



Final Evaluation of the UNDP Project:
Home Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions (HOUSES) -
An Action within the EE4U Programme
[Project Number: ENI/2018/396-961; Project ID: 00103123; Award ID: 00099918]

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared By:
Dr Jeff Fang
International Consultant

August 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	I
LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS.....	II
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION.....	6
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION	6
1.2 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	7
PHASE 1 - DESK REVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION (23 JUNE TO 12 JULY 2021):	8
PHASE 2 - DATA COLLECTION (13 JULY TO 9 AUGUST 2021)	8
PHASE 3 - DRAFT AND FINALISATION OF EVALUATION REPORT (10 TO 20 AUGUST 2021):	9
1.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS.....	9
1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT	12
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT.....	13
2.1 PROJECT START AND DURATION	13
2.2 PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS	13
2.3 IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT	14
2.4 BASELINE AND EXPECTED RESULT TARGETS ESTABLISHED	16
2.5 MAIN STAKEHOLDERS.....	18
3. FINDINGS.....	18
3.1 PROJECT DESIGN.....	18
3.1.1 Project Document (PRODOC) Formulation	18
3.1.2 Analysis of Logical Framework (Project Logic/Strategy and Indicators).....	18
3.1.3 Risks and Assumptions	19
3.1.4 Lessons from Other Relevant Projects Incorporated into Project Design	19
3.1.5 Planned Stakeholder Participation	19
3.1.6 Replication Approach	20
3.1.7 Management Arrangements.....	20
3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	21
3.2.1 Adaptive Management	21
3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements.....	22
3.2.3 Project Finance.....	23
3.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Activities Used for Adaptive Management	24
3.2.5 Implementing Agency	26
3.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT RESULTS.....	27
3.3.1 Overall Results	27
3.3.2 Relevance	30
3.3.3 Effectiveness.....	31
3.3.4 Efficiency	33
3.3.5 Ownership	35
3.3.6 Sustainability.....	35
3.3.7 Impact	36
3.3.8 Basic Human Needs / Gender Equality	37
3.3.9 Synergy.....	38
4. KEY SUCCESS STORY: MOBILISING HOME OWNERS THROUGH HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATIONS TO IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF APARTMENT RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITIES.....	39

5. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	41
5.1 CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED.....	41
Conclusion #1: The UNDP HOUSES Project has demonstrated that Ukrainian home-owners can be mobilised to establish their HOAs, given the right knowledge and tools.	41
Conclusion #2: External circumstances and economical challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic prevented HOAs from triggering energy efficiency improvements and other capital/modernisation works in their residential buildings	41
Conclusion #3: The HOUSES Project has the potential to be replicated and scaled up across Ukraine if there is the right environment with favourable conditions for HOAs to succeed and thrive to bring benefits to local communities.	42
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	43
ANNEXES.....	45
A.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	45
A.2 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED.....	59
A.4 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	61
A.5 LIST OF QUESTIONS USED DURING THE EVALAUTION.....	62
A.6 EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM.....	66
A.7 AUDIT TRAIL.....	67
A.8 EVALUATION MATRIX.....	68

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge people and organisations that helped and supported directly and indirectly in this final evaluation.

I am very thankful to UNDP Ukraine Regional Development Programme Team (Dr. Mustafa Sait-Ametov) and UNDP Ukraine Country Office (Ms Lesia Shyshko, Ms Maria Gutsman) for coordinating/organising all the stakeholder meetings and providing the comprehensive list of documentation.

I am very grateful to the National Counterparts of the Government of Ukraine (Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, EEF) for their support, time and openness during the evaluation.

I thank the UNDP Ukraine HOUSES Project Team and UNDP Ukraine Country Office staff for their close cooperation and support.

Many other stakeholder interviewees (UNDP Ukraine regional coordinators, local municipalities, HOAs, Associations of HOAs, EU, IFC, GIZ, resource centres) were very helpful in meeting and sharing their views, ideas and perspectives. All of them added great value to this evaluation.

LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

CO	Country Office
COVID-19	SARS-COV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2)
CPD	Country Programme Document (2018-2022)
DEU	Delegation of the European Union
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DRR	UNDP Deputy Resident Representative
EE	Energy Efficiency
EEF	Energy Efficiency Fund
EE4U	Energy Efficiency Support Programme for Ukraine
EU	European Union
FE	Final Evaluation
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HBC	House Building Cooperative
HOA	Home Owners Association
HQ	Headquarters
HOUSES	Home Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
IFC	International Finance Corporation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MTR	Mid-Term Review
Oblast	An administrative region in Ukraine
PRODOC	Project Document
PB	Project Board
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the result of the final evaluation mission which took place from 23 June to 23 August 2021. It was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations’.

1. Project Summary Table

Project Title	Home Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions (HOUSES) - An Action within the EE4U Programme (HOUSES Project)		
ATLAS Business Unit, Award #, Project ID	Business Unit: UNDP Ukraine Project Number: ENI/2018/396-961; Project ID: 00103123; Award ID: 00099918		
Country:	Ukraine	Date project manager commenced:	February 2019 Note: The functions of the Project Manager (HOUSES Project Team Leader) were duly performed by the UNDP Ukraine Regional Development Programme prior to the commencement of the HOUSES Project Team Leader.
Region:	Eastern Europe	Planned closing date:	30-09-2020
Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date:	26-10-2018	If revised, proposed closing date:	31-07-2021
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:	UNDP Ukraine		
Other project partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National partners - Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, EE4U • Development partner (Donor) - EU • International partners - IFC, GIZ 		
Project Financing			
<i>At Senior Management/Executive Board Level endorsement (EUR\$)</i>			
[1] UNDP contribution:	EUR\$4,000,000 (funded by EU)		
[2] Government:	In-kind contributions and support		
[3] Other partners:	In-kind contributions and support		
<i>Actual Expenditure at Final Evaluation (EUR\$)</i>			
Project Total Costs	EUR\$3,774,348 (As of 31 March 2021)		
	Note: The stated actual expenditure figures are for up to 31 March 2021. The final actual expenditure figures up to 31 July 2021 are reported to be full utilisation of the project budget (subjected to final reconciliation).		

2. Project Description in Brief

The UNDP Ukraine was called upon by the EU to contribute, through technical assistance, to the improvement of the Ukrainian housing stock energy efficiency. In the context of the HOUSES project, UNDP Ukraine will:

- provide interventions for a period of 34 months to stimulate and support the creation of HOAs through a local presence
- prepare the HOAs to seek and obtain financing for their home improvement projects.
- utilise its country-wide network of partnerships with regional and local governments, and its long-standing experience of citizens mobilisation for common action, including the creation of HOAs.

The HOUSES Project therefore addresses this development challenge by drawing from the experiences, lessons learned and more importantly the network relationships, infrastructure and local resources from two previous UNDP Ukraine projects:

- “EU-UNDP Community Development Approach to Local Development” (CBA) Project (2008 to 2017)
- “Municipal Governance and Sustainable Development Programme” Project (2002 to 2013)

The HOUSES Project was launched in October 2018 with the aim to mobilise the Ukrainian homeowners to establish their HOAs and trigger energy efficiency improvements in their residential buildings. Funded by the EU with an approved budget of 4 million Euros, the HOUSES Project specifically supports the creation and capacity development of HOAs at local level throughout the country, and the HOAs’ preparation to apply for financing to the EEF.

In order to achieve the above aim, two outputs are expected from the HOUSES Project:

- Output 1: Home owners are mobilised to organise themselves into HOAs.
- Output 2: Developed capacities of HOAs in housing stock management, renovations/EE retrofitting planning and resource mobilisation

3. Evaluation Rating Table

HOUSES PRODOC	Achievement Rating ^a
Output 1: Home owners are mobilised to organise themselves into HOAs Outcome 1: Increased homeowners’ engagement in housing stock management and renovations	6/6 (Highly Satisfactory - No Shortcomings)
Output 2: Developed capacities of HOAs in housing stock management, renovations/EE retrofitting planning and resource mobilisation Outcome 2: Quality and sustainable energy efficiency solutions identified by trained HOAs and financed by EEF	6/6 (Highly Satisfactory - No Shortcomings)

Note:

a. Evaluation Rating:

6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings

5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings

4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings

3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings

2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings

1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings

Evaluation Ratings:			
Category	Rating^b	Category	Rating^b
Relevance	S	Ownership	S
Effectiveness	S	Basic Human Needs/Gender Equality	S
Efficiency	S	Synergy	S
Impact	S		

Note:

b. Evaluation Rating:

6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings

5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings

4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings

3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings

2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings

1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings

Sustainability Rating:	
Category	Rating^c
Sustainability	ML

Note:

c. Sustainability Rating:

4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability

3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks

2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks

1. Unlikely (U): severe risks

4. Summary of Conclusions and Lessons Learned

CONCLUSION	LESSONS LEARNED
<p>Conclusion #1: The UNDP HOUSES Project has demonstrated that Ukrainian home-owners can be mobilised to establish their HOAs, given the right knowledge and tools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional knowledge must be preserved and made available for other Ukrainian home-owners to draw from • The virtual/face-to-face exchange tours and experience-sharing platforms proved extremely useful. National/regional/local authorities and local communities were able to witness the successes and benefits of setting up HOAs to manage the multi-apartment building and implementing energy efficient solutions in their residential buildings. • HOAs' role in improving and sustaining the well-being of residents and communities provides a compelling impactful narrative on how HOAs could be a platform to address broader societal and environmental issues in the housing and communal sector
<p>Conclusion #2: External circumstances and economical challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic prevented HOAs from triggering energy efficiency improvements and other capital/modernisation works in their residential buildings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setting up of HOA is the first step while continuous follow-up support and motivation to help HOAs function in any circumstances efficiently and effectively is critical • Newly created HOAs need ongoing support to start functioning incrementally on small-scale capital/modernisation works with close follow-up support and co-financing support. This will help them gain confidence and experience to take on large-scale capital/modernisation works

CONCLUSION	LESSONS LEARNED
<p>Conclusion #3: The HOUSES Project has the potential to be replicated and scaled up across Ukraine if there is the right environment with favourable conditions for HOAs to succeed and thrive to bring benefits to local communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong endorsement/support from national/regional/local authorities combined with strong commitment and participation from home owners in multi-apartment buildings are key to accelerate the creation and functioning of HOAs and achieve sustainable results • The successful incorporation and sustainability of well-functioning HOAs would depend on the legislation and regulations that could set the right environment and favourable conditions for HOAs to thrive in • Replication of knowledge/operational capabilities and strengthened capacities of institutional infrastructure (local resource centres, energy efficiency technology support centres, legal aid services, association of HOAs, apartment building management companies) needed to support/sustain the effective and efficient creation and functioning of HOAs

5. Recommendations

The evaluation proposes 5 recommendations in relation to proposed future directions to build upon the HOUSES Project. By doing so, this will further replicate and upscale with a significant contribution to:

- an increased public awareness of energy efficiency in the housing sector across Ukraine
- improved quality and transparency of the housing stock management and maintenance, and therefore to a higher energy efficiency compliance, of Ukraine’s housing stock
- a positive impact on living standards, through improved quality of housing and reduced economic burden of energy usage costs on households

It is to be noted that the implementation of these recommendations would be dependent on the funding availability for UNDP Ukraine.

R1: Strengthen outcomes indicators and exit strategies in future project design and formulation

For future project design and formulation, UNDP Ukraine should include:

- outcomes-based performance targets to balance expected results with outcome-oriented indicators to better assess the project effectiveness
- Specific activities that incorporate exit strategies to sustain future mobilisation of home owners associations after the project is completed

R2: Improve synergies with other UNDP-led Ukraine projects/programmes to maximise collective results

UNDP Ukraine could strengthen synergies by enabling collaborations and cooperations among other UNDP-led projects with similar portfolios and outcomes to maximise impact and efficiently allocate resources to achieve collective results effectiveness.

R3: Communicate project results with focus on benefits and impacts on societal and community well-being

To strengthen the communications of the project results, UNDP Ukraine should focus on reporting and presenting the project’s outcome-based benefits and impacts of having HOAs on the societal and community well-being. By doing so, the project would enable international donors, national/regional/local authorities and local communities to better understand the positive changes to beneficiaries made by project interventions.

R4: Consolidate institutional knowledge for HOAs into one primary source

For ease of access to all institutional knowledge on HOAs, UNDP Ukraine could consolidate all institutional knowledge into a single one-stop-shop platform. This could include the information brochures and booklets on legislations and regulations for HOAs, the set-up and continuous management of HOAs, training materials, best practice manuals, video links on HOAs, FAQs.

R5: Rollout and scale-up the HOUSES Project across 24 Regions in Ukraine

In the future of any stakeholder approval, it is strongly recommended that UNDP Ukraine should continue to scale-up from its HOUSES Project model across 24 regions in Ukraine and to be a long-term project (4 to 5 years) to embed the results effectiveness. This should be done by working in close partnership with relevant partners at national, regional and local levels. Building from the current HOUSES Project activities, there should be further integrated activities:

- R5.1) Harmonisation/amalgamation and strengthening of the legislations and regulations to enhance HOAs with the right environment and favourable conditions to thrive in
- R5.2) Organise study exchange/experience-sharing visits, in other countries of similar context and/or culture to Ukraine, for increased exposure to acquiring knowledge/application of best practices in HOAs
- R5.3) Strengthen the institutional infrastructures (local resource centres, energy efficiency technology support centres, legal aid services, association of HOAs, apartment building management companies) at different regions to support and sustain HOAs
- R5.4) Implement awareness and information campaign at national and regional levels to reach out to a wider population community, especially to the smaller towns and the rural regions
- R5.5) Disburse micro grants for HOAs to work on small modernisation capital or “greening” projects

1. INTRODUCTION

This Evaluation Report covers the Final Evaluation (FE) of the UNDP Ukraine project entitled “Home Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions (HOUSES) - An Action within the EE4U Programme” (HOUSES Project). The FE will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’.

The HOUSES Project has a duration of 34 months (1 October 2018 to 31 July 2021) at an approved budget of 4 million Euros. Following its final year of project implementation in 2021, the HOUSES Project is now required to undergo a FE.

1.1 Purpose of the Final Evaluation

As outlined in the HOUSES PRODOC, a FE is required upon completion of implementation and to be conducted by an independent third party, in consultation with UNDP and HOUSES Project stakeholders/beneficiaries at national and local levels.

The main objectives of the FE are to assess the:

- efficacy of the HOUSES Project design
- relevance of the HOUSES Project outputs, specific contributions and impact
- efficiency and effectiveness of the HOUSES Project’s approach
- sustainability of the interventions of the HOUSES Project

The purpose of the evaluation is to study the:

- mobilisation of the Ukrainian population of home-owners to trigger energy efficiency improvements in their housing buildings
- creation and capacity development of HOAs at the local level and their preparation to apply for financing to the EEF

It is further noted that significant challenges were encountered during the HOUSES Project implementation due to the country’s COVID-19 pandemic restrictions imposed by the Government of Ukraine.

In view of the above context and circumstances faced by the HOUSES Project, the FE will assess on project results and experiences as well as key challenges met, lessons learnt, and areas for improvement. This will be done through the questions of the following evaluation criteria as outlined in the TOR: (1) Relevance, (2) Effectiveness, (3) Efficiency, (4) Sustainability, (5) Impact.

Additionally, in accordance with UNDP evaluation guidelines on evaluating cross-cutting issues, the FE will also assess to the extent possible the evaluation criteria of (6) Basic Human Needs (Human Rights), (7) Gender Equality, (8) Ownership and (9) Synergy.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

As stated in the TOR, the HOUSES PRODOC required a FE to conduct a decentralised final project evaluation “*to provide project teams and stakeholders with an account of results received at the time of the reporting, assess project progress against initial plans, project documents, highlight important lessons learnt, demonstrate the sustainability of the results and ownership of the project by the beneficiaries.*”

The scope of the FE covered all activities undertaken in the framework of the HOUSES project. Given the nature of the evaluation, the Evaluator would:

- review the entire duration of project implementation (1 October 2018 to 31 July 2021), focusing on project results and experiences as well as key challenges met, lessons learnt, and areas for improvement
- compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project’s objectives
- draw lessons learnt and provide clear recommendations for similar initiatives in Ukraine.

The evaluability of the HOUSES Project was guided by the UNDP IEO’s evaluation guidelines on conducting evaluations during COVID-19¹ which utilizes the principle of “do no harm”. The evaluation was also conducted with the safety and mental well-being of UNDP staff, consultants, stakeholders and communities as paramount.

As this evaluation was purely conducted remotely without support from local/national evaluation consultants, there were challenges and limitations in data availability and data collection.

Furthermore, there were limited and constrained validation of results through desk reviews without sufficient data to triangulate, and without observation and limited contact with beneficiaries even with virtual stakeholder interviews.

