

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project name:	Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Ukraine Part)
Post title:	International Consultant for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Ukraine National component of UNDP-GEF project Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region
Type of contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Assignment type:	International Consultant
Country / Duty Station:	Home Based (remote)
Expected places of travel (if applicable):	n/a (COVID-19 pandemic restrictions)
Languages required:	English, knowledge of Ukrainian (or Russian) is an asset
Starting date of assignment:	1 August 2020 – 30 September 2020
Duration of Contract:	15 working days spread over a two months period
Duration of Assignment:	15 working days spread over a two months period
Payment arrangements:	Lump-sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results)
Administrative arrangements:	The consultant is responsible for any equipment and other materials needed for the assignment.
Evaluation method:	Cumulative score, ICs were previously assessed by ACP
Application deadline:	17 July 2019

Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF Monitoring & Evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Ukraine's national component of the full-sized project titled "*Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)*" (PIMS 4309) implemented through the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, and UNDP Country Offices in respective partner countries. The project was designed to respond to the obligations incurred by participating countries (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan) under their respective HCFC phase out schedules under the

Montreal Protocol. The project was designed to improve regulatory measures to help address the accelerated HCFC phase-out in the medium and longer term, and to strengthen the preparedness for the complete phase-out of HCFCs from current use. The project document was designed to address the following two main components (regional and national):

- Component 1 (Regional information exchange and networking component), addressing barriers associated with incomplete knowledge and awareness and which is aligned with PIF Component 1; Outcomes 1(a-d) - the component to be implemented on UNDP regional level (initially out of UNDP Bratislava Regional Center, and later on from a new UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub);
- Component 2 (National capacity building and technical assistance component), targeting support to the adoption of the fully completed HCFC phase-out strategy (with selected legislative options to control HCFC import/use), capacity building and supply of analytical and servicing equipment/tools for the Environmental Inspectorate and Customs Departments and refrigeration technicians, technological conversions for solvents and rigid foams, modernization of HCFC re-use scheme in the country and demonstration of alternative technologies in refrigeration equipment and A/C sectors, pilot small-scale ODS destruction.

The national components for Belarus and Tajikistan were operationally closed in early 2017 and the component for Uzbekistan reached completion of its activities as of 31 July 2018. In Ukraine, regional Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT region project activities planned under Component-1 were successfully concluded within the above extension period. But activities planned under Component-2 were only partially complete till that date. In view of delayed implementation, the national component for Ukraine was further subject to a substantive revision approved at the Project Board meeting held on 27 April 2018 and an additional no-cost until 31 July 2020 approved by UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.

The Regional and National components have been evaluated, while this additional evaluation aimed at update of the data on Ukraine in the main terminal evaluation report by annexing the current report. Therefore, this assignment envisages only evaluation of post revision extension Ukrainian National component of UNDP-GEF project Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region Project Summary Table.

Project Title:	Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region			
GEF Project ID:	4309		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	66300	GEF financing:	3.19 (Ukraine's component)	3.19 (Ukraine's component)
Country:	Ukraine	IA/EA own:	0	0
Region:	Europe and CIS	Government:	1,35	0
Focal Area:	Ozone Layer Depletion	Other:	9,56	0
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Government adopts policy frameworks			

	and mechanisms to ensure reversal of environmental degradation; climate change mitigation and adaptation; and prevention of and response to natural and human-caused disasters.			
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	3.19 (* as per ProDoc)	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resource of Ukraine of Ukraine State Fiscal Service of Ukraine State Ecological Academy for Post-Graduate Education and Management	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		29.05.2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31.07.2020	Actual: 31.07.2020

2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Being one of the 4 (four) Implementing Agencies (IA) designated by the Multilateral Fund (MLF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) supports selected countries to implement the Montreal Protocol's ozone depleting substances (ODS) phase-out projects. In Ukraine, the UNDP, under the support

of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), is implementing the Project “Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region” to support the fulfilment of obligations incurred by Ukraine under the present phase-out schedule for HCFCs providing for the decrease in HCFC consumption to at least 99.5% below baseline levels in 2020, culminating in a completed HCFC phase-out in 2030.

A principal component of the Project is the investment programme that aims at a rapid HCFC phase-out in the manufacturing sector and include activities related to technological conversion of polyurethane foam sector in Ukraine in order to eliminate the use of the blowing agent HCFC-141b – a significant ozone depleting as well as a global warming substance – by replacing it with non-ozone depleting, low global warming potential (GWP) alternatives.

