 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2018.
Payment arrangements:	Lump sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of outputs)
Evaluation method:	Lowest priced technically compliant offer

## 1. Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *full-sized project titled ESCO Moldova- Transforming the market for urban energy efficiency in Moldova by introducing Energy Service Companies, PIMS 5135, implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Environment. The project started on November 2014, had the inception workshop in June 2015 and it the Mid Term Review was completed in February 2017. The project is due to be completed no later than November 2018.*

More information about the project, including the project document, can be found here.

**See link:**

<http://www.md.undp.org/content/moldova/en/home/projects/esco-moldova.html>

The terminal evaluation (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 Terminal Evaluation must follow the guidance outlined in the document found her.

**See link:**

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

### I. Project Background Information

The UNDP GEF “ESCO Moldova project - Transforming the market for Urban Energy Efficiency in Moldova by introducing Energy Service Companies”, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and co-financed and implemented by the United Nations Development Program has an implementation timeframe of 4 years with a total budget of 1.45 million USD of which \$1.3 million USD comes from the GEF and \$150,000 USD from UNDP.

The project objective has been to create a functioning, sustainable and effective ESCO market in Moldova by converting existing energy service provider companies into ESCO companies, as the basis for scaling up mitigation efforts in the whole municipal building sector in Moldova, leading to CO2 emission reductions by implementing energy performance contracts. The project has been trying to work on the largely untapped energy efficiency market in the municipal sector, especially in facilities owned and operated by municipalities, in the Chisinau area for the first stage and then to other parts of Moldova.

The main barriers that the project has been trying to address are related to:

- Energy efficiency project financing;

- The eagerness of existing Energy Service Providers to embark on the ESCO business model;
- Institutional barriers at the local level;
- Energy efficiency awareness in the municipal sector.

The ESCO Moldova Project has been trying to eliminate/address these impediments through the following project outputs:

- Green Urban Development Plan adopted by city of Chisinau;
- ESCO Business model in Moldova is operational;
- Financial mechanism and financial support available to ESCOs;
- EPC projects replicated in other municipalities and information disseminated.

The main targets to be achieved by the end of the project have been:

- A functional ESCO market with a functional LGF in place;
- ESCO companies created and consolidated; creation of new investments in EE measures that will lead to long term energy consumption savings and 20 EE projects implemented;
- Better conditions in public and residential buildings and overall Chisinau will advance in its sustainable green development.

The Project activities were designed to respond all the outlined challenges and consequently offer feasible solutions to the requirements of the energy efficiency financing market needs. Also they envisaged the opportunity of creating synergies with local stakeholders as well as offer incentives for the ESCO market to start developing. A specific attention of the project was aimed at developing the capacities of local energy service providers (potential ESCOs), local authority as well as the banking sector. The overall project activities also aimed to develop amendments to the legal framework for energy services and green procurement, will facilitate the improvement of the Urban Development Plan by adding energy efficiency elements, and ultimately will incentivise the implementation of the first 20 projects using the guaranties of a fund established to secure the participation of all stakeholders in the financing scheme.

The mid-term review of the project was completed in February 2017 and main recommendations included specific recommendations for adaptive management to improve the project over the second half of its lifetime. The mid-term review concluded that major changes were required as the Project in early 2017 had an over-sized loan guarantee fund, an under-sized management budget, insufficient remaining time and no clear path for a no-cost extension, beyond the end of 2018.

Unfortunately, in April 2017 issues related the Energy Efficiency Fund meant that the Fund was no longer able to provide loans or a loan guarantee and in late 2017 the project once again went through an adaptive management exercise to look at alternative approaches to

helping stimulate the ESCO market in Moldova. An international consultant was hired and a variety of various options were considered and discussed but with the Energy Efficiency Fund not working properly, none of the options were actually implemented. In addition, new legislation before the Moldovan parliament in mid-2018 seeks to actually disband the Energy Efficiency Fund.

Ultimately, in May 2018, the UNDP Moldova took the decision to close the project and not apply for the 12 or 18 months project extension beyond the end of 2018. Developing the ESCO market in Moldova, as in other countries, is a challenging and difficult task and it takes a long time.

Because the project will shortly be closing, 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.

## **II. Objectives of the FE:**

The Terminal Evaluation will 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.