To mitigate the above challenges and limitations of remote evaluations, the evaluation utilised the UNDP IEO’s evaluation guidelines on conducting desk review and data collection during COVID-19. This would include:²

- exploring a wider range of documentation for extended desk reviews, including internal operational data, national reports and data, evaluation reports by UN agencies and donors
- consultation with other external evaluators who are conducting similar evaluations in Ukraine
- preparing key informants by providing key questions/talking points prior to commencing any remote interviews/focus groups
- evaluation analysis should focus on whether what is being done is the “right” thing to do instead of measuring results

Based on the objectives and scope of the evaluation assignment as outlined in the TOR, the evaluation methodology was conducted in three phases namely:

- Phase 1 - Desk Review of Documentation
- Phase 2 - Data Collection
- Phase 3 - Draft and Finalisation of Evaluation Report

¹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO), 2020, Evaluation Guidelines - Evaluations During COVID-19: Data Collection, Remote Interviews and Use of National Consultants (June 2020)

² UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO), 2020, Evaluation Guidelines - Evaluations During COVID-19: Data Collection, Remote Interviews and Use of National Consultants (June 2020)

Phase 1 - Desk Review of Documentation (23 June to 12 July 2021):

Prior to Phase 2, the Evaluator would review a wide variety of documents covering project design, implementation progress, monitoring, amongst others such as annual progress and monitoring reports, minutes from PB meetings, work plans, technical documents, implementing partner agreements, capacity building/training materials and other materials related to the HOUSES Project activities.

A virtual inception and planning meeting was held between the Evaluator and UNDP staff with in-depth knowledge of the HOUSES Project who:

- have historical knowledge of the HOUSES Project
- are currently implementing the HOUSES Project
- can ensure the correct data is identified to address the evaluation questions.

Expected Deliverable #1: Inception Report (including Evaluation Matrix) - 10 to 15 pages

Phase 2 - Data Collection (13 July to 9 August 2021)

Data collection comprised virtual interviews and virtual focus group discussions (FGDs) with key informants (FGD) for the gathering, verification and analysis of the evaluation required data.

Virtual consultations in the form of semi-structured interviews and FGDs were conducted with a wide range of key stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Conducted in English and assisted by translators, the virtual consultations enabled the Evaluator to understand about the experiences, feelings, hopes, views and opinions expressed in the words of the respondents on the HOUSES Project activities. This included conversations focusing on capturing the essence, meaning or significance of the experiences of respondents within their environment.

The order of sequence for the interview/focus group questions was flexible and dynamic, and allowed follow-up questions to clarify. Triangulation of results such as comparing information from different sources like documentation and interviews, or interviews on the same subject with different stakeholders, were used to corroborate or verify the evidence collected.

Participants for the semi-structured interviews and FGDs included:

- UNDP CO staff
- UNDP Regional Development Programme staff
- UNDP HOUSES project team including 24 regional coordinators
- National partners - Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, EEF
- Development partner (Donor) - EU (represented by the EU Delegation to Ukraine)
- International partners - IFC, GIZ
- Beneficiaries - HOAs, Associations of HOAs, Local Municipalities/City Councils, Resource Centres

The Evaluator organised one virtual Stakeholder Workshop meeting with the UNDP HOUSES Project team and UNDP CO to consider and discuss/validate the findings, conclusions and recommendations. It aimed to present the provisional findings and recommendations, covering achievement and experiences, challenges and lessons, future improvement in possible continuation and/or replication.

Expected Deliverable #2: Evaluation Debriefing - Presentation of provisional findings and recommendations

Phase 3 - Draft and Finalisation of Evaluation Report (10 to 20 August 2021):

The draft evaluation report would identify and translate the collated data into key issues, findings, conclusions and recommendations such as:

- Presentation of clear data analysis against all evaluation questions, including triangulated information
- Substantiation by credible evidence that has been checked for accuracy, consistency and reliability
- Limitations or gaps in evidence (if applicable)
- Indications where evidence is inconclusive (if applicable)

The Evaluator would prepare the FE report, which incorporated feedback from key stakeholders to convey clear findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Deliverable #3: Draft Evaluation Report - up to 30 pages without annexes

Deliverable #4: Final Evaluation Report (including an executive summary) - up to 30 pages without annexes

1.3 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The TOR included a set of evaluation questions to be assessed in relation to the above 9 evaluation criteria, including the cross-cutting issues on Basic Human Needs (Human Rights), Gender Equality, Ownership and Synergy, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Category	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country context: how relevant was the project to the interventions target group, including Home Owners Associations' needs and priorities? To what extent was the project aligned with the policies and strategies of the Government, the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as the UNDP Country Programme Document/UN Partnership Framework? • Target groups: To what extent was the project relevant to address the needs of community members that live in multi-apartment buildings in the realm of 1) creation of a HOA and management of its property through its statutory body and 2) conducting a meeting of co-owners and select a managing company by a majority of votes, or deciding that they will manage it directly? • Does the project remain relevant considering the changing environment in the face of the economic crisis linked to the COVID-19 pandemic, while taking into consideration the risks/challenges mitigation strategy? What can be done additionally to better capture the needs of the target group relevant to the focus of the project? • Was there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country caused by the presidential and parliamentary elections held in 2019, the local elections held in 2020 and the COVID-19 pandemic and their effect on the operational context?

Category	Evaluation Questions
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the overall project performance carried out with reference to the Energy Efficiency Support Programme for Ukraine (EE4U), the respective project document/cost-sharing agreement, strategy, objectives and indicators? • Was the cooperation with key project partners under the EE4U programme, namely IFC, EEF and GIZ successfully established and contributed to the achievement of the project's goals? • Was the cooperation and support of the municipalities fully explored? Which options remained unexplored for the successful implementation of the EE4U programme? • Was the involvement of the local partnership network (local administration, amalgamated territorial communities, Associations of HOAs) sufficient to achieve the project's results? • Was the project's strategy on the mobilisation of home owners and Functional Groups effective to motivate them to establish a HOA? • Were the needs of the project's beneficiaries - Functional Groups, Home Owners Associations and Housing-Building Cooperatives - fully covered by the proposed training curriculums? Were the benefits of managing the properly successfully and fully presented to the project's beneficiaries by the project? Which needs remained uncovered and would affect the decisions of home owners to establish themselves in an HOA? • Was the project's approach to the transformation of the House-Building Cooperatives successful and sufficient to achieve the project's results? What can be done better? • Did the project target the home owners in the new buildings? What are the challenges the home owners of the new buildings are facing on the way to organise themselves in an HOA? • What are the results achieved beyond the logical framework? What were the supporting factors at the national or at the sub-national level? What are the main lessons learned from the project's strategies and what are the possibilities of replication and scaling-up the project?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the project cost-effective? Was the project using the least cost options? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the relevant outputs and outcomes? • Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected period? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? • Was the project management, coordination and monitoring efficient and appropriate? Did the monitoring consider gender equality and women empowerment issues, as well as social inclusion and human rights, environmental protection and climate change? • Are the criteria and governance aspects related to the selection of beneficiaries and partner institutions appropriate? • Have there been sufficient cooperation and exchange of information between the partners of the project? • Was the project building upon/seeking synergies with existing programmes and strategies in order to maximize impact, efficiently allocate resources and avoid duplications?

Category	Evaluation Questions
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the project results (impact, if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the project ends? Define the areas that produced the most sustainable results, and the most promising areas requiring further support and scaling-up in the course of future interventions. • Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives? • Is the project’s approach likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated and increasingly contribute to the inclusive gender responsive socio-economic development at the local level after the project ends? Define which of the platforms, networks, relationships development in the framework of the project that have the highest potential for further scaling up and/or replication. • Was environmental sustainability considered in the project design and measures accordingly implemented / instruments put in place to ensure that no harm is caused to the environment and natural resources are used sustainably? • Which social or political risks have challenged the achievements of projects results and its sustainability? Has this appropriately been addressed by the project? • To what extent were capacity development initiatives for HOAs adequate to ensure sustainable improvements for women, men and vulnerable groups? • What are possible priority areas of engagement and recommendations for the possible future projects/initiatives? Findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect gender equality and women empowerment, social inclusion, and environmental protection. • What can additionally be done to improve the sustainability of the project?
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to the reform of the energy efficient sector of Ukraine, specifically to the reforming of its housing and communal sector? • Has the project contributed to the establishment of an institute of a responsible home-owner, capable to take the responsibility for the management of their homes and recognizing its importance for the country’s reforms, energy security and independence? • What is the impact of the establishment of an institute of a responsible home-owner on the quality of life of Ukrainian? What sustainable change has the project made in the lives of women and men, vulnerable groups, specifically home owners with low income, and targeted communities of home owners at large? Has there been any ‘spill-over’ effect on other communities or groups in the community? • Has the project improved the Ukrainian population’s awareness about energy efficiency issues and specifically the national energy reform agenda? • Has the project contributed to gender equality, women’s empowerment and protection of human rights, social inclusion and environmental protection? • Has the project contributed to the larger context in the achievement of the SDGs such as SDG 7, SDG 11 and SDG 13? • How do the cooperation and exchange of information between the partners of the project contribute to the achievement of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?

Category	Evaluation Questions
Cross-Cutting Issues	
Basic Human Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the principles of Human Rights, to what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and vulnerable groups benefitted from the HOUSES Project in contributing to enhance fulfilment of people’s economic and social needs? • Has the project addressed the needs of the home owners with low income and explored the support municipalities that can provide to support those? • Has the project sufficiently mainstreamed human rights concerns in the activities? What is the anticipated influence of the intervention on human rights? What measures can be taken up to improve the involvement of stakeholders, social inclusion, human rights and environmental protection in similar initiatives?
Gender Equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? • Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality? • To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? • Has the project sufficiently mainstreamed gender concerns in the activities? What is the anticipated influence of the intervention on gender equality? What measures can be taken up to improve the involvement of stakeholders and gender equality?
Ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the HOUSES Project have well designed and well-planned exit strategies? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability if any? • Is the level of ownership among HOAs sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained after project closure? • Will the resources (such as advisory, consultancy and grants) available to HOAs during the HOUSES Project continue to be available after project closure? • Can the HOA capacity building courses developed by the HOUSES Project continue to be implemented and updated even after project closure?
Synergy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the synergies of the HOUSES Project with other development partners (such as EEF, EU, IFC and GIZ) have contributed to a magnified development results? • Did the synergies and coordination by reinforcing a common strategy among project partners resulted in higher achieving results? • Did the HOUSES Project collaborate and cooperate with other international agency/organization project efforts which resulted in higher achieving results?

1.4 Structure of the Final Evaluation Report

The report is divided into five major sections:

- **Section 1** summarises the project together with the purpose of the FE, scoping and methodology
- **Section 2** outlines the development context and discusses the problems that the project sets out to address, the strategy adopted, operationalisation arrangements and key milestones and stakeholders impacted by the HOUSES Project
- **Section 3** reports the key findings from the HOUSES Project and presents under the perspectives of project strategy, project implementation and project results
- **Section 4** features a key success story on how the mobilising of home owners through home owners associations improved the well-being of apartment residents and communities
- **Section 5** reveals the conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Project Start and Duration

Project Implementation Start : 26th October 2018
Closing Date (Original) : 30th September 2020
Closing Date (Actual) : 31st July 2021

The HOUSES Project was launched in October 2018. The project document (PRODOC) was signed on 26 October 2018. The HOUSES Project was implemented by UNDP in direct implementation modality (DIM). The project had an initial duration of 24 months but was subsequently extended (approved by the EU) to 34 months.

2.2 Problems that the Project Sought to Address

There is a significant need for energy efficiency improvements across the Ukrainian economy. Ukraine's economy is two or three times as energy intensive as many neighbouring countries including Poland, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic. One of the many sectors which need to become more energy efficient is the housing and communal sector, which directly impacts the quality of the living conditions of millions of Ukrainians. The housing and communal sector is completely unsustainable due to the high levels of energy and heat consumption, outdated infrastructure, heating systems, significant gas wastage and old housing stock. Comparing to the neighbouring EU countries with a similar climate, Ukraine's housing and communal sector is three to four times less energy efficient and consumes almost 45% of the country's energy. The heating sector of residential buildings has one of the largest potentials for improving energy efficiency in Ukraine.

Although 98% of Ukraine's housing stock is privatised, the responsibility for the management and maintenance of the multi-apartment buildings has been shared between the municipal housing services organizations (ZHEK), housing and building cooperatives (HBC), and private home owners. Under this management system, major repairs, including those focused on energy efficiency, are traditionally not foreseen/planned. Co-owners also generally have limited awareness of their responsibilities, and are often not willing and/or capable to deal with and contribute to the financing of complex technical interventions. Attitudes and expectations often lag behind the legal and policy framework.

One of the important steps to align Ukrainian legislation in the field of responsibility of home owners for the energy efficiency of buildings with European standards was the Law №417 "On specifics of ownership in apartment buildings" (adopted in 2015). This Law determines the relations associated with the implementation of the rights and performance of duties by co-owners of apartment buildings in terms of its maintenance and administration (including energy efficiency issues). This law provides for the possibility of voluntarily creating a Home Owners Association (HOA) and declared it as a legal entity under the laws of Ukraine.

The proper functioning of HOAs in Ukraine and effective management of common property are prerequisites for the formation and successful implementation of state housing policy and implementation of energy efficiency measures. HOAs become an effective instrument to manage the common property in the multi-apartment building and achieve the reduction of energy consumption and improve quality of life at large.

Furthermore, there is a new law that implements a European Union directive on the efficiency of buildings in July 2017, and the set-up of a Ukrainian Energy Efficiency Fund (EEF) which was officially registered on 24 July 2018. The objective of the EEF is to improve Ukraine's energy efficiency by reducing the level of energy consumption and CO₂ emissions in the residential sector, thus achieving a decrease in the adverse impact on the environment. The EEF also provides financial support to HOAs

for the implementation of the thermo-modernisation projects and energy-efficiency renovations in multi-apartment buildings while factoring in the best European thermal modernisation practices. The EEF facilitates energy-efficient renovations of residential buildings in Ukraine by providing grants that leverage investments by the homeowners, which are paid for through a mix of homeowner dues and commercial bank loans. The grants and the oversight are supported by IFC and jointly financed by a Trust Fund of the EU and Germany and from the Government of Ukraine for an overall total of approximately €200 million.

In 2017 and 2018, the European Commission adopted its Energy Efficiency Support Programme for Ukraine (EE4U, phases I and II). The EE4U aims at contributing to increased energy efficiency in the Ukrainian residential sector and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In this context, the EU, together with Germany, supported the EEF activities by providing grants to energy efficient renovations of multi-apartment buildings across Ukraine. Through the EE4U, the EU contributes 80 million Euros to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (established and managed by the IFC in the EE4U Programme framework) as well as over 20 million Euros package of technical assistance.

2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

The UNDP Ukraine was called upon by the EU to contribute, through technical assistance, to the improvement of the Ukrainian housing stock energy efficiency. In the context of the HOUSES project, UNDP Ukraine will:

- provide interventions for a period of 24 months (but subsequently extended (approved by the EU) to 34 months) to stimulate and support the creation of HOAs through a local presence
- prepare the HOAs to seek and obtain financing for their home improvement projects.
- utilise its country-wide network of partnerships with regional and local governments, and its long-standing experience of citizens mobilisation for common action, including the creation of HOAs.

The HOUSES Project was launched in October 2018 with the aim to mobilise the Ukrainian homeowners to establish their HOAs and trigger energy efficiency improvements in their residential buildings. Funded by the EU with an approved budget of 4 million Euros, the HOUSES Project specifically supports the creation and capacity development of HOAs at local level throughout the country, and the HOAs' preparation to apply for financing to the EEF.

In order to achieve the above aim, two outputs with the corresponding output indicators are expected from the HOUSES Project as shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: HOUSES Project Outputs and Output Indicators

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS
<p>Output 1 - Home owners are mobilised to organise themselves into HOAs</p> <p>Project Outcome 1: Increased homeowners' engagement in housing stock management and renovations</p> <p>Project impact 1: Increase in the number of HOAs in Ukraine, leading to diversified and competitive housing stock management services</p>	1.1 Percentage of homeowners aware of emergency efficiency requirements and solutions for their buildings and EE financing facilities (gender disaggregated) in territories covered by the Project
	1.2. Cumulative number of home owners' functional groups, supported by the Project, register their associations
	1.3. Percentage of newly set-up functional groups and HOAs, supported by the Project, are managed by women or with a majority of women in their memberships
	1.4. Cumulated number of HOAs (both pre-existing and newly created) supported by the Project
	1.5. Percentage of newly set-up HOAs, supported by the Project, manage housing blocks with at least 25% of low-income home-owners

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS
<p>Output 2 - Developed capacities of HOAs in housing stock management, renovations/EE retrofitting planning and resource mobilisation</p> <p>Project Outcome 2: Quality and sustainable energy efficiency solutions identified by trained HOAs and financed by EEF</p> <p>Project impact 2: Housing energy consumption reduces, leading to a reduction of households' bills and state savings in subsidies</p>	2.1. Percentage of trained HOAs representatives confirm use of new skills and competence in running their Associations
	2.2. Number of renovation projects initiated by HOAs trained by the Project
	2.3 Number of HOAs trained by the Project and handed over to IFC
	2.4. Percentage of homeowners, in territories covered by the Project, satisfied with HOAs management (including plans for renovations and EE retrofitting) (gender disaggregated)
	2.5. Cumulative number of positive media coverage of the Project and HOAs energy efficiency solutions/energy savings

The evaluation noted that Output Indicator 2.3 was originally stated as “Number of application packages prepared by HOAs trained by the Project and handed over to IFC. This was subsequently amended accordingly as indicated above in December 2020 to justify the reason that application packages are included into Output Indicator 2.2. as part of the renovation projects documentation.