The national project component for Ukraine was designed to assist the country to return into compliance through achieving the following goals:

- A finalized and adopted HCFC accelerated phase-out strategy;
- Implementation of national level training for Environmental and Customs enforcement authorities; and
- Targeted HCFC phase out investment projects in eligible enterprises in the manufacturing sector and information exchange on emerging HCFC substitute technologies for ineligible companies

The national project in Ukraine has been implemented under UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2012-2016 in a Direct Execution Modality in close partnership with the major project counterparts, particularly the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine (Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine in present).

The originally planned project closing date was 30 July 2016. But based on specific delays in Ukraine and uneven progress with the national components in other countries, a request for 2-year project extension until 31 July 2018 was discussed and approved at the regional Project Board meeting in June 2015.

The original Project Document had 2 key components to assist the country to return to compliance and achieve HCFC phase-out goals. During the substantive project revision, conducted during 2016-2017 and approved in April 2018, only those outputs pertaining to the project Component 2 were revised as described here below.

Component 1: *Regional accelerated phase-out capacity building.* This component was successfully implemented and completed by 31 July 2018. Key outcomes of this component were achieved and evaluated, and no change or activities were planned in the project extension phase.

Component 2: *National Level Capacity Strengthening and HCFC Phase Out Investment.* This component was revised in 2018 and activities during the project extension phase include:

Output 2.1. Support for adoption of comprehensive strategy for the Montreal Protocol implementation (including awareness building program for key stakeholders such as the government authorities, public, and civil society on issues related to the Montreal Protocol

implementation and HCFC reduction obligations; ODS and ODS alternative survey to determine their consumption in Ukraine);

Output 2.2. Additional activities to ensure use of Analytical Tools for HCFC control enforcement agencies under sub-component Implementation of national level training for Environmental and Customs enforcement authorities.

Output 2.3. Completion of the investment component by including eligible enterprises in the manufacturing sector and supporting technology conversion to non-ODS low-GWP technology options.

Output 2.4. Demonstration of zero-ODS and low-GWP technology options in the servicing sector (new sub-component)

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines¹ and UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects².

The objective of the evaluation is to supplement the regional TE Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT region with National component Ukraine through assessing the achievement of the national project results, and design of lessons that can both improve the sustainability of the achieved results of the project, and assist in the overall development of UNDP's programmatic approach to improve compliance with Montreal protocol. .

4. Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method 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** (see Annex C), 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. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. Due to the COVID-19 situation, the evaluator is not expected to conduct any field missions to Ukraine. Online interviews will be held with the following organizations:

- 1) Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine
- 2) State Fiscal Service of Ukraine/State Customs Service of Ukraine

¹ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf

² <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

- 3) State Ecological Academy for Post-Graduate Education and Management Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, GEF Focal Point
- 4) Recipients of UNDP support:
 - PE “Khimpostachalnyk”
 - “PCF Advance” LLC;
 - Polyfoam LLC

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the revised project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports (Ukraine section), project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material 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 TOR Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

5. Detailed Scope of work

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

1. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the national 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 national Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the national 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 national 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.
- Review to what extent did the national project contribute to the SDGs and the UNDP Strategic Plan?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the national project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets were (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound).
- Are the national project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within the project's time frame?

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).

Project strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target ⁵	End of project target	Midterm level and assessment ⁶	Achievement rating ⁷	Justification for rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 2:							
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 analysis:

- Compare and analyze the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Final Evaluation.
- 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, identify lessons learned for future interventions;
- Make sure the data used is gender-disaggregated, whereas the progress analysis is gender-sensitive.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the national Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Color code this column only

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

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

- Is the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine (Customs) equipped with specialized and portable equipment for OSD substances identification?
- Are the downstream users technologically converted to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (water/HCOs/HFOs)?
- Did the commercial enterprises converted its technologies towards the non-ODS/ low GWP (to water/HCOs/HFO based)?
- Are the companies introduced the incoming/outgoing quality control in production cycle?
- Are the safety measures introduced by companies?
- Are the separate storage of flammable substances constructed and functioning?
- Do the capacity of laboratory staff enhanced?
- Was the market survey on the historical and predicted use of existing and new ODS alternatives, including low and high GWP alternatives and their distribution by sector and subsector carried out?
- Was the action plan adequate to deliver the envisaged result? Were the revisions to action plan well justified?
- Were the actions taken to achieve the Project goals cost effective?

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the National Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at 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 TOR Annex D.

PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

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

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

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? Were they efficient? Were they cost-effective?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Were sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the national 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 national 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 Ukraine 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.