## **III. Terminal EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> 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](#)) and will be discussed with UNDP IRH. 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 UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a 5 days field mission to Chisinau, Moldova within a maximum of 3 weeks of starting the contract. The 5 days field mission does not include 2

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

travel days meaning that they shall be 5 full working days to be spent in Chisinau, Moldova, not including the 2 travel days. During the mission, interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Project Management Unit, UNDP Moldova, UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub Regional Technical Advisor, International and National Consultants to the project, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Environment, Energy Efficiency Agency, Energy Efficiency Fund, City of Chisinau, all international and national consultants who have worked on the project, including the international consultant who designed the project and wrote the project document. It is also important that the Terminal evaluator consults with ESCOs or energy service provider companies that interacted with the project and gets their views on how the project has succeeded or where it has struggled. One roundtable meeting with private sector ESCOs should be organized in Chisinau during the course of the Terminal evaluation.

The Terminal evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, final evaluation, 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 A1](#) of this Terms of Reference.

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the Terminal evaluation consultant is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards cleared by UNDP. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. The evaluation mission will include a visit to Bucharest and some of the project pilot sites. The international consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, UNDP IRH, Steering Committee, project team, and key other stakeholders such as ESCOs. The Terminal evaluator will work with a national consultant whose job will be to organize the stakeholder meetings and to prepare a baseline and stocktaking report which analyses the impact of the project on the project outcomes vis-à-vis what would have happened under a business as usual scenario. The Evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document (“prodoc”), project reports – incl. Annual Reports, project budget revision, progress reports, CTA mission reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, GEF Capacity Development scores from inception to end of project, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment.

The methodology to be used by the Evaluation International Consultant should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation reviewed;
- Interviews;
- Field visits;

- Questionnaires;
- GEF CD Scorecard completed at the time of TE (by the Evaluator);
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Although the Evaluator should feel free to discuss with the relevant authorities concerned all matters relevant to its assignment, it s/he is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

The international consultant’s main responsibilities (24 working days over a period of several months) includes the following:

- Desk review of documents, development of detailed work plan and TE (Terminal Evaluation) outline (maximum 3 days by International Consultant; home-based);
- Debriefing with UNDP IRH, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report (1 day, home based);
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Project Coordinator and/or Regional Technical Advisor (5 days in-country mission + 2 travel days);
- Completion of the first TE report draft The draft will be shared with the UNDP IRH, UNDP-/GEF (UNDP-/GEF IRH – Istanbul Regional Hub) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting; (8 days)
- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (maximum 5 days);

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([Annex A2](#)), 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](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>

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. The analysis of project finance will include an analysis of the effectiveness of the funds spent. 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 Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) 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	Actual	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 has 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.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP IRH. The UNDP IRH will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the Evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be *24 working days* over a period of several months for the assignment of the Evaluator according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	<i>3 days to review documents by International Consultant and conduction phone interviews and request additional information</i>	<i>End June 2018</i>
<b>Debriefing</b>	<i>1 day to agree with IRH on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report</i>	<i>Early July 2018</i>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	<i>7 days: 5 days in Moldova and not including 2 travel days</i>	<i>End July 2018</i>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	<i>8 working days by International Evaluator</i>	<i>End August 2018</i>
<b>Final Report</b>	<i>5 days by the international evaluator</i>	<i>12 October 2018</i>

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)



<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP IRH
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP IRH
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to PMU, reviewed by RTA, UNDP Programme Specialist, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to PMU 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 Evaluator will be composed of 1 International Evaluator and 1 national evaluator from Moldova. Both consultants will have contracts for 24 working days, spread out over a period of several months. The international consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating at least 1 or more technical assistance projects, either working for the United Nations Development Programme and/or other international organizations or in the private sector. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. Experience with evaluation/audit in the private sector or outside of the UN system is also 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 in Moldova, meaning that the international consultant shall not have been hired by this project previously.

The evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluator who has had any direct or indirect involvement in the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluator who is associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the ESCO Moldova project, the Energy Efficiency Agency or the Energy Efficiency Fund in Moldova will be considered as grounds for disqualification. If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products.

## 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

---

%	Milestone
20%	Upon approval of Inception report, prior to mission #1
50%	Upon approval of the 1st draft version of the terminal evaluation report, following mission #1
30%	Upon approval of the final terminal evaluation report (by UNDP IRH and UNDP RTA), following incorporation of all comments into the final report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

The applications in English should contain the following

- Cover letter explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a brief methodology on how you will approach and conduct the work (based on commenting on the requirements indicated in this TOR) and explain when, if selected, you can start work.
- Filled P11 form or CV including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees (blank P11 form can be downloaded from):  
[http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11\\_modified\\_for\\_SCs\\_and\\_ICs.doc](http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc).
- Financial Proposal\* - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office (16) and on mission (7), international travel (2), per diems and any other possible costs), using the template below. Local travel should not be included in your proposal. Refer Annex H for more details on financial proposal. Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.