In order to effectively implement the project, the following key partnerships were established. At the national level, the project works with the Ministry for Communities and Territories Development as the main project partner. The HOUSES Project also provides support to the EEF in launching its grant programme, and closely cooperates with the IFC as the key institution providing support to the EEF in implementation of its grants programme.

The HOUSES Project covers activities related to the identification of the project’s participants (Functional Groups, HOAs, HBCs), improvement of their institutional capacity through professional knowledge developed within the project’s training programmes, while the IFC partner covers technical aspects of HOAs applications for EEF’s grants. At the sub-national level, the HOUSES Project works closely with municipalities, local councils, HOAs and Associations of HOAs.

The HOUSES Project is aligned with the UNDP Ukraine CPD’s UNDAF Outcome 4.2 which specifies that by 2022, national institutions, private businesses and communities implement gender-responsive policies and practices to achieve sustainable management of natural resources, preservation of ecosystems, mitigation, adaptation to climate change and generation of green jobs.

Adopting DIM, the HOUSES Project’s Implementing Agency is UNDP with a dedicated project team based in the UNDP Ukraine. A Project Team Leader is responsible for the daily management of the project with assistance from project staff, regional coordinators and recruited consultants. The HOUSES Project also have the following project partners:

- National partners - Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, EEF
- Development partner (Donor) - EU (represented by the EU Delegation to Ukraine)
- International partners - IFC, GIZ

The HOUSES Project is expected to have close and well-timed collaboration with different agencies and stakeholders, numerous territorial units and home-owners and their HOAs as beneficiaries of the HOUSES Project outcomes. This necessitates having a substantial level of flexibility in the decision making granted to the HOUSES Project implementation team.

2.4 Baseline and Expected Result Targets Established

The baseline and targets of the HOUSES Project were originally set for 2 years. Due to the approved extension of the HOUSES Project, targets were being set for 3 years as shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Baseline and Expected Result Targets

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE	BASELINE		TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)		
			Value	Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<p>Output 1 - Home owners are mobilised to organise themselves into HOAs</p> <p>Project Outcome 1: Increased homeowners' engagement in housing stock management and renovations</p> <p><i>Outcome indicators</i> - % of housing blocks in a given location covered by the Project, whose management and maintenance services are transferred to HOAs</p> <p>Baseline: 0 [2018] Target [2019]: 0.7% Target [2020]: 1.0% Target [2021]: 1.4.%</p> <p>- % of HOAs (including HOAs representing a majority of low-income homeowners) which confirm intention to renovate/retrofit their buildings for EE</p> <p>Baseline: 0 [2018] Target [2019]: 0 Target (2020): 1% Target [2021]: 5%</p> <p>Project impact 1: Increase in the number of HOAs in Ukraine, leading to diversified and competitive housing stock management services</p>	1.1 Percentage of homeowners aware of emergency efficiency requirements and solutions for their buildings and EE financing facilities (gender disaggregated) in territories covered by the Project	Baseline and yearly short surveys	0	2018	50% (50% male, 50% female)	50% (50% male, 50% female)	75% (50% male, 50% female)
	1.2. Cumulative number of home owners' functional groups, supported by the Project, register their associations	Project records	0	2018	825	1650	2,000 (original) 2,250 (revised)
	1.3. Percentage of newly set-up functional groups and HOAs, supported by the Project, are managed by women or with a majority of women in their memberships	Project records Local registers of NPOs	0	2018	30%	40%	50%
	1.4. Cumulated number of HOAs (both pre-existing and newly created) supported by the Project	Project records Local registers of NPOs	0	2018	1,500	3500 (original) 4,500 (revised)	4000 (original) 6,000 (revised)
	1.5. Percentage of newly set-up HOAs, supported by the Project, manage housing blocks with at least 25% of low-income home-owners	Project and local administrative records	0	2018	20%	20%	20%

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE	BASELINE		TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)		
			Value	Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<p>Output 2 - Developed capacities of HOAs in housing stock management, renovations/EE retrofitting planning and resource mobilisation</p> <p>Project Outcome 2: Quality and sustainable energy efficiency solutions identified by trained HOAs and financed by EEF</p> <p><i>Indicators</i> - % of housing blocks in territories covered by the Project retrofitted for EE</p> <p>Baseline: 0 [2018] Target [2019]: 0 Target [2020]: 0% Target [2021]: 1%</p> <p>-% % of Project's trained HOAs transferred to IFC for further application for EEF grants</p> <p>Baseline: 0 [2018] Target [2019]: 10% of total trained by the Project Target [2020]: 20% Target [2021]: 50%</p> <p>- % of renovation costs covered by EEF grants in a given location covered by the Project</p> <p>Baseline: 0 [2018] Target [2019]: 0 % Target [2020]: 1 % Target [2021]: 3 %</p> <p>Project impact 2: Housing energy consumption reduces, leading to a reduction of households' bills and state savings in subsidies</p>	2.1. Percentage of trained HOAs representatives confirm use of new skills and competence in running their Associations	Baseline and yearly surveys	0	2018	65%	70%	80%
	2.2. Number of renovation projects initiated by HOAs trained by the Project	Project records	0	2018	0	250	500
	2.3. Number HOAs trained by the Project and handed over to IFC	Project records	0	2018	150	500	1,000
	2.4. Percentage of homeowners, in territories covered by the Project, satisfied with HOAs management (including plans for renovations and EE retrofitting)	Baseline and yearly survey	0	2018	50%	50%	75%
	2.5. Cumulative number of positive media coverage of the Project and HOAs energy efficiency solutions/energy savings	Media coverage monitoring records	0	2018	200	400	600

2.5 Main Stakeholders

Adopting DIM, the HOUSES Project's Implementing Agency was UNDP with a dedicated project management team based in the UNDP Ukraine CO. A HOUSES Project Team Leader was responsible for the daily management of the project with assistance from national project staff and recruited consultants. The HOUSES Project also had the following project partners:

- National partners - Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, EEF
- Development partner (Donor) - EU (represented by the EU Delegation to Ukraine)
- International partners - IFC, GIZ

The HOUSES Project was managed by the Project Team Leader, under the supervision of the UNDP Ukraine Regional Development Programme Manager, and the oversight provided by the HOUSES Project Board (PB).

Programme monitoring and oversight of HOUSES Project activities was led by the UNDP Ukraine Regional Development Programme Team comprising the Regional Development Programme Manager and UNDP Programme Analyst.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Project Design

3.1.1 Project Document (PRODOC) Formulation

The HOUSES PRODOC indicated that the earliest commencement of the HOUSES Project formulation would be in 2018 after the completion end of another existing UNDP Ukraine "EU-UNDP Community Development Approach to Local Development" (CBA) Project, implemented over a 9-year period (2008 to 2017).

The HOUSES Project also built on the experiences of the CBA Project which played a major role in mobilising local communities to address, in partnership with local authorities, their social and economic development problems. The HOUSES Project also drew from the existing networks, partnerships and infrastructure that were established by the CBA Project. This enabled the HOUSES Project to commence with minimal transition and complications.

3.1.2 Analysis of Logical Framework (Project Logic/Strategy and Indicators)

In reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of the HOUSES Project in meeting its outcome, the evaluation reviewed the HOUSES Project's Logical Framework on the HOUSES Project's strategy, indicators, baseline, end of project intended outcome, source of verification, and risk and assumptions.

The evaluation reviewed that the HOUSES Project's Logical Framework design has taken careful consideration of the UNDP Ukraine CPD. Furthermore, the HOUSES Project's Logical Framework was prepared with in-depth thinking, accurately described the end of project goals, listed the sources of verification, and appropriately identified the risks and the assumptions.

The Logical Framework was clearly described with output indicators, baseline and yearly targets.

The HOUSES Project took extensive consideration to stakeholder participation in project design, decision making, planning, implementation and monitoring. For example, the EU and Ministry for Communities and Territories Development were invited to contribute to designing of project interventions and technical discussions on the output activities. This translated to an increase in confidence and endorsement of project activities in the HOUSES Project implementation.

The evaluation further assessed that:

- Due to the fixed budget being agreed upon, the HOUSES Project was formulated for an initial duration of 2 years. Typical extensive capacity building projects would take around 3 to 5 years to embed the result effectiveness and be able to determine the long-term impacts.
- the HOUSES Project's key performance indicators in the PRODOC were more output-oriented (WHAT IS BEING PRODUCED - EFFICIENCY) than outcome-oriented (WHAT IS THE VALUE/BENEFIT/ CHANGE/IMPACT - EFFECTIVENESS). It was understood that the HOUSES Project was part of a larger programme (EE4U Programme) which had outcome-based indicators while the HOUSES Project, being a short-term project, would be focused on output-oriented indicators.

While this does not affect the HOUSES Project Team's overall performance, the evaluation is of a view that future PRODOC design should consider a balance of expected results with outcome-oriented targets/indicators to determine the project effectiveness.

3.1.3 Risks and Assumptions

The HOUSES PRODOC had appropriate risk assessments with impact and probability ratings, and prepared corresponding counter-measures/management responses which were appropriate at that point of time and for the project duration (2018 to 2020). The HOUSES Project initially identified 6 risks comprising 1 political risk, 3 institutional risks and 2 socio-economic risks. The HOUSES Project, in its May 2020 update of the PRODOC, re-assessed and identified 11 primary risks:

- 2 institutional risks
- 1 political risk
- 1 operational risk
- 4 economic risks
- 1 social risk
- 1 strategic risk
- 1 security risk

The evaluation observed that this demonstrates UNDP's proactive approach in identifying and mitigating risks with appropriate counter-measures/responses. This was especially so when the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic in Ukraine required the HOUSES Project to review its activities and develop alternative approaches to overcome the limitations of the nation-wide lockdowns and restrictions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

3.1.4 Lessons from Other Relevant Projects Incorporated into Project Design

The HOUSES Project was also built from the experience, lessons learned and more importantly the network relationships, infrastructure and local resources from two previous UNDP Ukraine projects:

- "EU-UNDP Community Development Approach to Local Development" (CBA) Project (2008 to 2017)
- "Municipal Governance and Sustainable Development Programme" Project (2002 to 2013)

3.1.5 Planned Stakeholder Participation

The HOUSES Project generated strong stakeholder interest at national, regional and local levels across Ukraine. In terms of project design, the proxy indicators would be the number of stakeholders involved in planning and attendance during the project formulation/planning meetings. The evaluation interviews with key stakeholders indicated sufficient evidence of direct involvement based on detailed accounts of the project outputs.

The minutes of the donor coordination meetings recorded perfect attendance and representations from the donors, partners and national counterparts.

3.1.6 Replication Approach

Replication and up-scaling are fundamental to the HOUSES Project as it provides the opportunity to build on best practices and lessons learned, and expand the reach and impact of its project outputs.

While up-scaling strategies did not appear to feature strongly in the HOUSES PRODOC, the HOUSES Project made concrete plans to replicate across all 24 regions by heavily relying on its 24 community development associates who were pivotal “catalyst boosters” of the HOUSES Project to work collaboratively with local communities and regional/local municipalities.

3.1.7 Management Arrangements

Execution Modality: In accordance with the HOUSES PRODOC, the HOUSES Project modality was Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) which meant the project execution and implementation would be undertaken directly by UNDP Ukraine in accordance with UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP). The overall decision, including financial accountability would rest with UNDP Ukraine and the HOUSES Project was to be executed in coordination with relevant partners with a view to ensuring that effective assistance and support flowed directly to targeted beneficiaries.

Project Board (PB): The PB was established to provide high-level oversight and to steer the HOUSES Project. The PB is responsible for high-level management decisions and policy guidance required for implementation of the project, including recommendations and approval of project plans, budget and revision. The PB membership comprised the following key main stakeholders:

- The Executive: UNDP Ukraine
 - Represented by Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP Ukraine
- Senior Supplier: Delegation of the European Union to Ukraine
 - Represented by: Head of Operations Section ‘Economic Cooperation, Energy, Infrastructure and Environment’
- Senior Beneficiary: Government of Ukraine
 - Director General, Directorate for Energy Efficiency, Ministry for Communities and Territories Development
 - Deputy Director- Head of Department, Directorate for Housing Policy, Ministry for Communities and Territories Development as observer

The PB was first constituted in October 2019. The meeting minutes showed that the PSC effectively provided important directions and oversight. The evaluation noted that according to the HOUSES PRODOC the PB was scheduled to meet annually, but the PB only met once in October 2019 and had yet to convene again. However, the evaluation understood that the majority of PB members were present or represented in the biweekly donors coordination meeting. The evaluation further established that there were no significant impacts on the HOUSES Project and would be better if PB meetings could be more regular to ensure accountability.

UNDP: As the DIM agency, UNDP offered substantive support services to the HOUSES Project, which included project management/administration, financial reporting, procurement support, and technical advisory services. The HOUSES Project updates to the donors coordination meeting were comprehensive and timely produced. The HOUSES Project Annual Progress Reports covered many details and provided insights into project implementation, overall management, the many challenges faced in project implementation and mitigations/counter-measures to overcome the barriers.

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1 Adaptive Management

The HOUSES Project was formally signed off on 26 October 2018. The evaluation noted that the functions of the Project Manager (HOUSES Project Team Leader) were duly performed by the UNDP Ukraine Regional Development Programme Manager prior to the commencement of the HOUSES Project Team Leader in February 2019. As such, during the October 2018 to February 2019 period:

- the project implementation plan and communication strategy were developed
- the project team was mobilised and duly trained
- key consultants were contracted info-sessions in all oblasts were organised and refreshing of regional coordinators' knowledge on HOAs related issues (including legislation) through special training sessions was ensured

The above activities prepared the basis for the HOUSES Project Team Leader to commence the next stage of project implementation

The evaluation reviewed that the HOUSES Project Team displayed good project management abilities and effectively utilised appropriate project management tools to implement the HOUSES Project to the best of their abilities.

In terms of communication:

- the HOUSES Project implemented regular and effective communications processes and mechanisms with key partners and stakeholders.
- the key partners received regular updates on the HOUSES Project progress formally via the biweekly donors coordination meeting.
- the HOUSES Project team regularly communicated with feedback mechanisms in place among its Regional Coordinators across 24 regions in Ukraine

The evaluation also noted that the HOUSES Project adapted its communications processes and mechanisms to maintain the same level of communications during the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions.

The HOUSES Project actively organised information campaigns through regional/local televisions and social media platforms targeting at homeowners and other residents of multi-apartment buildings, community leaders and local authorities about the advantages/benefits of HOAs and the implementation of EE measures.

The HOUSES Project also established an online application form and information source (<http://www.houses.in.ua>) to communicate the progress, information on HOAs, training, webinars and success stories of how HOAs impacted local communities.

