



Job Title: International Consultant for Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project

Project title: De-risking and Scaling-up Investment in Energy Efficient Building Retrofits

Contract Modality: Individual Contract (IC)

Duration: 5 weeks (22 consultancy days)

Start date 04 September 2020

Duty station: Yerevan, Armenia (home based)

Interim Evaluation Terms of Reference for UNDP-supported GCF-financed project

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project titled “*De-risking and Scaling-up Investment in Energy Efficient Building Retrofits*” (PIMS#5684) implemented through the *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)*, which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started on the 6/30/2017 and is in its 3rd year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation. *The ToR considers COVID-19 country context, situation and details of impact on project implementation.*

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Objective and Brief Description: The Project objective is to use an integrated suite of interventions to systematically decarbonise the existing building stock to realise both energy savings and sustainable development benefits. The project will create a favourable market environment and scalable business model for investment in energy efficiency retrofits, leading to sizeable energy savings and accompanying GHG emission reductions (directly, 1.4 million tCO₂ over the 20-year lifetime of the investments; including additional indirect savings, a total of between 4.2-4.4 tCO₂eq). It will also catalyse additional private and public sector financing of approximately US\$ 100 million.

The project has four components as indicated below:

Component 1: Establishment of Building Sector MRV: Provision of technical assistance to establish and implement energy measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems for the building sector for various categories of buildings.

Component 2: Policy de-risking: Provision of technical assistance to: (i) national, sub-national and local authorities to adopt and implement an enabling policy framework for EE retrofits using UNDP's framework to support policy-makers in selecting public instruments to promote renewable energy investment; (ii) support on-going legislative reform; and (iii) building owners, associations and energy service companies on legal matters related to energy efficiency.

Component 3: Financial de-risking: Provision of technical assistance to banks, financial institutions and local banks in developing and implementing financial instruments to finance EE retrofits in private and public owned buildings.

Component 4: Financial Incentives: Provision of financial incentives (ex-post capital grants) to low-income households and public building administrators to invest in EE retrofits.

Location: Republic of Armenia

Project Duration: 6 years, 2017-2023

Total Budget: USD 116,070,0001, including GCF grant USD 20,000,000; UNDP (cash) USD 420,000; UNDP (parallel) USD 1,000,000; Government (Ministry of Environment) USD 400,000; Yerevan Municipality USD 8,000,000; EIB 86,250,000.

Partners: Project is implemented by UNDP under coordination of the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Armenia (RA). The main beneficiary of the Project is the Yerevan Municipality.

Funds: The Project is funded by the GCF and co-financed by the Government of the RA and UNDP.

Citing the necessity to contain the further spread of a potentially deadly COVID-19, the RA Government declared a state of emergency on 16 March 2020, introducing a range of limitations for Armenian citizens and prohibiting entry into the country for foreigners. The emergency situation will last until at least 12 August 2020 with travel restrictions (more details are available here: <https://www.gov.am/en/covid-travel-restrictions/>).

In regards to the GCF funded Project, the impact of the COVID-19 is as follows:

1. Project has planned trainings, workshops and events as well as awareness raising events, which are either postponed or shifted to online mode. All the site visits, as well as in person meetings and round tables with financial institutions, construction/ESCO companies and other stakeholders planned for this period are cancelled, the ones linked to the upcoming construction activities are at risk. As currently the project is mainly dealing with technical revisions of documents submitted by construction companies and communities and field works are not active, the movement restrictions are manageable. The existing and well established online solutions allow partial mitigation of the negative effects of the halted activities, and the substantial part of the non-field related works is ensured by virtual communication through emails, zoom, skype, WebEx meetings.

2. Because of the travel restrictions the Project is undergoing planned Independent Technical Review (as per the FAA condition) using online platforms to conduct interviews with stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries. This remote modality is decreasing efficiency and increasing time needed to complete the review, however, it is considered the only way for now.

3. According to official data the construction activities during quarter 1-2, 2020 contracted by 51% compared to the previous year's same month. At the same time the government is considering capital investments in infrastructure as the main driver of the post covid recovery and is planning to allocate substantial budgetary contributions to the construction sector, which is expected to create favorable conditions for the Project implementation.

3. There is no impact on the Co-financing commitments, although disbursement schedules for co-financing may be re-adjusted in line with the impacted schedule for implementation of the Funded Activities due to COVID-19. Securing of co-financing by the MAB households and private sector may potentially be impacted due to the overall worsening of socio-economic conditions.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The Interim Evaluation will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The project is impacted by COVID-19 and the impact may also have to be taken into account in the Interim Evaluation.

The Interim Evaluation team will assess implementation of the project and its alignment with Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) obligations and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. The Interim Evaluation will also assess the following:

- Implementation and adaptive management
- Risks to sustainability
- Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities;
- Gender equity;
- Country ownership of projects and programmes;
- Innovativeness in results areas (extent to which interventions may lead to paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development pathways);
- Replication and scalability – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporated in independent evaluation); and
- Unexpected results, both positive and negative.
- Risks arising from the current COVID-19 pandemic and impact on the project may also need to be considered in the evaluation.

4. INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The methodology will combine quantitative and qualitative approaches. The Evaluator will collect hard data from the desk review process and verify them with soft data from interviews. The Evaluation will be based on the findings and factual statements identified from review of relevant documents and interviews. Due to emergency situation in Armenia and travel restrictions during COVID-19 pandemic, in country mission will be replaced with virtual interviews with stakeholders, including the target beneficiaries, government officials (both at the national and municipal levels). Participation of stakeholders in the Evaluation should be maintained at all the times, reflecting opinions, expectations and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives. Additionally, National Consultant will be recruited in support to the International Consultant. In the time of COVID-19 pandemic, the National Consultant will support with certain field visits, e.g. visit the retrofitted buildings.