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluator will assess the extent to which the national 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.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Ukraine. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.

Duty station

Home-based.

Travel

Not envisaged due to the COVID-19.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 32 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	10.08.2020
Evaluation (online interviews, desk review)	10 days	30.08.2020

Draft Evaluation Report	15 days	20.09.2020
Final Report	2 days	30.09.2020

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than July 30, 2020	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	No later than September 20, 2020	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft, but no later than September 30, 2020	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CANDIDATE

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

The International consultant must present the following qualifications:

- A Master's degree in chemistry, physics, engineering, environmental science, or other closely related field;
- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience on Montreal Protocol and Ozone Depleting Substances;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Experience working with the UN and GEF will be considered an asset;
- Experience on Montreal Protocol implementations in the Europe and CIS region of the project will be considered an asset;
- Fluent written and spoken English; knowledge of Russian or Ukrainian is an asset.

Core Competencies:

- Ethics and Values: Demonstrate and safeguard ethics and integrity;
- Organizational Awareness: Demonstrate corporate knowledge and sound judgment;
- Development and Innovation: Take charge of self-development and take initiative;
- Work in teams: Demonstrate ability to work in a multicultural environment and to maintain effective working relations with people of different national and cultural backgrounds;
- Communicating and Information Sharing: Facilitate and encourage open communication and strive for effective communication;
- Conflict Management: Surface conflicts and address them proactively acknowledging different feelings and views and directing energy towards a mutually acceptable solution;
- Continuous Learning and Knowledge Sharing: Encourage learning and sharing of knowledge.

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
10%	Following submission of a detailed workplan/inception report
60%	Upon submission of the draft TE report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice
30%	Upon finalization of the TE report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice

EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis **taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal.**

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (P11 desk reviews and interviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified (received minimum 70% of maximum available technical scores) for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation”.)

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Education (**maximum 10 points**): A Master’s degree in chemistry, physics, engineering, environmental science, or other closely related field – 8 points; PhD in relevant field – 10 points;

- Relevant professional experience on Montreal Protocol and Ozone Depleting Substances (**maximum 20 points**): at least 5 years – 15 points; 11 or more years – 20 points;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (**maximum 20 points**): 5 years of experience – 10 points; 6 or more years – 20 points;
- Experience working with the UN and GEF (**maximum 10 points**): no – 0 points; yes – 10 points;
- Experience on Montreal Protocol implementations in the Europe and CIS region of the project (**maximum 5 points**): no – 0 points; yes – 5 points;
- Fluent written and spoken English; knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian (**maximum 5 points**): no knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian – 0 points; knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian – 5 points.

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – maximum 30 points will be assigned to the financial proposal with the lowest price. All other proposals will be evaluated and assigned points, as per below formula: 30 points [max points available for financial proposal] x [lowest of all evaluated offered prices among responsive offers] / [evaluated price].

The proposal obtaining the overall cumulatively highest score after adding the score of the technical proposal and the financial proposal will be considered as the most compliant offer and will be awarded a contract.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Qualified candidates will be selected from the evaluation roster within the [GPN/ExpRes consolidated roster platform](#) :

- **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 (if applicable). Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- **Filled P11 form** / CV including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees (blank form can be downloaded from http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc)
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and supported by a breakdown of costs, as per Annex I template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template (can be downloaded from http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=13028). Please note that all travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.) will be reimbursed separately as per UNDP rules.
- **Incomplete applications will not be considered.** Please make sure you have provided all requested materials

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Prepared by:

Yuliya Petsyk,
Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist



Date: 29-Jul-2020

Approved by:

Manal Fouani,
Deputy Resident Representative

Manal Fouani Date: 29-Jul-2020

.

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:

Government adopts policy frameworks and mechanisms to ensure reversal of environmental degradation; climate change mitigation and adaptation; and prevention of and response to natural and human-caused disasters.

Country Programme Outcome Indicators:

Percent of national and subnational government bodies that integrate environment, DRR and climate change in development and management plans.

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):

Government adopts policy frameworks and mechanisms to ensure reversal of environmental degradation; climate change mitigation and adaptation; and prevention of and response to natural and human-caused disasters.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:

Objectives: To protect human health and the environment by assisting countries to phase out consumption and production and prevent releases of ODS according to their commitments to Montreal Protocol phase-out schedules, while enabling low-GHG (Greenhouse Gas) alternative technologies and practices.