3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements

In order to achieve an effective implementation of the HOUSES Project, UNDP Ukraine utilised the following key partnership arrangements:

- At the **national level**, the HOUSES Project would work with the:
 - Ministry for Communities and Territories Development. UNDP Ukraine signed a partnership agreement with this Ministry. A representative of the Ministry will be invited to take part in the PB Meeting each year
 - Energy Efficiency Fund (EEF). The HOUSES Project would coordinate its activities with the EEF to ensure effective support to its operations under existing restrictions and the rolling out of the “ENERGODIM” programme for the residential sector in online format and support of its Kyiv-based project team and 24 regional coordinators. The EEF would be regularly informed of the HOUSES Project’s goal, activities and expected results, consulted as needed during the project lifetime, and informed of the progress achieved
 - IFC, as the organisation which, through its technical assistance programme, would ensure that the HOUSES Project trained HOAs would have access to energy efficiency financing from the EEF. A representative of the IFC would be invited to take part in the PB Meeting each year
 - Coordination Council which would be a coordination mechanism between the donors contributing to the MDTF and the Ukrainian Government aimed at aligning policies and strategies as well as reviewing progress of the MDTF and the Ukrainian EEF. UNDP would also take part as observer, as appropriate, in the Coordination Council meetings as well as in other related coordination meetings organised by the beneficiary or the EU
 - project partners (EU, IFC, GIZ, EEF, Ministry for Communities and Territories Development) and would support the joint communication efforts towards the COVID-19 prevention in addition to sharing information materials developed by the UN agencies
- At the **regional level**, the HOUSES Project would work with its already established partnerships of regional administrations/councils, based on recently signed partnership agreements on cooperation in the field of sustainable development to include the HOUSES Project’s proposed interventions and its expected results. It will keep representatives of regional administrations informed about the project’s achievements by inviting them to key events.
- At the **local level**, the HOUSES Project would work in close coordination with:
 - municipality councils and rayons/ATCs councils to ensure the successful mobilisation of home owners and their institutionalisation in HOA. Coordination will take the form of on-going information and consultations with councils and local authorities, possible involvement in selected capacity building events, participation in exchange/experience-sharing events
 - resource centres, established by the CBA and Municipal Development Projects, and institutionalised within local authorities/councils. The resource centres would be fully informed of the HOUSES Project’s goals, activities and key outputs, and would be invited to the planning and implementation of the capacity building and experience sharing events

3.2.3 Project Finance

The project had an initial duration of 24 months but was subsequently extended (approved by the EU) to 34 months, with an approved funding of EUR\$4,000,000. The budget and actual expenditure of the HOUSES Project are provided below in Table 4 as follow:

Table 4: Summary of Budget and Actual Expenditure (HOUSES Project)

HOUSES Project	Budget - All Years (EUR\$)	2019 (EUR\$)		2020 (EUR\$)		2021 (EUR\$)	
		Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
1. Human Resources	2,537,760	1,268,880	848,903	1,682,856	1,258,181	505,779	456,607
2. Travel	24,000	12,000	5,325	18,072	3,368	7,500	34
3. Equipment and Supplies	144,920	144,920	118,539	44,268	22,019	11,950	0
4. Local Office	526,600	269,800	116,403	279,190	130,665	100,000	58,387
5. Other Costs, Services	94,218	42,915	24,763	215,588	131,836	155,677	14,322
6. Other (seed grant, training, capacity building)	410,820	205,410	23,240	361,169	150,080	124,089	164,755
7. Indirect Costs	261,682	136,075	79,602	182,080	118,730	63,350	48,587
Total	4,000,000	2,080,000	1,216,775	2,783,222	1,814,880	968,344	742,693
Utilisation Rate (Actual/Budget)		58.5%		65.2%		76.7%	

The evaluation noted that:

- the HOUSES Project, from October 2018 to March 2021, under-spent its allocated total project funds by about 6% and its annual utilisation rate with an average of 66.8%. This was due to the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions in Ukraine which resulted in reduced travel costs and local training/workshop venues costs.
- the stated actual expenditure figures are for up to 31 March 2021. The final actual expenditure figures up to 31 July 2021 are reported to be full utilisation of the project budget (subjected to final reconciliation).
- to address the project challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions, the HOUSES Project further undertook two budget revisions to re-purpose the project funds towards increased training and telecommunication and audio/visual equipment for online training, webinars, and virtual workshops/consultancy support/exchange and experience-sharing visits among the HOAs and local authorities.

The evaluation found that the budget reporting format in the HOUSES Project Annual Work Plans were different from that of the HOUSES Project Annual Progress Reports. This was due to the different submission formats by UNDP and the PRODOC.

While this does not affect the financial management of the HOUSES Project, it would be good financial reporting practice that UNDP projects could use one standardised financial reporting format for both the Annual Workplan and the Annual Progress Report.

The evaluation strongly suggests that showing comparisons between budget and actual expenditure, according to project outputs/activities, provides optimal financial accountability and transparency purposes that clearly demonstrates the efficient use of funding on project outputs/activities.

3.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Activities Used for Adaptive Management

The M&E framework consisted of local monitoring and reporting as well as international independent evaluations. Both the HOUSES Project Team and the UNDP Ukraine Regional Programme Development Team were responsible for the preparation of the M&E activities at project and programme levels respectively. Table 5 below summarises the achievement of monitoring actions as required by the HOUSES PRODOC.

Table 5: HOUSES Project M&E Activity Status

M&E Activity	Frequency/ Timing	Status	Comments
Preparing Feedback reports	Monthly or quarterly (depending of the Project's phase)	Completed	Feedback reporting conducted by HOUSES Project Team in written report and verbally through electronic communications during the COVID-19 pandemic
Track results progress	Quarterly Beginning and end of Project	Completed	Results tracked through the integrated M&E system
Monitor and Manage Risk	Quarterly	Completed	Reporting conducted in written report and verbally through electronic communications during the COVID-19 pandemic
Learn	Quarterly	Completed	Reporting done through the information story board
Annual Project Quality Assurance	Annually	Completed	Completed by UNDP Regional Development Programme Team
Review and Make Course Corrections	Annually	Completed	Completed by the HOUSES Project Team Leader and UNDP Regional Development Programme Team
Project Progress Report	Annually, and at the end of the project (final report)	In Progress	Final report to be completed by the HOUSES Project Team Leader in August 2021
Project Review (Project Board)	Annually	In Progress	Conducted one PB meeting in October 2019 with another final PB meeting due in September 2021
End of Project Evaluation	Towards the end of the project	In Progress	One Final Evaluation report to be completed by an independent evaluator in August 2021

The evaluation reviewed that the monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems at Country Office (CO), Programme and Project levels were comprehensive, well-utilised and adapted to COVID-19 pandemic environment:

- Project level - there were detailed and appropriate Annual Project Progress Reports, feedback reporting (written and verbal), and information story boards
- Programme Level - there were detailed and appropriate quality assurance reports for both the design appraisal and implementation stages (Programme Level)
- CO Level - there were submission of Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs) and an integrated M&E reporting system to track output indicators (CO Level)

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions, the UNDP Ukraine Regional Development Programme Team and HOUSES Project Team would conduct monthly field monitoring visits to assess the progress of the HOUSES Project outputs. Key recommendations and corrective actions/measures would be provided to further improving the HOUSES Project, and monitoring the implementation of these key recommendations and corrective actions/measures until completion.

The M&E process could be further strengthened if more data in relation to the “spill-effects” impact of HOAs on local community issues and resident/community well-being could be collected. The evaluation noted that some of these data had already been collected and published publicly. As the HOUSES Project had only an initial 24 months which then extended to 34 months, the “spill-effects” impact data could continue to be collected over a longer project duration.

3.2.5 Implementing Agency

The HOUSES Project adopted the direct implementation modality (DIM) which meant that UNDP Ukraine would be the Implementing Agency with a dedicated project team based in the UNDP Ukraine CO with regional support.

The HOUSES PRODOC also provided details of project staff responsible for providing technical assistance and carrying out administrative and management tasks. This would comprise:

- One Project Team Leader (based in UNDP country office) who is responsible for the overall management of the Project activities, developing and implementing a results-based work plan for the project.
- One Community Development Specialist who will coordinate the work of 24 Community Development Associates and review the delivery rate of the Training and Support Programme, potential delivery issues (and ways to solve them), the capacity development results achieved by the target groups, and assess the degree of readiness of HOAs.
- One Community Development Assistant to support the Community Development Specialist in all organisational aspects of her/his coordinating work throughout the country.
- 24 Community Development Associates (one in each oblast) to coordinate the timely and quality delivery of the Training and Support Programme to the HOUSES Project's target groups.
- One Administration Officer (based in UNDP country office) to ensure transparent and efficient administration services and systems throughout the whole project implementation period.
- One Finance and Procurement Specialist based in UNDP country office to ensure transparent and efficient financial and procurement services and processes during the whole project implementation period, and ensure full compliance of the HOUSES Project's procurement activities with UNDP rules and regulations
- Two project assistants: Administration Assistant and Finance Assistant, both based in UNDP country office to support the above-mentioned Administration Officer and Finance Specialist.
- One Communication and Monitoring Associate (based in UNDP country office) to support the HOUSES Project's communication activities and maintaining public relations with various stakeholders as well as maintaining and keeping up-to-date the HOUSES Project's databases
- 25 drivers (1 at the national level and 24 at oblasts level) to ensure effective transportation services at national and regional levels

The evaluation determined that the HOUSES Project Team had the project management expertise and suitable technical expertise, through specialist training and recruited technical expertise, to deliver the project outputs which are technically complex and required specialised expertise and knowledge in HOAs set-up and functional management, and energy efficiency.

3.3 Achievement of Project Results

The evaluation rated the HOUSES Project's project results according to the evaluation ratings table listed below in Table 6.

Table 6: Evaluation Overall Results/Impact Rating

Evaluation Ratings for Overall Results, Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, Impact, Basic Human Needs (Human Rights), Gender Equality, Ownership and Synergy	Sustainability Ratings:
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)	

3.3.1 Overall Results

The evaluation rated the HOUSES Project's overall results with reference to its 2 project outputs as per stated in the HOUSES PRODOC. The overall reported results are presented below in Table 7.

Table 7: Overall Reported Results - HOUSES Project

HOUSES PRODOC			Achievement Rating			
Output 1: Home owners are mobilised to organise themselves into HOAs Outcome 1: Increased homeowners' engagement in housing stock management and renovations			6/6 (Highly Satisfactory - No Shortcomings)			
OUTPUT INDICATORS	2019		2020		2021	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.1 Percentage of homeowners aware of emergency efficiency requirements and solutions for their buildings and EE financing facilities (gender disaggregated) in territories covered by the Project	50% (50% male, 50% female)	Survey conducted outside of reporting period	50% (50% male, 50% female)	78.8%	75% (50% male, 50% female)	78.8%
1.2. Cumulative number of home owners' functional groups, supported by the Project, register their associations	825	825	1650	1,861	2,000 (original) 2,250 (revised)	2,288

HOUSES PRODOC			Achievement Rating			
Output 1: Home owners are mobilised to organise themselves into HOAs Outcome 1: Increased homeowners' engagement in housing stock management and renovations			6/6 (Highly Satisfactory - No Shortcomings)			
OUTPUT INDICATORS	2019		2020		2021	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.3. Percentage of newly set-up functional groups and HOAs, supported by the Project, are managed by women or with a majority of women in their memberships	30%	Survey conducted outside of reporting period	40%	51%	50%	51%
1.4. Cumulated number of HOAs (both pre-existing and newly created) supported by the Project	1,500	1,556	3500 (original) 4,500 (revised)	5,545	4000 (original) 6,000 (revised)	6,104
1.5. Percentage of newly set-up HOAs, supported by the Project, manage housing blocks with at least 25% of low-income home-owners	20%	Survey conducted outside of reporting period	20%	24%	20%	24%

HOUSES PRODOC			Achievement Rating			
Output 2: Developed capacities of HOAs in housing stock management, renovations/EE retrofitting planning and resource mobilisation Outcome 2: Quality and sustainable energy efficiency solutions identified by trained HOAs and financed by EEF			6/6 (Highly Satisfactory - No Shortcomings)			
OUTPUT INDICATORS	2019		2020		2021	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2.1. Percentage of trained HOAs representatives confirm use of new skills and competence in running their Associations	65%	Survey conducted outside of reporting period	70%	90%	80%	90%

HOUSES PRODOC				Achievement Rating		
Output 2: Developed capacities of HOAs in housing stock management, renovations/EE retrofitting planning and resource mobilisation				6/6 (Highly Satisfactory - No Shortcomings)		
Outcome 2: Quality and sustainable energy efficiency solutions identified by trained HOAs and financed by EEF						
2.2. Number of renovation projects initiated by HOAs trained by the Project	0	Survey conducted outside of reporting period	250	169	500	1,085
2.3. Number HOAs trained by the Project and handed over to IFC	150	Survey conducted outside of reporting period	500	Survey conducted till March 2021	1,000	3,130
2.4. Percentage of homeowners, in territories covered by the Project, satisfied with HOAs management (including plans for renovations and EE retrofitting)	50%	Survey conducted outside of reporting period	50%	Survey conducted till March 2021	75%	81%
2.5. Cumulative number of positive media coverage of the Project and HOAs energy efficiency solutions/energy savings	200	227	400	378	600	1,350

The evaluation assessed that the:

- HOUSES Project's first year (2019) targets were close to being achieved or their results deferred due to the transition time needed for preparation and promotion of HOAs by the HOUSES Project Team
- HOUSES Project's second (2020) and third (2021) targets were achieved and furthermore the actual figures reported exceeded the original and revised targets.
- HOUSES Project Team had done its best to deliver and achieve the desired project results despite encountering significant external factors/challenges, mainly due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the restrictions imposed in Ukraine.

3.3.2 Relevance

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

The HOUSES Project aligned with the policies and strategies of the Government, the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as the UNDP Ukraine CPD UNDAF Outcome 4.2 Outcome which specifies that by 2022, national institutions, private businesses and communities implement gender-responsive policies and practices to achieve sustainable management of natural resources, preservation of ecosystems, mitigation, adaptation to climate change and generation of green jobs.

The HOUSES Project was highly relevant to the HOAs' needs and priorities, the needs of community members that live in multi-apartment buildings. This was especially relevant in:

- setting up a HOA as a statutory body
- managing/maintaining the property through the HOA
- conducting a meeting of co-owners to make key decisions such as selecting a managing company by a majority of votes, or deciding that they will manage it directly

While the HOUSES Project remained relevant considering the changing environment in the face of the economic crisis linked to the COVID-19 pandemic, the financial stability of the HOAs was significantly affected and thus affected the HOAs in wanting to continue modernisation activities and implement energy efficiency measures for the apartment buildings.

The HOUSES Project was implemented during the presidential and parliamentary elections held in 2019, the local elections held in 2020 and the COVID-19 pandemic. While the PRODOC and Logical Framework were not reformulated, the HOUSES Project had to make a key transition switch to the online platform for almost all its activities targeted for the beneficiaries. This key transition switch proved successful in terms of generating strong interest with apartment building dwellers and setting up more HOAs as a result.

3.3.3 Effectiveness

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

The HOUSES Project had strong cooperation with key project partners under the EE4U programme, namely IFC, EEF and GIZ. This collectively contributed to more than 700 HOAs applying to the EEF to trigger energy efficiency improvements in their residential buildings. The evaluation noted the HOUSES Project was not required to track how many HOUSES Project supported HOAs have successfully completed the EEF supported energy efficiency improvements in their residential buildings.

The HOUSES Project was effectively the “catalyst booster” primarily using its established and highly-competent Regional Coordinators to enable the involvement of the local partnership networks (local administration, amalgamated territorial communities, Associations of HOAs) to sufficiently achieve the project’s results.

The HOUSES Project hence achieved its strategy on mobilising home owners and Functional Groups effectively to motivate them to establish HOAs. As of 6 August 2021, 2,288 home owners’ Functional Groups, supported by the HOUSES Project, registered to become HOAs.

The needs of the HOUSES Project’s beneficiaries (Functional Groups, HOAs and HBCs) were fully covered by training curriculums and consultancy support. This again was attributed to the organisation and coordination of the Regional Coordinators across 24 regions in Ukraine. As of 6 August 2021, 6,105 HOAs (newly registered and existing) were supported.

The HOUSES Project’s information campaign through social media platforms, online information sessions/workshops have resulted in 153 HBCs interested to transform into HOAs. However, challenges remain on further transforming HBC across Ukraine due to:

- outdated legislations/regulations that still enabled HBCs to continue functioning alongside with HOAs
- the need to changing regional/local authorities’ and home owners’ mentalities on the advantages and benefits of HOAs over HBCs
- the regional/local authorities receiving true source of information on HBCs and HOAs

As the training curriculums and consultancy support were fully presented to the beneficiaries by the HOUSES Project, this contributed significantly to improved knowledge on the benefits of managing the apartment buildings successfully and Project. The evaluation further noted that due to the short-term duration of the HOUSES Project, it was unable to determine if HOAs, especially newly-registered and inexperienced HOAs, would be self-motivated to apply the knowledge to function on their own, especially managing large and complex modernisation capital works and keeping updated on changing accounting standards.

However, base on discussion with sample of the evaluation’s beneficiary informants, it was highly more probable that further training and consultancy/technical support is required for these newly-registered and inexperienced HOAs to give them greater confidence before they can effectively function and manage on their own. The HOUSES Project closure further meant home owners of the new apartment buildings might face challenges to effectively organise themselves in an HOA without extensive resources and technical support from the HOUSES Project.

The evaluation also observed that the effectiveness of the HOUSES Project activities and interventions were only truly taking place in the second and third year. While the evaluation noted that during the first year the HOUSES Project established 825 HOAs which was 41% of the target number of HOAs in the PRODOC, this indicated that the HOUSES Project 2-year implementation period would be insufficient as the first year was focused on preparation and promotion of the HOAs. The evaluation thus assessed

that future roll-out to replicate and scale-up the HOUSES Project would need a minimum 4 to 5 years to optimally attain the long-term result effectiveness.