### 6. Detailed Scope of the TE

The International consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

#### 1. 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 addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- 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. See *Guidance For Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- 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's time frame?
- 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.

## **2. 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 following the *Guidance For Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress 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 <sup>3</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>4</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>5</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>6</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>7</sup>	Justification for Rating
<b>Objective :</b>	Indicator (if applicable):							
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
<b>Etc.</b>								

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Final Evaluation.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits;
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that were not successful, in order to learn lessons for future interventions;

**3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

**Management Arrangements:**

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>4</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>5</sup> If available

<sup>6</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>7</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- 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.

### **Overall Effectiveness**

- Did the project achieve 20 building rehabilitations financed in Moldova, using the ESCO modality, before the end of the project?
- Did the project deliver cumulative (20 years) energy savings of 295 GWh as a result of the 20 demo projects selected?
- Did the loan guarantee fund on track to deliver \$2.7 million dollars of loan guarantees to be signed with the Energy Efficiency Fund?
- Did the project leave behind a market in Moldova for ESCOs in which there are at least 5 companies, which previously worked as engineering companies, now working as ESCOs.

### **Component 1**

- Did the project have a green urban development plan for Chisinau, including a resource mobilization plan, developed and approved, with support from this project, by the end of the project?
- Did the project have a public green procurement plan developed and applied by the City of Chisinau by the end of the project?

### **Component 2**

- What did the project achieve related to training on the ESCO business model which includes 3 target beneficiaries' groups and 3 training sessions, at least 20 ESPs are trained on the ESCO business model, public Building managers and Maintenance Managers, at least 20 staffs are trained on ESCO business model, and Financial Institutions (5), including the EEF are trained on the ESCO business model
- Did the project achieve to have 20 projects selected and contracted and under implementation using the EPC modality before the project ends?
- Did the project achieve to have a framework agreement signed with the Energy Efficiency Agency, the City of Chisinau, and the PMU

### **Component 3**

- Was a loan guarantee mechanism adequately designed and set-up? Have the adaptive management changes to the loan guarantee mechanism from how it was described and defined in the project document helped to strengthen the project or otherwise? Please explain.

- To what extent is the loan guarantee mechanism likely to be sustainable beyond the lifetime of the project? What will happen to the mechanism once the project ends and is this a sustainable solution?
- To what extent, if any, has the banking sector in Moldova worked with the loan guarantee mechanism? What further could be done in this regard?
- What changes, if any, could have been used to strengthen the loan guarantee mechanism?

#### **Component 4**

- To what extent did the project achieve replication and dissemination to another town/city in Moldova and to what extent have initial discussions been held with another town/city regarding working with the ESCO Moldova project
- To what extent is the project on track to support the development of a green urban development plan in another city?

#### **Work Planning:**

- Review any delays in project implementation, identify the causes and examine if they were resolved and if not examine the reasons why they were not resolved
- Has the work planning been carried out in a manner which is consistent with the project document and with the project workplan or were there significant deviations or delays?
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, what was the reason results were not achieved?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to the logframe since the project started.

#### **Finance and co-finance:**

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific references to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions. Have the budget revisions strengthened or weakened the project overall?
- Did the project have 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?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Manager meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

#### **Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:**

- Review the monitoring tools that were being used including PIR reporting and quarterly financial reporting: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing

information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

#### Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

#### Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board including assessing how well the project has worked with UNDP Moldova and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in identifying and implementing adaptive management measures
- Assess how well the Project international consultant and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process has been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

#### Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

#### **4. Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

##### Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
- What is the likelihood of the financial support mechanism being established by the project being sustainable (meaning that it will continue to operate and function beyond the lifetime of the project)

##### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
- Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project team a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

##### Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.
- To what extent has the project managed to improve or contribute to legal frameworks related to the development of the ESCO market in Moldova

##### Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

#### **Conclusions & Recommendations**

The TE International consultant will include a section in the report setting out the FE's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings with the main goal of making recommendations on how to significantly improve the project (i.e – how to implement



adaptive management) over the second half of the project lifetime.<sup>8</sup> UNDP and GEF rules for adaptive management allow for change of activities and outputs to better achieve the project objective and main outcomes. However, they do not allow for the project objective or outcomes to be changed. There should be no more than 15 recommendations.