Program:

For the period of GEF-4, the GEF will assist eligible countries in meeting their HCFC phase-out obligations under the Montreal Protocol, and strengthening capacities and institutions in those countries that still are faced with difficulties in meeting their reporting obligations.

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:

(1) HCFCs are phased-out according to Montreal Protocol schedule, or faster, in GEF-eligible countries

(2) GEF-eligible countries meet their reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:

(1) Indicators for Outcome 1:

(a) ODP adjusted tons of HCFCs phased-out from consumption (GEF-4 replenishment target: HCFCs: 50-70 ODP tons)

(b) Percentage reduction in HCFC consumption in the participating countries

(2) Indicators for Outcome 2:

(a) Percentage of GEF-funded countries that meet their reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
<i><u>Objective:</u> To achieve compliance of Ukraine with the accelerated Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out requirements through stabilization and progressive reduction of HCFC consumption.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ukraine returns to compliance with the MP obligations and sustains the status for 2020 milestone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of approved HCFC phase-out strategy; Continued institutional changes and weak institutional capacity to implement Montreal Protocol; No current information products and programs on Montreal Protocol and HCFC phase-out obligations; Lack of technical tools to test gas composition and quality as well as to limit emissions of HCFCs during equipment maintenance; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCFC phase-out strategy fully formulated and recommended for adoption and implementation; Effective regulatory instruments to control HCFC use, and thus, import of HCFCs and HCFC containing equipment in place and effectively implemented; Institutional capacity is substantially improved through regional cooperation and implementation of Stage I; Current capacities of project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of HCFC phase-out strategy as a formal government strategic document; National legal and regulatory registers Art 7 reporting to Ozone Secretariat on HCFC import and monitoring of HCFC import reduction; Project Progress and M/E reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall government commitment and assumption of appropriate responsibility; Regulatory enforcement resources and capacity available; Project stakeholders actively participate in the project implementation and realization of HCFC phase-out strategy;

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited exposure to alternative technologies in manufacturing sector; • Large number of GEF ineligible manufacturing enterprises (MLF cut-off date) 	strengthened through capacity building, knowledge exchange platforms on new technological developments and investment support for eligible enterprises in manufacturing sector.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate monitoring and reporting.
<i>Outcome 2: National level phase-out capacity building</i>					

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
<i>Outcome 2 (c – Ukraine): HPMP, National Level Capacity Strengthening and HCFC Phase Out Investment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trained working level Environmental and Customs enforcement officials using resources (trainers and training materials) from Component 1 with respect to legislation, regulations, and customs controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Government stakeholders as well as working level officials have limited awareness of HCFC phase-out issue, challenges to address it and skills/tools to enforce HCFC control measures in practice; • Lack of portable HCFC analytical equipment; • Limited active educational efforts or tools are available; • No current information products and programs • Illegal trade in ODS continues unregistered and unnoticed; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of HCFC control issues into curricula of Environmental and Customs' training institutions; • Well informed enforcement stakeholder community engaged in addressing HCFC phase-out issue with required level of understanding and technical capacity; • State Fiscal Service of Ukraine (Customs) is equipped with basic portable analytical instrumentation; • HCFC and HCFC equipment import quota system(s) are enforced to return the country into compliance; • HCFC imports are appropriately registered and reported to NOU; • Illegal trade is registered and stopped at entry points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepared and registered educational curricula • Attendance at training information sessions and events • Customs reporting information • Procurement documents on supply of equipment • Project Progress and M/E reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interagency coordination (Ministry of Education is supportive of changes to curricula) is sustainable through high-level Government support • Sustaining interest and capacity in educational institutions to maintain educational programs • Active participation and partnership with education institutions and large scale attendance of training events

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted HCFC Phase-out Investment Program and Demonstration projects 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of blending operation conversion to non-ODS/very low GWP alternative (water/HCOs/HFOs) at Private Company Khimpostachalnyk ("Khimpostachalnyk") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Khimpostachalnyk (system house) and its downstream users continue to depend on HCFC-141b in polyol blending and consumption; Alternative technologies are scarcely available to the company, and its downstream clients, for access and transfer, not tested at the facility and lack processing and safety instrumentation for practical introduction; No current information products and programs on information dissemination related to the proposed alternative technologies in the manufacturing sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Khimpostachalnyk and its downstream users are technologically converted to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (water/HCOs/HFOs) HCFC use at Khimpostachalnyk stopped and company committed not to use HCFCs any longer Technical staff is knowledgeable on correct use of new technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement documents on supply of equipment Mission and site visits reports of international and national consultants Company's written commitments to stop usage of HCFCs in manufacturing processes Project Progress and M/E reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP requires regular reporting and conducts monitoring of equipment use Supplied equipment is adequately maintained and used by company Company continues to co-finance the project as specified in the co-finance commitments