The evaluation further understood that current laws (legislations and regulations) required updating to contemporary societal expectations to enable the right environment and conditions for HOAs to effectively function and thrive in. Some examples included:

- Housing code regulations to regulate home owners in apartment buildings
- Consumer protection laws to create appropriate market prices, concession rates and subsidies for HOAs

The evaluation also observed that current laws on HOAs were still not well understood by regional/local authorities across Ukraine. This also created different interpretations and confusion among the regional/local authorities.

The evaluation noted that the HOUSES Project, as advocates, supported inclusive dialogues between HOAs and national/local authorities, resulting in setting up working groups to develop policy proposal recommendations for the Government of Ukraine. There is an opportunity for UNDP Ukraine to go further in providing technical assistance to the Government of Ukraine in reviewing and developing fit-for-purpose and contemporary laws (legislations and regulations).

The evaluation also noted that the HOUSES Project cooperated with Association of Energy Efficient Cities of Ukraine and provided the association with information on establishing a Revolving Fund to support HOAs.

To resolve current legal, institutional and cultural challenges faced in the HOUSES Project, it is therefore critically important for UNDP Ukraine in its next phase to work closely in partnership with the Government of Ukraine in:

- harmonising and amalgamating of laws (legislations and regulations) to set the right environment and favourable conditions for HOAs
- a coherent dissemination of updated laws to regional/local authorities for effective compliance.

UNDP Ukraine could also consider the below for future follow-up action:

- UNDP Ukraine could potentially explore the cooperation and support of the Association of Ukrainian Cities and Association of Energy Efficient Cities of Ukraine to accelerate the creation and effective functioning of HOAs. By doing so, this would build on the basis established by HOUSES Project to extend the cooperation with existing associations of local authorities
- UNDP Ukraine could initiate their own disbursement of micro grants to help jumpstart HOAs in small scale modernisation capital works. This would give HOAs confidence and experience to implement bigger and complex modernisation capital works

3.3.4 Efficiency

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

Table 8 below shows the key reported figures from the beginning of the HOUSES Project until 1 July 2021 (cumulatively):

Table 8: Key HOUSES Project Information until 1 July 2021

Key HOUSES Project Information	Count
Number of registered Functional Groups	1,902
Number of registered existing HOAs for participation in the HOUSES Project	4,630
Number of registered Housing and Building Cooperatives (HBC) for participation in the HOUSES Project	162
Number of municipalities supporting the HOUSES Project	332
Number of newly established/registered HOAs	2,276
Number of newly established/registered HOAs during the COVID-19 pandemic	711
Number of HOAs (established and pre-existing) applied to EEF	373
Number of HOAs (established and pre-existing) at the energy audit stage prior to applying to EEF	71
Number of HOAs (established and pre-existing) at the stage of making decision to participate in EEF's programme	216

The evaluation noted that despite the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions imposed across Ukraine, the HOUSES Project was still able to adapt accordingly and the activities continued. As a result, about 31% of the newly established/registered HOAs were done during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 9 below showed the implementation status of each HOUSES Project output as assessed by the evaluation.

Table 9: HOUSES Project Implementation Status

HOUSES PRODOC	Implementation Status
Output 1: Home owners are mobilised to organise themselves into HOAs Outcome 1: Increased homeowners' engagement in housing stock management and renovations	Fully Achieved (Exceeded Output Targets)
Output 2: Developed capacities of HOAs in housing stock management, renovations/EE retrofitting planning and resource mobilisation Outcome 2: Quality and sustainable energy efficiency solutions identified by trained HOAs and financed by EEF	Fully Achieved (Exceeded Output Targets)

The HOUSES Project has fully achieved the intended outputs:

- Output 1 considered fully achieved and exceeding the output targets
- Output 2 considered fully achieved and exceeding the output targets

In terms of resource efficiency, the HOUSES Project under-spent its allocated total project funds by about 6% and its utilisation with an average of 66.8%. This was due to the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions in Ukraine which resulted in reduced travel costs and local training/workshop venues costs.

To address the project challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions, the HOUSES Project further undertook two budget revisions to re-purpose the project funds towards increased training and telecommunication and audio/visual equipment for online training, webinars, and virtual workshops/consultancy support/exchange and experience-sharing visits among the HOAs and local authorities.

The HOUSES Project demonstrated sufficient cooperation and exchange of knowledge and information with the partners, having worked closely with the energy efficiency programmes implemented by IFC and GIZ through efficient co-sharing of technical expertise, and joint training and consultancy support to maximise benefits to HOAs.

Key challenges still remained:

- there is a significant slowdown of the development of local HOAs support programs by the local municipalities due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and the recently concluded local elections which resulted in changes to local councilors and local authorities that might not support or fully understand HOAs.
- local municipalities have revised their budgets allocated to support programmes for HOAs and EE in favour of budget repair measures to overcome the budget pressures caused by the COVID-19 pandemic

3.3.5 Ownership

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

The HOUSES Project developed exit strategies to ensure that key essential advisory and support would still be available to HOAs. These essential advisory and support included online webinars, civil society organisations, association of HOAs, local resource centres, free legal aid services (Ministry of Justice).

The sustaining ownership and HOUSES Project benefits among HOAs would be affected by the continuing COVID-19 pandemic restrictions, reduced/limited financial support from local authorities and economical challenges faced by home owners to their livelihoods.

Existing and more experienced HOAs would likely sustain the ownership while newly-created HOAs would still need support to sustain the ownership.

The HOUSES Project Regional Coordinators were instrumental in organising and coordinating all advisory, consultancy support and grants resources which were extensively available for free to HOAs. Hence, the HOUSES Project with its 24 Regional Coordinators as “catalyst boosters” helped accelerated the extensive availability. After the HOUSES Project closure, these 24 Regional Coordinators and resources would not be extensively available and some of these resources would only be available on a pay-per-service.

HOA training courses continue to be available for interested participants but updating of the training content materials may not happen after the HOUSES Project closure.

3.3.6 Sustainability

Sustainability Rating: **3/4** (Moderately Likely - Moderate Risks)

The HOUSES Project developed online training courses and manuals on the setting up of HOAs and assisting HOAs to sustainably manage their multi-apartment buildings. Subject to any drastic circumstantial changes due to ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and economical challenges, experienced and existing HOAs who have gone through the HOUSES Project interventions should be able to sustain themselves although all stakeholder informants interviewed in this evaluation overwhelmingly would want the HOUSES Project to continue.

Newly-created HOAs or Functional Groups who did not go through the HOUSES Project interventions would require ongoing support in the initial journey to give them confidence and experience.

The HOUSES Project prepared Association of HOAs and Resource Centres to assist existing or newly created HOAs. However, these resources would likely not be able to fully replicate the extensive “catalyst booster” coordination, training, institutional infrastructure and consultancy support provided by Regional Coordinators of the HOUSES Project.

The changing political and legislative environments affected the achievements of projects results and its sustainability. The evaluation assessed that there is still a need to increase public/stakeholder awareness in support of the HOUSES Project long-term objectives at national, regional, and local levels.

The HOUSES Project has the potential to be scaled up and replicated sustainably across Ukraine if the platforms, networks, institutional infrastructures, and the legislations and regulations are set up to provide the right environment and favourable conditions for HOAs to thrive and sustain:

- Political platform/factors - there is strong support and commitment from (1) the legislators/lawmakers to harmonise/amalgamate and strengthen the legislations and regulations to enhance HOAs with the right environment and favourable conditions to thrive and sustain, (2) the association of local authorities (such as Association of Ukrainian Cities and Association of Energy Efficient Cities in Ukraine) to send a strong unified and consistent message on HOAs
- Financial platform/factors - there should be financial support programmes such as municipality support programmes for HOAs, revolving funds and micro grants for HOAs to jumpstart important modernisation capital works without increasing financial burdens
- Technical platform/factors - Institutional infrastructures (local resource centres, energy efficiency technology support centres, legal aid services, association of HOAs, apartment building management companies) to support long-term sustainability of HOAs
- Environmental platform/factors - implementation of waste management and recycling programmes will help broaden and complement energy efficiency measures for the multi-apartment buildings
- Social platform/factors - domestic exchange visits (virtual, face-to-face) on experience sharing among HOAs, targeted information campaigns to different regions and community groups

3.3.7 Impact

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

The success stories and lessons learned from the HOUSES Project have the potential to contribute to further reform of Ukraine's energy efficient sector, specifically to the reforming of its housing and communal sector. The evaluation further assessed that there is a need to harmonise the legislations and regulations to set the right environment and favourable conditions for HOAs to thrive in.

The HOUSES project contributed to the establishment of an institute of a responsible home-owner, capable to take the responsibility for the management of their homes. However due to the short-term duration of the HOUSES Project, the evaluation cannot yet establish if HOAs can function effectively and efficiently on their own after project closure. As previously mentioned, it is highly more probable that:

- further training and consultancy/technical support is required for newly-registered and inexperienced HOAs to give them greater confidence before they can effectively function and manage on their own
- the HOUSES Project closure could result in home owners of the new buildings facing challenges to effectively organise themselves in an HOA without extensive resources and technical support from the HOUSES Project

The HOUSES Project demonstrated how the establishment of HOAs could provide sustainable change and impacts on the lives of women and men, vulnerable groups, specifically low-income home owners. Specifically, the HOUSES Project had "spill effects" evidences of contributing women's empowerment, protection of human rights, social inclusion and environmental protection within the resident families of multi-apartment building communities or groups in the community. Some examples included stronger community bonding through organised social events, community response to COVID-19 pandemic, and practical helps to needy residents (more details provided in Section 4 of this report).

The HOUSES Project's targeted information campaign via regional/local TV channels and social media platforms improved the awareness about energy efficiency issues in multi-apartment buildings. This would form the basis for future information campaigns to provide greater coverage at national TV channels to reach the entire Ukraine population, especially to those in the smaller towns and rural regions.

3.3.8 Basic Human Needs / Gender Equality

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

The evaluation assessed that there were some reported “spill-effect” evidences and stories on how the HOUSES Project, through the HOAs, contributed to improving and sustaining the well-being of residents and communities. Some examples included how HOAs contributed to insulating the apartments for residents’ better living, supporting the most vulnerable residents with personal needs, strengthening apartment resident community bonding through community activities, and disseminating true source of information to apartment residents (more details found in Section 4 of this report).

The HOUSES Project also reportedly looked into the needs of the low-income home owners. It was reported that 24% of newly set-up HOAs, supported by the HOUSES Project, managed apartment buildings with at least 25% of low-income home owners. The evaluation noted that future follow-up work could also focus in working closely with the Government of Ukraine to consider concession rates and subsidies for low-income home owners in apartment buildings.

The HOUSES Project had specific indicators with gender marker data to address gender equality and the empowerment of women. For example, it was reported that 51% of newly set-up functional groups and HOAs, supported by the HOUSES Project, are managed by women or with a majority of women in their memberships. This demonstrates how HOAs can function as a platform to promote and enable gender equality.

The evaluation assessed that while the HOUSES Project had already proactively collected “spill-effect” impact stories, having more of the “spill-effect” stories communicated publicly would further strengthen the HOUSES Project’s profile on how HOAs could be a platform to address broader societal and environmental issues.

3.3.9 Synergy

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

The HOUSES Project Regional Coordinators, the main transformational “catalyst boosters” of HOUSES Project had strong cooperation with the IFC Regional Coordinators which resulted in:

- providing comprehensive information about EE and related topics
- providing information about the support and grant packages available from the EEF’s “ENERGODIM” programme
- raising general awareness of the legislation in the area of EE
- organising specialised online training sessions and webinars, coupled with targeted consultancy support, to improve HOAs’ knowledge and skills related to energy saving and energy efficiency in multi-apartment buildings

The UNDP Ukraine was part of the biweekly donors’ coordination meeting with Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, EEF, EU, IFC and GIZ which served as a key coordination mechanism between the partners of the EE4U programme.

While this donors’ coordination meeting helped to reinforce a common strategic goal among the EE4U programme partners to support HOAs in implementing EE activities and apply to the EEF, the prolonged EEF application process together with the COVID-19 pandemic, reduced/limited financial support from local authorities and economical challenges faced by home owners to their livelihoods significantly affected the number of HOA applications to the EEF.

The HOUSES Project could benefit further from:

- closer synergy and collaborations with the Association of Ukrainian Cities and Association of Energy Efficient Cities in Ukraine to advance the mobilisation of HOAs
- collaborating with other UNDP-led projects in Ukraine which are involved in parliamentary reforms and sustainable development at the local level to increase the outreach to stakeholders at national, regional and local levels

4. KEY SUCCESS STORY: MOBILISING HOME OWNERS THROUGH HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATIONS TO IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF APARTMENT RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITIES

Background and context:

The Ukrainian housing stock, especially multi-apartment buildings, is known to be relatively old with only 7% of the stock built after 1991. Approximately 94% of the Ukrainian housing stock has been privatised and it is reported that many of these households are still living in obsolete, unsafe or unsuitable apartment buildings. A typical multi-apartment building is 30-50 years old and desperately need major repairs and renovations to make them liveable for apartment residents.

The responsibility for the management and maintenance of common parts of the multi-apartment buildings would be shared between the municipal housing services organisations (ZHEK), home building cooperatives (HBC), and private home owners. Under this management system, major repairs, including those focused on energy efficiency, are traditionally not foreseen/planned. Public heating and hot water supply systems use technically outdated equipment characterised by excessive heat energy losses during its production and transportation to the end-user apartment residents. The energy inefficiency of the apartment building resulted in a negative impact on the cost of energy supply to apartment residents and this in turn affected their social, environmental and economic well-being.

Moreover, home owners generally had limited awareness of their responsibilities, and were often not willing and/or not capable to deal with and contribute to the financing of complex technical interventions to modernise their apartment buildings.

Results and Impact:

The HOUSES Project has implemented activities/interventions and resulted in implementing energy efficient solutions into apartment buildings and improving the well-being of apartment residents and communities as shown in Table 10:

Table 10: The Impact of Home Owners Associations on Multi-Apartment Buildings and Apartment Resident Communities

	Prior to UNDP HOUSES Project Interventions	Post UNDP HOUSES Project Interventions
HOAs involved in implementing energy efficiency solutions into apartment buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apartment buildings common areas (such as exterior building structures, sewerage, indoor pipes, lightings, indoor walkways and common lifts) are in poor working conditions due to low maintenance, making it inconvenient and unsafe for apartment residents Higher use of electricity and gas resulting in higher utility bills for apartment residents Indoor temperature was still not warm enough in extreme cold conditions and this could increase unhealthy/hazardous indoor air quality conditions for apartment residents, especially vulnerable groups (elderly residents) Forming of ice and condensation on the walls would cause long-term damage to the apartment building structure 	<p>HOAs helped to initiate and implement thermo modernisation capital works to the apartment buildings, resulting in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> well-maintained apartment building common areas, enabling apartment residents to be able to conveniently travel in and out of the apartments safely with ease reduced forming of ice and water condensation on the walls which would improve the preservation and protection of the apartment building structure well-insulated apartments with suitable temperature conditions for the apartment residents to rest and sleep in comfort lower utility bills resulting in significant financial savings for apartment residents

	Prior to UNDP HOUSES Project Interventions	Post UNDP HOUSES Project Interventions
HOAs proactively ensured the well-being of apartment residents and communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apartment residents faced daily challenges and stresses without knowing how to get support and help Apartment residents, especially single and vulnerable residents being confined to their own apartments, felt isolated and alone without knowing who to turn to for help in the community 	<p>HOAs initiated their own locally-supported initiatives to improve and sustain the well-being of apartment residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> home owners, especially women and people with disabilities, mobilised and empowered to support other disadvantaged groups and families during difficult circumstances supporting the most vulnerable neighbours with payment issues, communal services, and reporting their needs to the local non-governmental organisations to support them organising festive celebrations and other social events among residents and families in the apartment buildings to strengthen community bonding and stay connected organising social activities for people with disabilities building community facilities (such as sports playgrounds and gardens) to improve mental and physical health welfare of apartment residents
HOAs communicate awareness and information knowledge to apartment residents and communities	<p>Apartment residents have little or no access to important information such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> lack of knowledge and awareness on the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak in Ukraine community news or issues on their apartment buildings 	<p>HOAs created social media chat groups and utilised the apartment buildings information boards (provided by the HOUSES Project) to effectively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> disseminate true source of information to apartment residents on COVID-19, and how to avoid infection and protect oneself promote community waste sorting and composting to help improve the apartment building environment organise greening and gardening activities to improve the environment surroundings as part of overcoming the stress and challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown <p>HOAs have also started connecting with other HOAs in other towns to initiate exchanges and experience-sharing on better practices in the management and maintenance of apartment buildings.</p>

5. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Conclusion #1: The UNDP HOUSES Project has demonstrated that Ukrainian home-owners can be mobilised to establish their HOAs, given the right knowledge and tools.

The HOUSES Project seeks to address a development challenge in Ukraine on the need to further mobilise the community of Ukrainian home owners to change/shift to a new mindset to organise themselves within the available legal environment to fully realise their rights and responsibilities in relation to the management and maintenance of their apartment buildings. This is only made possible with home owners changing/shifting to a new mindset and attitude to take responsibility and play an active role.