## **5. Final Evaluation Arrangements**

### **Institutional arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this Final Evaluation resides with the UNDP Moldova Country Office which is the Commissioning Unit. The Project team will be responsible for liaising with the TE International consultant and national consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews and agenda, and arrange field visits if necessary. The TE consultant should review all documents and request meetings and interviews to take place prior to the mission.

### **Duty station**

Home-based with 5 working days mission to Moldova which should be carried out within 3 weeks of the signing of the contract between the Parties.

### **Travel:**

- **International travel** (5 working days - mission) will be required to Moldova which is called the Final Evaluation mission; This 5 working days mission does not include travel days or weekend days which means that the consultant will need to travel on the weekend. Weekend days are not considered working days but are part of the 2 travel days allocated to this assignment. Travel costs need not to be included in the financial proposal. They will be paid for separately by UNDP Moldova.

## **7. Qualifications and experience requirements**

The TE International Consultant should be an international expert with experience and exposure to energy efficiency projects and will have some prior experience in carrying out mid-term or final evaluations. It is preferable that the international consultant has some prior familiarity with the ESCO business model. The international consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

**The International Consultant on energy-efficiency - TE Consultant should have the following qualifications and experience:**

### Academic qualifications:

---

<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, TE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

- Master's degree in Energy, Environment, Business Administration, Economics, Engineering, or other closely related field. PhD is an asset;

Experience:

- At least 5 (five) years work experience in providing advice to energy-efficiency projects funded by international donors including UNDP or other donors;
- At least 7 (seven) years work experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in energy efficiency in transition economies;
- Experience in working with the UNDP or another GEF agency or GEF project evaluations, including experience with SMART based indicators (Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset);
- Experience in evaluating performance based energy efficiency projects. Proven knowledge of energy performance contracting, ESCO mechanism;
- Experience in working with international technical assistance projects in the Europe and CIS region with international organizations;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Proven experience in preparation of written reports in an accurate and concise manner in English;

Language requirements:

- Writing and verbal skills in English, knowledge of Romanian or Russian would be an asset.

Because this tender process is working through the roster, all candidates to whom this request for proposals has been sent is automatically assumed to meet this criteria. This means that the roster rules will apply, meaning that there will be no technical scoring, but instead the applicants who apply will be selected upon the basis of who is offering the best value for money.

## **7. Application process**

All applications should include the following:

1. Personal information (Personal History Form/P11) including past experience in similar projects.
2. Financial proposal (in USD, specifying the total lump sum amount as well as the requested amount of the fee per day). The financial proposal shall not include travel costs which will be paid for separately by UNDP. (See Annex I)

*Incomplete applications will not be considered.*

**Annex I – Financial Proposal of the International Consultant**

5 working day mission to Moldova	5	man/days		0
Travel Days	2	man/days		0
Return Air-Ticket	n/a			0
<b>Sub-total fee</b>				<b>0</b>
<b>Other costs</b>				
				0
				0
				0
<b>Sub-total other costs</b>				<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24</b>			<b>0</b>

\* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.

\*\* Add rows as needed

Travel cost are not included in the proposal and will be paid for separately by UNDP Moldova.

**I agree to perform this assignment for a lump sum of \_\_\_\_\_ USD**

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

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

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / **2018**

This offer remains valid for a period of 3 months from the date of signature.

## ANNEXES to TE TOR

### ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the International consultant

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the project
10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm GEF Climate Change Mitigation Tracking Tool ([https://www.thegef.org/documents/tracking\\_tools](https://www.thegef.org/documents/tracking_tools))
11. Oversight mission reports
12. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
13. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
  15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
  16. Minutes of the ESCO Moldova Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
  17. Project site location maps
-