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Implementation of a PU foam conversion to water/HCOs/HFOs (non-ODS/very low GWP blowing agent) at PCF Advance LLC ("Advance")</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advance (spray foam manufacturing) depends on HCFC-141b in its manufacturing processes; • Alternative technologies are scarcely available to the company for access and transfer, not tested at the facility and lack processing and safety instrumentation for practical introduction; • Spray foam manufactured by the company continues to be produced with HCFC-141b in foam insulation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advance technologically converted to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (water/HCOs/HFOs) • HCFC use at Advance stopped and company committed not to use HCFCs any longer • Technical staff is knowledgeable on correct use of new technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement documents on supply of equipment • Mission and site visits reports of international and national consultants • Company's written commitments to stop usage of HCFCs in manufacturing processes • Project Progress and M/E reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP requires regular reporting and conducts monitoring of equipment use • Supplied equipment is adequately maintained and used by company • Company continues to co-finance the project as specified in the co-finance commitments

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Demonstration project in servicing sector</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large use of HCFC-22 in servicing sector especially in domestic airconditioners and commercial refrigerators ; • Alternative technologies are scarcely available to the company for access and transfer, not tested at the facility and lack processing and safety instrumentation for practical introduction • Refrigeration equipment continues to use HCFC-22 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial enterprises retrofits a few of its equipment to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (to hydrocarbons based); • HCFC use at such enterprises reduced and company decides to further convert all HCFC based equipment to non-ODS/ low GWP technology; • Technical staff is knowledgeable on correct use of new technology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement documents on supply of equipment; • Mission and site visits reports of international and national consultants; • Company's written commitments to stop usage of HCFCs in manufacturing processes; • Project Progress and M/E reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP requires regular reporting and conducts monitoring of equipment use; • Supplied equipment is adequately maintained and used by company; • Company continues to co-finance the project as specified in the co-finance commitments.

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Awareness building program for Government authorities and other key stakeholders on issues related to the Montreal Protocol and HCFC reduction obligations</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low awareness about the Montreal Protocol and HCFC phase-out schedule in Government sector, and public in general • Inter-agency coordination to address HCFC phase-out is limited; • Low level of awareness related to technologies for HCFC phase-out and linkages with energy efficiency; • Due to lack of awareness inter agency coordination is poor and project implementation might lack wider support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-agency coordination related to HCFC phase-out is improved • Main stakeholders are informed about HCFC phase-out strategy and regulatory measures related to HCFC import and use control • Widely accessible information on HCFC phase-out strategy and its elements; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification of training records; • Monitoring of press and media coverage; • Project Progress and M/E reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government commitment to timely processing of required HCFC action plan and regulations • Art 7 compliance reporting to Ozone Secretariat • Interagency coordination is sustainable through high-level Government support

<i>Project Strategy</i>	<i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Sources of verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
	<i>Output 2c.6 (new activity) – HCFC and HCFC alternative survey in Ukraine</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data discrepancy about HCFC consumption as reported in the country program report and consumption stated by industry players • Lack of awareness about HFC and other HCFC alternatives availability and usage in Ukraine • Possibility of illegal import resulting in higher amount of HCFC availability in the country 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key objective of this study will be to develop a national inventory of HCFCs/HFCs/other ODS alternatives that are imported, used and banked in Ukraine, to estimate current and projected levels of HCFC/HFC use and emissions and to survey and report on the historical and predicted use of existing and new ODS alternatives, including low and high GWP alternatives and their distribution by sector and subsector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internationally approved methodology is adopted for this survey • National consultant has access to all required sources of data for detailed survey

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

1. PIF
 2. UNDP Initiation Plan
 3. UNDP Project Document (original and revised)
 4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
 5. Project Inception Report
 6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
 7. Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the project
 8. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm GEF Climate Change Mitigation Tracking Tool (https://www.thegef.org/documents/tracking_tools)
 9. Oversight mission reports
 10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
 11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
- The following documents will also be available:
12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
 13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
 14. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
 15. Project site location maps

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

ANNEX D: EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation will at 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.

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

ANNEX E: GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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 Manual⁸)

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 rated⁹)

Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁹ 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.

- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

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
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Relevant final stage GEF Tracking Tool
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX F: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹⁰

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

¹⁰www.unevaluation.org/unevaluateofconduct

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____