With the HOUSES Project providing the numerous exchange-experience sharing and equipping HOAs with the right institutional knowledge, skillsets and tools, home owners can now be empowered through the existence of HOAs to bring social, environmental and economic benefits to ensure the well-being of apartment residents and communities.

Lesson Learned:

- Institutional knowledge must be preserved and made available for other Ukrainian home-owners to draw from.
- The virtual/face-to-face exchange tours and experience-sharing platforms proved extremely useful. National/regional/local authorities and local communities were able to witness the successes and benefits of setting up HOAs to manage the multi-apartment building and implementing energy efficient solutions in their residential buildings.
- HOAs' role in improving and sustaining the well-being of residents and communities provides a compelling impactful narrative on how HOAs could be a platform to address broader societal and environmental issues in the housing and communal sector

Conclusion #2: External circumstances and economical challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic prevented HOAs from triggering energy efficiency improvements and other capital/modernisation works in their residential buildings

The HOUSES Project Team has done their best and laid strong foundations to mobilising home owners to establish of new HOAs. Furthermore, the HOUSES Project was able to effectively build and strengthen the capacities of the newly established and pre-existing HOAs. This capacity building activities should continue to assist HOAs in effective and efficient functioning to manage and maintain multi-apartment buildings.

The challenging external circumstances and economical challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions prevented HOAS from continuing to function effectively and efficiently such as triggering energy efficiency improvements and other capital/modernisation works in their residential buildings. Improving energy efficiency in the residential housing sector remains significant. Further potential opportunities exist for mobilising financing resources for HOAS to continue implementing home improvement projects.

Lesson Learned:

- The setting up of HOA is the first step while continuous follow-up support and motivation to help HOAs function in any circumstances efficiently and effectively is critical
- Newly created HOAs need ongoing support to start functioning incrementally on small-scale capital/modernisation works with close follow-up support and co-financing support. This will help them gain confidence and experience to take on large-scale capital/modernisation works

Conclusion #3: The HOUSES Project has the potential to be replicated and scaled up across Ukraine if there is the right environment with favourable conditions for HOAs to succeed and thrive to bring benefits to local communities.

An important result demonstrated in the HOUSES Project was how the intended project outputs stimulated and supported the creation of HOAs throughout Ukraine, and to prepare them to seek and obtain financing for their home improvement projects. This was further strengthened with strong support and commitment from national counterparts and local municipalities.

The HOUSES Project, as a “catalyst booster” that resulted in creation of HOAs as entities for active bottom-up engagement and civic responsibility, also has other social, environmental and economic benefits on Ukraine’s overall housing sector reform

The HOUSES Project has the potential to be replicated and scaled up across Ukraine. But this must be done in close partnership collaboration with national, regional and local authorities to create the right environment with favourable conditions for HOAs to succeed and thrive to bring benefits to local communities.

Lesson Learned:

- Strong endorsement/support from national/regional/local authorities combined with strong commitment and participation from home owners in multi-apartment buildings are key to accelerate the creation and functioning of HOAs and achieve sustainable results
- The successful incorporation and sustainability of well-functioning HOAs would depend on the legislation and regulations that could set the right environment and favourable conditions for HOAs to thrive in
- Replication of knowledge/operational capabilities and strengthened capacities of institutional infrastructure (local resource centres, energy efficiency technology support centres, legal aid services, association of HOAs, apartment building management companies) needed to support/sustain the effective and efficient creation and functioning of HOAs

5.2 Recommendations

The evaluation proposes 5 recommendations in relation to proposed future directions to build upon the HOUSES Project. By doing so, this will further replicate and upscale with a significant contribution to:

- an increased public awareness of energy efficiency in the housing sector across Ukraine
- improved quality and transparency of the housing stock management and maintenance, and therefore to a higher energy efficiency compliance, of Ukraine's housing stock
- a positive impact on living standards, through improved quality of housing and reduced economic burden of energy usage costs on households

It is to be noted that the implementation of these recommendations would be dependent on the funding availability for UNDP Ukraine.

R1: Strengthen outcomes indicators and exit strategies in future project design and formulation

For future project design and formulation, UNDP Ukraine should include:

- outcomes-based performance targets to balance expected results with outcome-oriented indicators to better assess the project effectiveness
- Specific activities that incorporate exit strategies to sustain future mobilisation of home owners associations after the project is completed

R2: Improve synergies with other UNDP-led Ukraine projects/programmes to maximise collective results

UNDP Ukraine could strengthen synergies by enabling collaborations and cooperations among other UNDP-led projects with similar portfolios and outcomes to maximise impact and efficiently allocate resources to achieve collective results effectiveness.

R3: Communicate project results with focus on benefits and impacts on societal and community well-being

To strengthen the communications of the project results, UNDP Ukraine should focus on reporting and presenting the project's outcome-based benefits and impacts of having HOAs on the societal and community well-being. By doing so, the project would enable international donors, national/regional/local authorities and local communities to better understand the positive changes to beneficiaries made by project interventions.

R4: Consolidate institutional knowledge for HOAs into one primary source

For ease of access to all institutional knowledge on HOAs, UNDP Ukraine could consolidate all institutional knowledge into a single one-stop-shop platform. This could include the information brochures and booklets on legislations and regulations for HOAs, the set-up and continuous management of HOAs, training materials, best practice manuals, video links on HOAs, FAQs.

R5: Rollout and scale-up the HOUSES Project across 24 regions in Ukraine

In the future of any stakeholder approval, it is strongly recommended that UNDP Ukraine should continue to scale-up from its HOUSES Project model across 24 regions in Ukraine and to be a long-term project (4 to 5 years) to embed the results effectiveness. This should be done by working in close partnership with relevant partners at national, regional and local levels. Building from the current HOUSES Project activities, there should be further integrated activities:

- R5.1) Harmonisation/amalgamation and strengthening of the legislations and regulations to enhance HOAs with the right environment and favourable conditions to thrive in
- R5.2) Organise study exchange/experience-sharing visits, in other countries of similar context and/or culture to Ukraine, for increased exposure to acquiring knowledge/application of best practices in HOAs
- R5.3) Strengthen the institutional infrastructures (local resource centres, energy efficiency technology support centres, legal aid services, association of HOAs, apartment building management companies) at different regions to support and sustain HOAs
- R5.4) Implement awareness and information campaign at national and regional levels to reach out to a wider population community, especially to the smaller towns and the rural regions
- R5.5) Disburse micro grants for HOAs to work on small modernisation capital or “greening” projects

ANNEXES

A.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Decentralized Final Evaluation of UNDP Project:

Home Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions (HOUSES) - an action within the EE4U Programme

Project ID: 103123

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1.1 Project factsheet

Project name	Home-Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions (HOUSES)
Project ID	00103123
Post title	International Consultant to conduct a decentralized Project Final Evaluation
Country / Duty Station	Home-based
Expected places of travel	Home-based
Duration of Initial Contract	10 May- 30 June 2021
Assignment Quality Assurer	Lesia Shyshko, Partnership and Coordination Officer
Assignment Coordinator	Maria Gutsman, IDRPB Portfolio Analyst
Expected Duration of Assignment	20 working days within the timeframe May-June (including) 2021
Payment arrangements	Lump Sum (payments are linked to deliverables)
Administrative arrangements	All working arrangements to be provided by the Consultant. The Consultant will receive all required information from UNDP, including project documents (electronic or paper format), analytical papers and other relevant documents
Selection method	Technically compliant offer and the lowest price

1.2 Project background and context

The need for energy efficiency improvements across the Ukrainian economy is significant. Ukraine's economy is two or three times as energy intensive as many neighboring countries, including Poland, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic. One of the many sectors which need to become more energy efficient is the housing and communal sector, which directly impacts the quality of the living conditions of millions of Ukrainians, and is completely unsustainable due to the high levels of energy and heat consumption, outdated infrastructure, and heating systems, significant gas wastage and old housing stock. Comparing to the neighbouring EU countries with a similar climate, the housing and communal sector of Ukraine is three to four times less energy efficient and consumes almost 45 percent of the country's energy. The heating sector of residential buildings has one of the largest potentials for improving energy efficiency in Ukraine.

48% of the Ukrainian population live in around 180,456 multi-apartment buildings, 144,000 out of them- which is 80%- require modernisation.¹As an average, the Ukrainian resident of a multi-apartment building consumes 264 kWh energy per sq. meter, while in the European countries the corresponding figure does not exceed 90 kWh / sq. meter as per the official statistics. An analysis of the heating losses in a multi-apartment building shows that 60-90% of the heat is lost through the building envelope (the walls, top floor ceiling, and cellar) due to their low thermal characteristics, 30-40% is lost with ventilated air, 20-30% through the walls, 15-25% is lost through the windows, 10-25% through the roof and 3-6% through the basement, which belong to common parts of the multi-apartment building.

However, although Ukraine's housing stock is privatised at the level of 98%, the responsibility for the management and maintenance of common parts of the multi-apartment buildings has been shared between the municipal housing services organizations (ZHEK), housing/building cooperatives (HBC), and private home owners. Under this management system, major repairs, including those focused on energy efficiency, are traditionally not foreseen/planned. Moreover, co-owners have generally had limited awareness of their responsibilities, and are often not willing and/or capable to deal with and contribute to the financing of complex technical interventions. Attitudes and expectations often lag behind the legal and policy framework.

One of the important steps to align Ukrainian legislation in the field of responsibility of home owners for the energy efficiency of buildings with European standards was the Law №417 "On specifics of ownership in apartment buildings" adopted in 2015. This Law determines the relations associated with the implementation of the rights and performance of duties by co-owners of apartment buildings in terms of its maintenance and administration (including energy efficiency issues). This law provides for the possibility of voluntarily creating a Home Owners Association (HOA) and declared it as a legal entity under the laws of Ukraine.

The proper functioning of HOAs in Ukraine and effective management of common property are prerequisites for the formation and successful implementation of state housing policy and implementation of energy efficiency measures. HOAs become an effective instrument to manage the common property in the multi-apartment building and achieve the reduction of energy consumption and improve quality of life at large.

¹ Data of the Ministry for Communities and Territories Development <https://www.minregion.gov.ua/press/news/fond-energoefektivnosti-prezentuvav-programu-modernizatsiyi-zhitlovogo-fondu-ukrayini/>

According to the State Statistics Service on the beginning of 2020 in Ukraine, the Unified State Register of Legal Entities, Individual Entrepreneurs and Public Associations in Ukraine counted over 34,000 Home Owners Associations, almost 33,000 of them active, while the remaining part either haven't finished their registration or suspended their activity. An analysis held by the Ministry for Communities and Territories Development showed that the most important for HOAs are the first years after the registration; the majority of the HOAs suspended their activities during the first four years². The biggest number of HOAs was established after the adoption of Law#417, currently, approximately 140 HOAs are created per month. If the number of HOAs does not increase, it will take about 87,5 years to establish them in all multi-apartment buildings in Ukraine.

Furthermore, a new law that implements a European Union directive on the efficiency of buildings in July 2017, and the set-up of a Ukrainian Energy Efficiency Fund (EEF), which was officially registered on 24 July 2018. The objective of the Fund is to improve Ukraine's energy efficiency by reducing the level of energy consumption and CO₂ emissions in the residential sector, thus achieving a decrease in the adverse impact on the environment. The Energy Efficiency Fund provides support to Home Owners Associations for the implementation of the thermo-modernisation projects and energy-efficiency renovations in multi-apartment buildings while factoring in the best European thermal modernisation practices. Financing of energy efficiency projects is made through partial refunds (grants) to Ukrainian Home Owners' Associations for energy efficiency project's costs. Since the launch of its programme for the residential sector "ENERGODIM" in September 2019 the Energy Efficiency Fund received 625 applications for grants from HOAs, with estimated total budget of projects exceeding UAH 4,9 billion and total amount of requested funding from EEF approaching UAH 3,6 billion. More than 321³ applications are already approved for funding.

In 2017 and 2018, the European Commission adopted its Energy Efficiency Support Programme for Ukraine (EE4U, phases I and II), aimed at contributing to increased energy efficiency in the Ukrainian residential sector and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In this context, the EU, together with Germany, is supporting the activities of the Ukrainian Energy Efficiency Fund by providing grants to energy efficient renovations of multi-apartment buildings across Ukraine. Through this Programme, the EU contributes 80 million Euros to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (established and managed by the International Finance Corporation - IFC - in the framework of the EE4U Programme) as well as over 20 million Euros package of technical assistance.

² В Україні діє 32 982 ОСББ - дослідження Мінрегіону <https://www.minregion.gov.ua/press/news/v-ukrayini-diye-32-982-osbb-doslidzhennya-minregionu/> ³ <https://energodim.org>

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) NDP was called upon by the European Union to contribute, through technical assistance, to the improvement of the Ukrainian housing stock energy efficiency. In the context of “Home Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions (HOUSES) - an action within the EE4U Programme” (HOUSES) project, UNDP is intervening during a period of 34 months to stimulate and support the creation of Home Owners Associations through a local presence, and to prepare them to seek and obtain financing for their home improvement projects. UNDP is preparing HOAs by building on its country-wide network of partnerships with regional and local governments, and its long-standing experience of bottom-up citizen mobilisation for common action, including the creation of home-owners’ associations.

The specific targets to be achieved through the implementation of the project are: throughout the country’s 24 oblasts, with UNDP’s support, at least 2,250 new HOAs to be created and a total of 6,000 HOAs to be trained to manage their associations and develop energy efficiency projects. The project will directly benefit an average of 480,000 people throughout Ukraine and will help raise energy efficiency awareness of no less than 1,000,000 people overall. The large-scale creation of home-owner associations as entities for active bottom-up engagement and civic responsibility also have other benefits on overall housing sector reform.

Overall, since the beginning of the project, some 5,545 HOAs improved their capacities in the management of their home through training provided by the Project; more than 2,118 new HOAs were established, including more than 570 established during the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, up to the date, 57 newly established and 114 trained HOAs by the project applied for the “ENERGODIM” programme of the EEF, while 45 more HOAs are at the stage of the energy audit and 77 HOAs are considering their participation in “ENERGODIM” programme.

In order to effectively implement the project, the following key partnerships were established. At the national level, the project works with the Ministry for Communities and Territories Development as the main project beneficiary; provides support to the Energy Efficiency Fund in launching its grant programme, closely cooperates with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) as the key institution responsible for the management of the EEF and an international organization of the World Bank Group active in the field of energy efficiency and communal services. Both IFC and UNDP have been working in close cooperation through the entire project’s implementation period and clearly distributed activities: UNDP covers activities related to the identification of the project’s participants (Functional Groups, HOAs), improvement of their capacity through professional knowledge developed within the project’s training programmes, while the IFC partner covers technical details of the EEF grants. At the sub-national level, the project works closely with municipalities (over 300), local councils, home owners and Associations of Home Owners Associations.

2. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

UNDP seeks to conduct a decentralized final project evaluation. The nature of the final evaluation is largely a management tool to provide project teams and stakeholders with an account of results received at the time of the reporting, assess project progress against initial plans, project documents, highlight important lessons learnt, demonstrate the sustainability of the results and ownership of the project by the beneficiaries.

The main objective of the evaluations is to assess the efficacy of the project design, relevance of the project outputs, specific contributions and impact, efficiency and effectiveness of the project's approach, and sustainability of the interventions of the project "Home-Owners of Ukraine for Sustainable Energy Solutions (HOUSES) - an action within the EE4U Programme".

The purpose of the evaluation is to study the mobilisation of the Ukrainian population of home-owners to trigger energy efficiency improvements in their housing buildings and the creation and capacity development of Home Owners Associations at the local level throughout the country and their preparation to apply for financing to the Energy Efficiency Fund. It is expected that the incumbent will analyze the implementation of the project in 2018-2021 against the planned results and draw conclusions and lessons learned as well as recommendations for similar initiatives, carried out by UNDP. The evaluation will highlight strengths, weaknesses/gaps, good practices and provide recommendations for similar initiatives for HOAs in multi-apartment buildings in Ukraine.

This decentralized evaluation will assess project performance against the review criteria, as outlined in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, based on OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.**

The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the HOUSES project. Given the nature of the evaluation, the Evaluator will:

- a) compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project's objectives, and
- b) draw lessons learnt and provide clear recommendations for similar initiatives in Ukraine.

The evaluation will be carried (home-based) between December 2020 and February 2021 (30 working days in total).

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A. RELEVANCE

- Country context: how relevant was the project to the interventions target group, including Home Owners Associations' needs and priorities? To what extent was the project aligned with the policies and strategies of the Government, the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as the UNDP Country Programme Document/UN Partnership Framework?
- Target groups: To what extent was the project relevant to address the needs of community members that live in multi-apartment buildings in the realm of 1) creation of a HOA and management of its property through its statutory body and 2) conducting a meeting of co-owners and select a managing company by a majority of votes, or deciding that they will manage it directly?
- Does the project remain relevant considering the changing environment in the face of the economic crisis linked to the COVID-19 pandemic, while taking into consideration the risks/challenges mitigation strategy? What can be done additionally to better capture the

needs of the target group relevant to the focus of the project?