## ANNEX A2: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK - PROJECT RESULT FRAMEWORK

UNDP Strategic Plan: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded					
Output 1.5. Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy)					
Expected <u>CP Outcome 3.2</u> – Low Emission and Resilient Development: Strengthened national policies and capacities enable climate and disaster resilient, low emission economic development and sustainable consumption					
Country Programme Outcome Indicator: Energy Intensity reduced by 7% till 2017 in comparison with 2010					
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: Climate Change Objective 2: Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: CC Objective 2: Sustainable financing and delivery mechanism established and operational					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective</b> The project objective is to create a functioning, sustainable and effective ESCO market in Moldova, as the basis for scaling up mitigation efforts in the whole municipal building sector in Chisinau and Moldova in line with the Green Urban Development Plan	Number of EE projects implemented under the EPC modality and loan guarantee to ESCOs	0	20 buildings financed using EPC modality	Project monitoring system and reporting. EE projects completion reports Number of ESCO submitting proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Feasibility studies prove cost-effectiveness of EE projects</li> <li>– Required investments are forthcoming through the EEF and the selected commercial bank.</li> <li>– Private investors (ESCOs) can get access to project financing from the financial institution and are in a position to invest about 20 to 25% of the EE project costs (equity).</li> <li>– The Municipal Council is</li> </ul>
	Loan Guarantee Fund		Loan guarantees of at least \$2.7 million USD have been signed with the financial institution managing the Loan Guarantee Fund		

	Energy Service Providers (ESPs) operating as ESCOs	0	At least 5 companies in Moldova which previously worked as ESPs now operate as ESCOs (it could also be new companies)		willing to approve the Green Urban Development Plan
	Energy savings and Cumulative direct, post direct and indirect CO2 emissions reduction from the building sector	0	Cumulative (20 year) energy saving of 295 GWh as a result of 20 demo projects Cumulative (2014-2038) Direct: 68 ktonsCO2 Post-project (2024-2038): 40 ktonsCO2 Indirect (2018-2038): 240 ktonCO2 Total: 381 ktonsCO2		
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Green Urban Development Plan Adopted by City of Chisinau and additional emission reduction projects are financed and implemented in Chisinau. In addition, Green Urban Procurement Guide is being utilized by City of Chisinau	Green Urban Development Plan (GUDP)	There is no green urban development plan but Chisinau already approved the Urban Development Plan.	Chisinau Green Urban Development Plan approved and the Resource Mobilization Plan is implemented.	GUDP Report Decision of the Municipal Council	Sustained and consolidated political support and commitment to promote low-carbon development. Key stakeholders understand the benefits of the greening the policy document and engage in implementation. The donor community is responding and supports the GUDP implementation.
	The municipal Green Procurement Plan	There is no Green Public Procurement guidelines enforced in Chisinau.	Public Green Procurement Plan applied by Chisinau.	Report and decision of the Municipal Council	

	Awareness raising and replication mechanism	No information available.	Information related to GUDP is available to all other municipalities through documents and workshops.	Documents (Cases studies, lessons learned)	
<b>Outcome 2:</b> ESCOs are successfully investing in energy savings green urban development projects in the building sector using Energy Performance Contracting modality (EPC)	- Number of municipal staff members capable of implementing EPC projects and evaluating results - Number of building managers trained in ESCO business model - Staff from financial institutions in a position to evaluate EPC projects and ESCO proposals	ESCO business model does not exist in Moldova and there are no dedicated trainings in the area for the relevant stakeholders.	3 target beneficiaries groups and 3 training sessions: - At least 20 ESPs are trained on the ESCO business model - Public Building managers and Maintenance Managers, at least 20 staffs are trained on ESCO business model - Financial Institutions (5), including the EEF are trained on the ESCO business model.	Training sessions evaluation reports Quality of ESCOs' technical and financial proposals FIs readiness to analyse and approve (or reject) loan and loan guarantee request	ESCOs must agree to attend the training sessions, no fee.  EEA agrees to intensively support the project by providing key experts to attend the training sessions and further to serve as trainers in other municipalities.  EEA and the municipality express their willingness to work together
	Long-term agreement between the EEA, Chisinau and PMU	Although the EEA is active in the building sector, the EEA did not develop any special acquaintance with the municipal sector to advance EE in the public and residential building sector owned and operated by the municipality.	Framework Agreement jointly signed by 3 parties	Framework Agreement EEA's readiness to provide effective, quality and relevant TA.	