Data Collection Methods¹:

Desk Review

The Evaluator will review the following documents before conducting any interviews: project documentation, progress reports, work plans, mission reports, monitoring data, workshop reports, UNDP's data etc.

The Interim Evaluation team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The Interim Evaluation team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

Interview with project stakeholders and beneficiaries

The Interim Evaluation team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The review team will conduct interviews with key project stakeholders as identified in the UNDP-GCF Project Document.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Interim Evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the Interim Evaluation team is expected to conduct online interviews and meetings with stakeholders via virtual communication tools, eg. Zoom. And the National Consultant is expected to conduct field missions to project sites in retrofitted public and residential buildings in Armenia, exact locations to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the Interim Evaluation team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the Interim Evaluation report.

As of 11 March 2020, The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. From 16 March 2020, Armenian Government announced the emergency situation and travel in the country is also restricted.

¹ All data collected and analysed should be sex-disaggregated.

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following four 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 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 Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews 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 its 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.

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Was the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?

- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project applies adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and 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 ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Fund Level Impact:	Indicator:							
Outcome 1:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Etc.								

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 and outputs analysis:

- 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.
- Review risks arising from the current COVID-19 pandemic and impact on the project implementation

iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- 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.

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

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

- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are 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.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference 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.
- Does 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 Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?
- Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: 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?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
 - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks ⁸ (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
- Assess the efficiency, timeliness, and adequacy of reporting requirements.

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.

v. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, APRs 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 GCF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors,

⁸ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

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 on 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.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

vi. Country Ownership

- To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- What level and types of involvement for all Is the project as implemented responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

vii. Gender equity

- Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?
- How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

- What role has the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country

context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the project’s ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

x. Replication and Scalability

- What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints?
- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The Interim Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary.

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The Interim Evaluation team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *Interim Evaluation Ratings and Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Interim Evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (“De-risking and Scaling-up Investment in Energy Efficient Building Retrofits”)

Measure	Interim Evaluation Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	

	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be approximately **(22)** working days over a time period of **(5) weeks**, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing Interim Evaluation Inception Report	3	03 September 2020
Interim Evaluation virtual meetings and interviews with stakeholders.	10	17 September 2020
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the Interim Evaluation at the end of the virtual interviews/meetings period	1	18 September 2020
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the presentation of initial findings)	5	25 September 2020
Finalization of Interim Evaluation report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	3	30 September 2020

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. INTERIM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Interim Evaluation Inception Report	Interim Evaluation team clarifies objectives and methods of the evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before the virtual mission	Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management

2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of virtual interviews/meetings	Interim Evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Interim Evaluation Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the virtual mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
4	Final Interim Evaluation Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final Interim Evaluation report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. INTERIM EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this Interim Evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's Interim Evaluation is the UNDP Country Office.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Interim Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the Interim Evaluation - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National Consultant, from the country of the project. The consultants 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 selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education

- A Master's degree in (*Economics, Energy, Environment, Climate Change*), or other closely related field.

Experience

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to (*Energy Efficiency/Climate Change finance/Energy Efficiency in Buildings*);
- Experience in evaluating projects in similar sector and with similar complexity;
- Experience working in (CIS countries, especially in South Caucasus Regions);
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Knowledge of and/or experience with UNDP-GCF;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

10. ETHICS

This Interim Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The Interim Evaluation team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The Interim Evaluation team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the Interim Evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the Interim Evaluation process must also be solely used for the Interim Evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft Interim Evaluation report
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final Interim Evaluation report and approval by the Commissioning Unit, Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) and Principal Technical Advisor (PTA) – via signatures on the Interim Evaluation Report Clearance form) and completed Audit Trail

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **CV shall include Education/Qualification, Professional Certification, Employment Records /Experience**
- b) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

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

⁹ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team

1. Funding Proposal
2. Funding Activity Agreement
3. GCF Refocusing Note
4. Independent Technical Review Report
5. UNDP Project Document
6. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
7. Project Inception Report
8. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
9. Monitoring and Standard Progress reports
10. Mission reports
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
12. The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Evaluation reports, including Independent Country Programme Evaluation and UNDAF evaluation
18. Results Framework Reporting of the UNDP Results Oriented Analysis Report

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report¹⁰

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
 - Interim Evaluation time frame and date of report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Interim Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, Interim Evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations
 - Structure of the Interim Evaluation report
3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list

¹⁰ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Relevance
 - 4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency
 - 4.4 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.6 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
 - 4.7 Country Ownership
 - 4.8 Innovativeness in results areas
 - 4.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative
 - 4.10 Replication and Scalability
 - 4.11 Gender Equity
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - Conclusions
 - 5.1
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Interim Evaluation's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - Recommendations
 - 5.2
 - 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
6. Annexes
 - Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed Interim Evaluation Report Clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim Evaluation report

ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the Inception Report and as an Annex to the Interim Evaluation report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(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 evaluation, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
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? How is the impact of COVID-19 addressed?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

Interim Evaluation 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: _____

¹¹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
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.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
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.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
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 Midterm Review
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: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit, RTA and PTA included in the final report)

Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Principal Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be listed as an annex in the final report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on *(date)* from the Interim Evaluation of (*“De-risking and Scaling-up Investment in Energy Efficient Building Retrofits” UNDP-GCF Project*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #5684*)

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

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft report	Interim Evaluation team response and actions taken