- Was there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country caused by the presidential and parliamentary elections held in 2019, the local elections held in 2020 and the COVID-19 pandemic and their effect on the operational context?

B. EFFECTIVENESS

- Was the overall project performance carried out with reference to the Energy Efficiency Support Programme for Ukraine (EE4U), the respective project document/cost-sharing agreement, strategy, objectives and indicators?
- Was the cooperation with key project partners under the EE4U programme, namely IFC, EEF and GIZ successfully achieved and contributed to the achievement of the project's goals?
- Was the cooperation and support of the municipalities fully explored? Which options remained unexplored for the successful implementation of the EE4U programme?
- Was the involvement of the local partnership network (local administration, amalgamated territorial communities, Associations of Home Owners) sufficient to achieve the project's results?
- Was the project's strategy on the mobilisation of home owners and Functional Groups effective to motivate them to establish a Home Owners Association?
- Were the needs of the project's beneficiaries - Functional Groups and Home Owners Associations - fully covered by the proposed training curriculums? Were the benefits of managing the properly successfully and fully presented to the project's beneficiaries by the project? Which needs remained uncovered and would affect the decisions of home owners to establish themselves in an HOA?
- Was the project's approach to the transformation of the House-Building Cooperatives successful and sufficient to achieve the project's results? What can be done better?
- Did the project target the home owners in the new buildings? What are the challenges the home owners of the new buildings are facing on the way to organise themselves in an HOA?
- What are the results achieved beyond the logical framework? What were the supporting factors at the national or at the sub-national level? What are the main lessons learned from the project's strategies and what are the possibilities of replication and scaling-up the project?
- Has the project sufficiently mainstreamed gender and human rights concerns in the activities? What is the anticipated influence of the intervention on human rights and gender equality? What measures can be taken up to improve the involvement of stakeholders, gender equality, social inclusion, human rights and environmental protection in similar initiatives?
- Has the project addressed the needs of the home owners with low income and explored the support municipalities that can provide to support those?

C. EFFICIENCY

- Was the project cost-effective? Was the project using the least cost options? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the relevant outputs and outcomes?
- Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected period? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results?
- Was the project management, coordination and monitoring efficient and appropriate? Did the monitoring consider gender equality and women empowerment issues, as well as social inclusion and human rights, environmental protection and climate change?
- Are the criteria and governance aspects related to the selection of beneficiaries and partner

institutions appropriate?

- Have there been sufficient cooperation and exchange of information between the partners of the project? How do they correspond to each other and contribute to the achievement of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?
- Was the project building upon/seeking synergies with existing programmes and strategies in order to maximize impact, efficiently allocate resources and avoid duplications?

D. SUSTAINABILITY

- To what extent are project results (impact, if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the project ends? Define the areas that produced the most sustainable results, and the most promising areas requiring further support and scaling-up in the course of future interventions.
- Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- Is the project's approach likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated and increasingly contribute to the inclusive gender responsive socio-economic development at the local level after the project ends? Define which of the platforms, networks, relationships development in the framework of the project that have the highest potential for further scaling up and/or replication.
- Was environmental sustainability considered in the project design and measures accordingly implemented / instruments put in place to ensure that no harm is caused to the environment and natural resources are used sustainably?
- Which social or political risks have challenged the achievements of projects results and its sustainability? Has this appropriately been addressed by the project?
- To what extent were capacity development initiatives for partner organizations adequate to ensure sustainable improvements for women, men and vulnerable groups? What can additionally be done to improve the sustainability of the project?
- What are possible priority areas of engagement and recommendations for the possible future projects/initiatives? Findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect gender equality and women empowerment, social inclusion, and environmental protection.

E. IMPACT

- Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to the reform of the energy- efficient sector of Ukraine, specifically to the reforming of its housing and communal sector?
- Has the project contributed to the establishment of an institute of a responsible home-owner, capable to take the responsibility for the management of their homes and recognizing its importance for the country's reforms, energy security and independence?
- What is the impact of the establishment of an institute of a responsible home-owner on the quality of life of Ukrainian? What sustainable change has the project made in the lives of women and men, vulnerable groups, specifically home owners with low income, and targeted communities of home owners at large? Has there been any 'spill-over' effect on other communities or groups in the community?
- Has the project improved the Ukrainian population's awareness about energy efficiency issues and specifically the national energy reform agenda?
- Has the project contributed to gender equality, women's empowerment and protection of human rights, social inclusion and environmental protection?
- Has the project contributed to the larger context?

The final list of evaluation questions and tools to be proposed by the evaluator and agreed with UNDP in an Inception report. All evaluation questions should mainstream gender and will be screened by UNDP's gender team.

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Methodology

The evaluator will be required to use a few different methods to ensure that data collection and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, such as: desk studies and literature review, quantitative data, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys, most significant change method... This approach will not only enable the final evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The concrete mixed methodological approach will be detailed in the Inception report and stated in the Final report. All data provided in the report should be disaggregated by gender and types of vulnerabilities. Furthermore, the evaluation methods and sampling frame should address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the project, particularly the most vulnerable ones. Ethical standards are required throughout the evaluation and all stakeholder groups are to be treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with UNDP Country Office (CO), project team, government counterparts, the Delegation of the European Union to Ukraine at all stages of the evaluation planning and implementation. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with UNDP strategic priorities, including eradicating poverty, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development, gender equality and women's empowerment, and building resilience to crises and shocks.

The evaluation of project performance will be carried out against the expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. All indicators in the Logical Framework need to be assessed individually, with final achievements noted. An assessment of the project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) design, implementation and overall quality should be undertaken, with specific emphasis of whether gender equality and women's empowerment issues have been considered. The evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including project budget revisions. Project cost and funding data will be required from the project, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. The evaluation also should include the value of money aspect - the minimum purchase price (economy) but also on the maximum efficiency and effectiveness of the purchase.

The evaluator is expected to develop and present a detailed statement of evaluation methods/approaches in the Inception report to show how each objective and evaluation criterion will be assessed.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of including, but not limited to:
 - a) The original project documents, progress reports, action plans, M&E frameworks;
 - b) Notes from the meetings involved in the project (donor coordination meetings, Project Board meeting, Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) etc.)
 - c) Other project-related material produced by the project (such as datasets, publications, audio-visual materials and consultancies reports).
2. Interviews with the relevant UNDP Country Office and the project's management and staff, Delegation of the European Union, project partners such as GIZ, IFC and EEF, and the various national sub-regional, and local authorities dealing with project activities as necessary, to provide in-depth briefing on the project, its results, context of partnerships with different stakeholders etc. as well as vision for future.
3. Interviews and focus groups discussions with project partners, beneficiaries and other

social groups affected by the outcomes of the project. Partners and beneficiaries can be divided into two distinct groups:

- a) Members of local communities, specifically Initiative Groups and Home Owners Associations, who directly participated in the implementation of the project and benefitted from the project;
- b) Government institutions (national authorities, regional and local state administrations, amalgamated territorial communities, other).

4. Debriefing session will be arranged for discussing the evaluation findings, results and recommendations.

5. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (key deliverables)

The Consultant should provide the following deliverables:

Deliverable #	Task description	Days and timing	Payment breakdown
Deliverable #1	<p>Conduct desk research of the project's core documentation (cost-sharing agreements, project documents, annual work plans and progress reports 2018-2021, project implementation plans). The set of documents to be reviewed will be prepared by UNDP.</p> <p>Develop an evaluation methodology and strategy to collect the required data, plans and forms for the interview with partners and counterparts. Output: The Inception report (with detailed description of the methodology and evaluation matrix, and a workplan) is produced; an annotated structure of the report is developed; a toolkit for gathering data (questionnaire and interview plans, a questionnaire for a beneficiary satisfaction survey) is designed to address the review criteria and the principles illustrated above in the document. All documents are submitted to UNDP for final approval.</p>	3 days, By 14 May 2021	20%

<p>Deliverable #2</p>	<p>Conduct necessary consultations and interviews with the project staff and project partners. Examine how stakeholders assess the project and what their concerns and suggestions are. Clarify issues that emerge from the preliminary analysis of the project and require hard and soft data to substantiate their reasoning. Discuss the existing needs in the field of energy efficiency sector development and how the follow-up phase of the project should address them. Collect and analyse feedback from the partners.</p> <p>Initial findings discussed in a wrap-up session with Project team and UNDP CO (via video conference).</p>	<p>10 days, By 11 June 2021</p>	<p>0%</p>
<p>Deliverable #3</p>	<p>Produce a draft report of the evaluation covering all items detailed in paragraph #2 of the present TOR with a definition of the lessons learned and recommendations for the follow-up phase of the project.</p> <p>Output: draft of the report produced and submitted for UNDP and Delegation of the European Union (DEU) Results-Assessment Form for Final Project Evaluation (<i>UNDP and DEU review will take up to 10 working days</i>).</p>	<p>5 days, By 18 June 2021</p>	<p>40%</p>
<p>Deliverable #4</p>	<p>Collect, review and incorporate comments from UNDP and DEU into the final version of the evaluation report.</p> <p>Output: Final evaluation report containing all required annexes indicated in paragraph #3 of the present TOR, submitted to UNDP for final review and approval.</p> <p>Final finding discussed in the debriefing session with UNDP CO and DEU team</p>	<p>2 days, By 29 June 2021</p>	<p>40%</p>

The detailed structure of the final report should be agreed with UNDP and reflect all key aspects in focus.

The key product expected is a comprehensive evaluation report (up to 30 pages without annexes, single spacing, Myriad Pro font, size 11), which includes, but is not limited to, the following components:

- Executive summary (up to 3 pages)
- Introduction
- Evaluation of scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and methods
- Development context and project background
- Data analysis and key findings and conclusions
- Lessons learned and recommendations for future intervention (including viable ideas on work directions which could be sharpened and further enhanced in the next project phase)
- Annexes: TOR, list of people interviewed, interview questions, documents reviewed etc.

The conclusions related to the implementation of the project in 2019-2021 should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, challenges and outcomes of the project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically linked to the final evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and DEU.

The recommendations for the project should identify how best practices and achievements of the project can be scaled up or proliferated to increase the positive impact of similar intervention on local communities' development in Ukraine. Also, how theory of change of the project may be adapted/strengthened to be more relevant in the evolving context, based on interviews with project partners and beneficiaries, and desk analysis. The recommendations (5-7) need to be supported by an evidential basis, be credible, practical, action-oriented, and define who is responsible for the action - to have potential to be used in decision-making.

The evaluator should provide a proposed design, methodology of evaluation (methods, approaches to be used, evaluation criterion for assessment of each component to be proposed), detailed work plan and report structure to UNDP prior to the start of fieldwork; these documents and the list of businesses and other stakeholders to visit should be agreed with UNDP. While proposing the methodology, the Consultant should be guided by UNDP approach to project evaluations⁴. Payment will be based upon satisfactory completion of deliverables. 100% of the total amount shall be paid upon completion of the Deliverables 1-4.

⁴ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf>

6. MONITORING/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The consultant will interact with UNDP project and CO staff to receive any clarifications and guidance that may be needed. He/she will also receive all necessary informational and logistical support from UNDP CO and the project. On a day-to-day basis, the consultant's work will be coordinated with UNDP Programme Analyst. The satisfactory completion of each of the deliverables shall be subject to the endorsement of the UNDP Partnership and Coordination Officer.

The consultant will inform UNDP of any problems, issues or delays arising during the implementation of the assignment and take necessary steps to address them.

The key product expected is two comprehensive evaluation reports (*with parameters indicated above in section 2*)

The report must be as free as possible of technical jargon in order to ensure accessibility to its wide and diverse audience. The Report should be prepared in English.

All reports and results are to be submitted to the UNDP in electronic form (*.docx, *.xlsx, *.pptx, and *.pdf or other formats accepted by UNDP).

7. EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS

Education: Master's/Specialist's degree or equivalent in Economics, Management, Mathematics, Social Sciences, Public Administration, Business Administration or other relevant area.

Relevant professional experience: At least 5 years of work experience in the area of socio-economic development, energy efficiency, community mobilization, civil society and community development, monitoring and evaluation. Working experience in Eastern Europe region and CIS will be an asset.

Experience in evaluation and research: Not less than 5 years of proven experience in designing, conducting and leading development evaluations, providing consultancies and/or monitoring, based on qualitative and quantitative methods.

At least, 3 completed evaluations and/or research reports, where the candidate was the author or co-author especially in of socio-economic development, energy efficiency, community mobilization, civil society and community development, understanding of gender aspects (a reference to or copies of previously developed knowledge materials including analytical reports, research papers, case studies materials, etc. to be provided).

Excellent written and oral communication skills with demonstrable experience of analytical reports writing (at least 3 program/project evaluation documents prepared).

Fluency in English. Ukrainian would be an asset.

The evaluator must be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation.

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant 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 consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

8. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS

Required	
	Letter of interest/proposal, providing brief methodology on how the work will be conducted and/or approached (up to 2 pages);
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	P11 form, including information about past experience in similar projects / assignments and contact details for referees.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial proposal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP

A. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

Lump sum contract

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Education:

- Master's/Specialist's degree or equivalent in Economics, Management, Mathematics, Social Sciences, Public Administration, Business Administration or other relevant area - pass/fail;
- *Relevant professional experience:* At least 5 years of work experience in the area of socio-economic development, energy efficiency, community mobilization, civil society and community development, monitoring and evaluation. Working experience in Eastern Europe region and CIS will be an asset - pass/fail;

Experience in evaluation and research:

- Not less than 5 years of proven experience in designing, conducting and leading development evaluations, providing consultancies and/or monitoring, based on qualitative and quantitative methods - pass/fail;

- At least, 3 completed evaluations and/or research reports, where the candidate was the author or co-author especially in of socio-economic development, energy efficiency, community mobilization, civil society and community development, understanding of gender aspects (a reference to or copies of previously developed knowledge materials including analytical reports, research papers, case studies materials, etc. to be provided) - pass/fail
- Excellent written and oral communication skills with demonstrable experience of analytical reports writing (at least 3 program/project evaluation documents prepared)
- pass/fail;
- Fluency in English - pass/fail.

C. EVALUATION METHOD

Lowest price technically compliant

Contract award shall be made to the incumbent whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
 - b) having received the cumulative highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
- * Technical Criteria weight: 70%
- * Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum 70% from the maximum available technical score (70 points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

The maximum number of points assigned to the financial proposal is allocated to the lowest price proposal and will equal to 30. All other price proposals will be evaluated and assigned points, as per below formula:

30 points [max points available for financial part] 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.