	Documented long-list of EE projects	9 EA were already carried out by Chisinau.	30 to 40 Energy Audits carried out in buildings owned and operated by the municipality.	Energy Audit Reports	The municipality includes a budget provision in its annual budget to outsource a series of 40 EA
	Short-list of 20 EE projects selected for investment using EPC contracting modality	no EE projects are identified yet	20 EE projects selected and documented	Joint decision: Chisinau, PMU and EEf	EE projects meeting the selection criteria in term of cost, payback and measurable savings.
	Steady stream of payments by Chisinau in line with the EPC modality	There are no EE projects using EPC modality currently under implementation in Moldova	20 EE projects using EPC modality are under implementation using EPC modality	Quarterly LGF activity reports from the selected financial institution.	Project financing available from the financial institution and grants provided by the EEf to shorten the payback period. The municipality is in a position to face its obligations in regard to EPC Quarterly payments) EE projects reach on target in term of energy savings and timeliness to carry out quality EE projects. ESCO are in a position to provide the expected co-financing
	Data available in regard to actual ESCO Moldova progress	UNDP BAU M&E guidelines	M&E plan drafted and implemented within 3 months after the project start-up.	M&E Plan Quarterly and Annual progress reports	The UNDP project monitoring reporting systems and template are appropriate for the purpose of the current project. If needs be the UNDP CO will provide guidelines and guidance to this end.



<b>Outcome 3:</b> Financial Mechanism is set up and functional, providing financing to ESCOs	Loan Guarantee Fund (LGF) Regulation and Operational Guidelines	EE project loan guarantee scheme is already available in its draft version	LGF Regulation Document negotiated and duly signed by all parties: Chisinau, PMU, UNDP and the financial partner (bank) to be selected through a Request for Proposal Procedure by the PMU and UNDP.	LGF regulation enforced	Tripartite joint agreement on the way to manage the LGF bank account is drafted at the earliest stage of the project. The LGF trust bank account belongs to the UNDP up to the end of the project (EOP).
	Financial Framework Agreement between the Project (PMU), the municipality, and the Energy Efficiency Fund (EEF): - Number of projects approved by the EEF - Total project-based co-financing (EEF's grant)	The EEF agreed on the principles of the Financial Framework Agreement, but this is not finalized yet.	Financial Working Agreement dully signed	Framework Agreement	The EEF will redesign the grant component to support ESCOs rather than energy users.

	<p>LGF Performance indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of projects approved by the FI;</li> <li>- Total amount of loans (\$)</li> <li>- Total amount of loan guarantees (commitment)</li> <li>- Default of payment: total amount and %</li> <li>- Number of requests rejected by the FI</li> <li>- Duration of the decision making procedure from the LGF request and the final approval</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 20 Loan Guarantee approvals: (i) 5 in year 1; (ii) 10 in year 2, and (iii) 5 in year 3.</li> <li>- At least \$2.7 million approved (LGF and loans)</li> <li>- There is no target in regard to default of payment. A default of payment means the project investment is not fully repaid.</li> <li>- If the training program has the expected impact in term of EE projects design and financial analysis, the rate of reject should be very low. No special target.</li> <li>- LGF approval delay should be 1 month if the request does not need improvements.</li> </ul>	<p>LGF quarterly and Annual Activity reports</p>	<p>ESCOs are in a position to submit a quality technical project design and comprehensive and reliable financial analysis in accordance with guidelines. ESCO are in a position to co-finance 20% of the whole project cost (out of the financing cost) The selected FI is efficient as expected. EEF provides grants to EE projects</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--

<p><b>Outcome 4:</b> ESCO(s) are designing, financing and successfully implementing energy efficiency projects using EPC modality in at least one (1) other city in Moldova outside of Chisinau</p>	<p>EPC projects</p>	<p>EPC projects were not implemented in Moldova: no case studies or lessons learnt reports were drafted. EPC and ESCO concept (model) start from scratch.</p>	<p>10 EPC Case Studies identified and made available EPC replicated in another town/city. One short project video is made available on the EPC projects carried out by the project At least 3 EPC projects are implemented at least in one other city GUDP lessons learnt reports made widely available At least another town will have developed or started to develop a Green Urban Development Plan</p>	<p>Documents: - EPC projects and GUDP lessons learnt report - Mid-term and Final Project Review reports - Project final report</p>	<p>At least 1 other city will be willing to develop a GUDP and carry out energy-efficiency investment projects using the ESCO business model and EPC modality</p>
---	---------------------	---	--	--	---

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

Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>10</sup>)

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

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

Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>11</sup>)

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

---

<sup>9</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>10</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>11</sup> 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.

- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

#### 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

#### Project Results

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

#### 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

#### 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

ToR ANNEX C: Final Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</b>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**TE Consultant Agreement Form**

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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>12</sup> [www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct)

## ToR ANNEX E: TE Ratings

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Final Evaluation



2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

**ToR ANNEX F: TE Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Final Evaluation Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

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

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

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

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

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