A.2 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP):

UNDP Ukraine Country Office:

- Ms Lesia Shyshko, Partnership and Coordination Officer, Team Leader a.i., Strategic Planning, Partnerships and RBM
- Ms Maria Gutsman, Programme Analyst

UNDP Ukraine HOUSES Project Team:

- Ms Svitlana Timshyna, Project Team Leader
- Ms Tetiana Kvinikadze, Administrative Officer
- Ms Anna Orudzhova, Administrative Assistant
- Ms Yana Zhambekova, Community Development Specialist
- Ms Oksana Vlasenko, Project Assistant (Community Development)
- Ms Iryna Gram, Finance Assistant
- Ms Iryna Boiko, Community Development Associate in Volyn oblast
- Ms Lesia Popeliukh, Community Development Associate in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast
- Ms Mykola Smirnov, Community Development Associate in Kyiv oblast
- Ms Oksana Kraplych, Community Development Associate in Zhytomyr oblast
- Ms Svitlana Koval, Community Development Associate in Luhansk oblast
- Ms Tamara Kharchenko, Community Development Associate in Sumy oblast
- Ms Tetiana Hvozdz, Community Development Associate in Mykolaiv oblast
- Mr Ihor Stefaniv, Community Development Associate in Ternopil oblast
- Ms Olga Kashevskaya, Community Development Associate in Rivne oblast
- Ms Svitlana Rozhok, Community Development Associate in Chernihiv oblast
- Ms Natalia Kalchenko, National Consultant/Trainer

UNDP Ukraine Regional Development Programme Team

- Dr. Mustafa Sait-Ametov, Regional Development Programme Manager
- Mr Anton Sydorenko, Communications and Monitoring Associate
- Mr Martin Zelinka, Social Inclusion Associate

UNDP Independent Evaluation Office:

- Mr. Anthony Constanzo, Independent Evaluator, Independent Country Programme Evaluation (ICPE) Ukraine

European Union (EU Delegation to Ukraine):

- Ms Olga Borodankova, Sector Manager for Energy Efficiency

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ):

- Ms. Oksana Oliynyk, Senior Project Coordinator in Lviv oblast
- Ms. Olena Symonenko, Project Coordinator

International Finance Corporation (IFC):

- Ms Mai Nguyen, Program Manager, Energy Efficiency For Ukraine
- Mr Mykhailo Pavlychenko, Lead Coordinator, Residential Energy Efficiency Project in Ukraine
- Ms Oksana Rafalska, Regional Coordinator in Zhytomyr oblast
- Mr Viktor Mostovoi, Regional Coordinator in Odesa oblast
- Mr Serhii Kazaku, Regional Coordinator in Donetsk oblast
- Mr Mykhailo Lukianyuk, Regional Coordinator in Rivne oblast

National Partners:

- Mr. Dmytro Petrunin, Director-General for the Energy Efficiency Directorate, Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, Government of Ukraine
- Ms. Svitlana Startseva, Deputy Director- Head of Department, Directorate for Housing Policy, Ministry for Communities and Territories Development, Government of Ukraine
- Ms Yuliia Holovatiuk-Ungureanu, Director, Energy Efficiency Fund (EEF), Government of Ukraine
- Ms Kateryna Radchenko, Communications Advisor, Energy Efficiency Fund (EEF), Government of Ukraine

Regional/Local Municipalities:

- Ms Kytaigora Iryna Oleksandrivna, Kremnina Municipality
- Ms Lyudmila Balabukha, Chief Specialist, Housing and Communal Services, Department of the Belotserkivsky City Council
- Ms. Olena Khomych, Rivne Regional State Administration, Department for Communal Services, Energy and Energy Efficiency
- Ms. Olena Lapiuk, Head of Civic Organisation “Resource Centre for Support of HOAs”, Rivne Oblast
- Mr. Oleh Antoniuk, Executive Committee of the City Council, Nadvirna City Council
- Ms. Oksana Semehen, Community Resource Centre, Nadvirna City Council

Local Beneficiaries:

- Ms. Alyona German, Home Owners Association, Severodonetsk Oblast
- Mr. Oleksiy Androsiuk, Home Owners Association, Rivne Oblast
- Mr. Grygoriy Tsal-Tsalko, Association of Home Owners Association Heads, Volynsky Oblast
- Mr. Fostyk Valeriy, Association of Home Owners Associations “Bilopilskiy Dim”, Sumy Oblast
- Mr. Adamovych Sergiy, Association of Home Owners Associations "Service", Sumy Oblast
- Ms. Lyudmyla Herasymenko, Home Owners Association, Ch�nihiv Oblast
- Ms. Valentyna Trohymenko, Home Owners Association, Ch�nihiv Oblast
- Ms Olena Fesenko, Home Owners Association, Ch�nihiv Oblast
- Ms. Tamara Miroshnychenko, Association of Home Owners Associations and Home Building Cooperatives Development "Suchasnyi Dim", Deputy Head on HOAs development and Energy Efficiency, Dnipro Oblast
- Ms. Oksana Borova, Home Owners Association/Head of Resource Centre - Epicenter of Changes, Dnipro Oblast

A.4 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- UNDP Ukraine Annual Report 2020
- UNDP Ukraine Country Programme Document 2018 - 2022
- HOUSES Project Document
- HOUSES Annual Work Plans
- HOUSES Project Annual Progress Reports
- HOUSES Project Board Meeting Minutes
- HOUSES Field Monitoring Visit Reports
- HOUSES Project Internal Reports/Documents
- Donors Coordination Meeting Minutes

A.5 LIST OF QUESTIONS USED DURING THE EVALUATION

<u>Stakeholders</u>	<u>Questions</u>
Local Municipalities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your current role in the local municipality/city council? 2. How did you come to know about UNDP HOUSES Project? 3. How did the UNDP HOUSES project contribute to improving municipality issues on home owners and energy efficiency for multi-apartment buildings? 4. Do you see any difference in the quality between home owners associations who were part of the HOUSES Project and home owners associations who were not part of the UNDP HOUSES Project? 5. How do you find the quality of communications and working relationship between UNDP and your city council? 6. In your perspective, what were the key achievements of the HOUSES Project 7. In your perspective, what would be the challenges faced and areas for improvement for the HOUSES Project 8. Would your city council and municipality home owners associations be able to manage on your own after the HOUSES Project ended? 9. How can the HOUSES Project be further scaled up for the future in Ukraine? 10. How do you find the EEF application process? 11. Did you do virtual exchanges on HOAs 12. Do you have an Association of HOA in your municipality? 13. If you were to start all over again, what would you and your city council like to see better coming from the HOUSES Project?
International Partners/Donors	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the international partner/donor appropriately and consistently consulted during the project design stage, and updated on the project implementation progress? 2. Did the HOUSES project align with and address the international partner/donor priorities/directives on sustainable energy solutions and energy efficiency? 3. Did UNDP communicate the HOUSES Project results well to the the international partner/donor? 4. How do you find the quality of communications and working relationship between the international partners/donors and UNDP? 5. How do you find the synergies and coordination among UNDP and the international partners/donors in the HOUSES Project? 6. In your perspective and base on what you understood so far, what were the key achievements of the HOUSES Project 7. In your perspective and base on what you understood so far, what would be the challenges faced and areas for improvement for the HOUSES Project 8. Should the HOUSES Project be further scaled up for the future in Ukraine, what would be the priority and emphasis on?

<u>Stakeholders</u>	<u>Questions</u>
National Partners	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the Ministry appropriately and consistently consulted during the project design stage, and sufficiently updated on the project implementation progress? 2. Did the HOUSES project align with and address the government’s priorities on residential buildings and the housing and communal sector? 3. Did UNDP communicate the HOUSES Project results well to the Ministry? 4. How do you find the quality of communications and working relationship between the Ministry, UNDP and other partners? 5. How do you find the synergies and coordination among UNDP, EU and other donors/partners in the HOUSES Project? 6. In your perspective and base on what you understood so far, what were the key achievements of the HOUSES Project? 7. In your perspective and base on what you understood so far, what would be the challenges faced and areas for improvement for the HOUSES Project? 8. Should the HOUSES Project be further scaled up for the future in Ukraine, what should be the priority focus and emphasis on? 9. Will the Energy Efficiency Fund still continue and will there be any future changes to the Fund? 10. Are there future plans to make changes to the legislation and regulations on the rights and performance of duties by co-owners of apartment buildings in terms of its maintenance and administration (including energy efficiency issues)?
UNDP HOUSES Project Regional Coordinator	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the key achievements of the HOUSES project? 2. What were the challenges faced in the HOUSES project? 3. What would be the key areas for improvement for this HOUSES project? 4. Would the current HOAs be able to manage themselves after this HOUSES project ended? 5. How can the HOUSES Project be further scaled up for the future in Ukraine to increase positive impact of local communities development? 6. If you were to start all over again, what would you have done better for this HOUSES project?

<u>Stakeholders</u>	<u>Questions</u>
UNDP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Details and context behind the HOUSES Project Design stage ie. drafting, finalising and approval of the PRODOC 2. Details and context behind the 2 subsequent changes to the PRODOC 3. Details and context behind M&E activities on the HOUSES Project 4. Data collection on the HOAs during the HOUSES Project 5. What were the key achievements of the HOUSES project? 6. What were the challenges faced in the HOUSES project? 7. What would be the key areas for improvement for this HOUSES project? 8. Would the current HOAs be able to manage themselves after this HOUSES project ended? 9. If this was to start all over again, what could be done better for this HOUSES project? 10. Does UNDP HOUSES Project provide technical support and assistance to HOA applying for EEF grants? Any feedback captured on the challenges faced by HOAs on EEF grant application? 11. How can the HOUSES Project be further scaled up for the future in Ukraine to increase the positive impact of local communities development through HOAs?
Home Owners Associations (HOAs)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Before the HOA was created, what were the challenges you faced in living in your multi-apartment building 2. How did you come to know about the HOUSES Project? 3. After the HOA was created, were these challenges overcome? What are the other benefits of having a HOA? 4. After the HOA was created, do you still encounter any challenges in your multi-apartment building? 5. How has the HOA benefited the local community within your apartment building or within your town? 6. Can you manage the HOA on your own after the HOUSES Project has ended? 7. Having been involved in the HOUSES Project and benefited from the HOUSES Project, what can be done better for the HOUSES Project and what can improve for the HOUSES Project? 8. If the HOUSES Project is to continue, what do you hope for the HOUSES Project to do?

<u>Stakeholders</u>	<u>Questions</u>
Association of Home Owners Associations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the role of the Association of Home Owner Associations? 2. How did you come to know about the HOUSE Project? 3. Before the Home Owners Association was created, what were the challenges faced in multi-apartment building? 4. After the Home Owners Association was created, were these challenges overcome? What are the other benefits of having a Home Owner Association? 5. After the Home Owners Association was created, do they still encounter any challenges in multi-apartment buildings? 6. How has the Home Owners Association benefited the local community within your apartment building or within your town? 7. Can the Home Owners Association manage on their own after the HOUSES Project has ended? 8. Having been involved in the HOUSES Project and benefited from the HOUSES Project, what can be done better for the HOUSES Project and what can improve for the HOUSES Project? 9. Do you work with Home Building Cooperatives (HBC)? 10. What would be the difference between HBCs and HOAs? 11. What are the difficulties/challenges/issues faced by HBCs to convert to HOA? 12. If the HOUSES Project is to continue, what do you hope for the HOUSES Project to do?

A.6 EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

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. ^[L]_[SEP]
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 Form³

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

Name of Consultant: Jeff Fang

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 on *23 August 2021* Signature: 

³ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

A.7 AUDIT TRAIL

Annexed in a separate file

A.8 EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>RELEVANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country context: how relevant was the project to the interventions target group, including Home Owners Associations' needs and priorities? To what extent was the project aligned with the policies and strategies of the Government, the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as the UNDP Country Programme Document/UN Partnership Framework? Target groups: To what extent was the project relevant to address the needs of community members that live in multi-apartment buildings in the realm of 1) creation of a HOA and management of its property through its statutory body and 2) conducting a meeting of co-owners and select a managing company by a majority of votes, or deciding that they will manage it directly? Does the project remain relevant considering the changing environment in the face of the economic crisis linked to the COVID-19 pandemic, while taking into consideration the risks/challenges mitigation strategy? What can be done additionally to better capture the needs of the target group relevant to the focus of the project? Was there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country caused by the presidential and parliamentary elections held in 2019, the local elections held in 2020 and the COVID-19 pandemic and their effect on the operational context? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project stakeholders / partners Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation review Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project aligns with national and UN/UNDP strategies The project addresses the needs of intended beneficiaries Extensive analysis was done in designing the project Donors, national/local partners and/or other stakeholders have been involved and consulted during the project design Resources are sufficiently allocated to achieve the project outcomes The project design remains relevant to take into account the presidential and parliamentary elections held in 2019, the local elections held in 2020 and the COVID-19 pandemic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thematic Analysis Comparative Analysis

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>EFFECTIVENESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the overall project performance carried out with reference to the Energy Efficiency Support Programme for Ukraine (EE4U), the respective project document/cost-sharing agreement, strategy, objectives and indicators? Was the cooperation with key project partners under the EE4U programme, namely IFC, EEF and GIZ successfully established and contributed to the achievement of the project's goals? Was the cooperation and support of the municipalities fully explored? Which options remained unexplored for the successful implementation of the EE4U programme? Was the involvement of the local partnership network (local administration, amalgamated territorial communities, Associations of HOAs) sufficient to achieve the project's results? Was the project's strategy on the mobilization of home owners and Functional Groups effective to motivate them to establish a HOA? Were the needs of the project's beneficiaries - Functional Groups, Home Owners Associations and Housing-Building Cooperatives - fully covered by the proposed training curriculums? Were the benefits of managing the properly successfully and fully presented to the project's beneficiaries by the project? Which needs remained uncovered and would affect the decisions of home owners to establish themselves in an HOA? Was the project's approach to the transformation of the House-Building Cooperatives successful and sufficient to achieve the project's results? What can be done better? Did the project target the home owners in the new buildings? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project stakeholders / partners Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation review Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has fully achieved the intended outcome The project has fully achieved the intended outputs What percentage of the project results at the output level has been achieved? What changes can be observed as a result of these outputs? What other factors may have affected the project results? What were the unintended results (+ or -)? The project results reached the intended local communities/beneficiaries The project has successfully reached and met the intended needs of the target beneficiaries How have the particular needs of targeted and/or disadvantaged groups been taken into account in the design and implementation, benefit sharing, monitoring and evaluation of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thematic Analysis Comparative Analysis

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>What are the challenges the home owners of the new buildings are facing on the way to organise themselves in an HOA?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the results achieved beyond the logical framework? What were the supporting factors at the national or at the sub-national level? What are the main lessons learned from the project's strategies and what are the possibilities of replication and scaling-up the project? 				
<p>EFFICIENCY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the project cost-effective? Was the project using the least cost options? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the relevant outputs and outcomes? • Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected period? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? • Was the project management, coordination and monitoring efficient and appropriate? Did the monitoring consider gender equality and women empowerment issues, as well as social inclusion and human rights, environmental protection and climate change? • Are the criteria and governance aspects related to the selection of beneficiaries and partner institutions appropriate? • Have there been sufficient cooperation and exchange of information between the partners of the project? • Was the project building upon/seeking synergies with existing programmes and strategies in order to maximize impact, efficiently allocate resources and avoid duplications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Project stakeholders / partners • Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation review • Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circumstances giving rise to the need for time extension on the project were justified • Has there been over-expenditure or under-expenditure on the project? • Effective mechanisms are in place to monitor project implementation • Are project resources concentrated on the most important outputs/activities or are they scattered/spread thinly across? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic Analysis • Comparative Analysis

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>SUSTAINABILITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the project results (impact, if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the project ends? Define the areas that produced the most sustainable results, and the most promising areas requiring further support and scaling-up in the course of future interventions. • Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? • Is the project's approach likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated and increasingly contribute to the inclusive gender responsive socio-economic development at the local level after the project ends? Define which of the platforms, networks, relationships development in the framework of the project that have the highest potential for further scaling up and/or replication. • Was environmental sustainability considered in the project design and measures accordingly implemented / instruments put in place to ensure that no harm is caused to the environment and natural resources are used sustainably? • Which social or political risks have challenged the achievements of projects results and its sustainability? Has this appropriately been addressed by the project? • To what extent were capacity development initiatives for HOAs adequate to ensure sustainable improvements for women, men and vulnerable groups? • What are possible priority areas of engagement and recommendations for the possible future projects/initiatives? Findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect gender equality and women empowerment, social 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Project stakeholders / partners • Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation review • Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has planned and put in place an exit strategy • To what extent does the exit strategy take into account the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Political factors (support from national /local authorities) ○ Financial factors (available budgets) ○ Technical factors (skills and expertise needed) ○ Environmental factors (environmental appraisal) • Risk assessments and mitigation strategies/action plans were identified and implemented during project design • Unanticipated sustainability threats emerged during project implementation were mitigated with appropriate measures • What actions have been taken to scale up the project if it is a pilot initiative? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic Analysis • Comparative Analysis

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>inclusion, and environmental protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What can additionally be done to improve the sustainability of the project? 				
<p>IMPACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to the reform of the energy efficient sector of Ukraine, specifically to the reforming of its housing and communal sector? • Has the project contributed to the establishment of an institute of a responsible home-owner, capable to take the responsibility for the management of their homes and recognizing its importance for the country's reforms, energy security and independence? • What is the impact of the establishment of an institute of a responsible home-owner on the quality of life of Ukrainian? What sustainable change has the project made in the lives of women and men, vulnerable groups, specifically home owners with low income, and targeted communities of home owners at large? Has there been any 'spill-over' effect on other communities or groups in the community? • Has the project improved the Ukrainian population's awareness about energy efficiency issues and specifically the national energy reform agenda? • Has the project contributed to gender equality, women's empowerment and protection of human rights, social inclusion and environmental protection? • Has the project contributed to the larger context in the achievement of the SDGs such as SDG 7, SDG 11 and SDG 13? • How do the cooperation and exchange of information between the partners of the project contribute to the achievement of the UN 2030 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Project stakeholders / partners • Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation review • Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of the housing and communal sector being reformed through energy efficient measures • HOA as a legalized entity has been established to take the responsibility for the management of their homes and recognizing its importance for the country's reforms, energy security and independence • There is evidence of sustainable change in the lives of women and men, vulnerable groups, specifically home owners with low income, and targeted communities of home owners at large • There is evidence of increased population awareness about energy efficiency issues and specifically the national energy reform agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic Analysis • Comparative Analysis

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
Agenda for Sustainable Development?				
<p>BASIC HUMAN NEEDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the principles of Human Rights, to what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and vulnerable groups benefitted from the HOUSES Project in contributing to enhance fulfilment of people's economic and social needs? Has the project addressed the needs of the home owners with low income and explored the support municipalities that can provide to support those? Has the project sufficiently mainstreamed human rights concerns in the activities? What is the anticipated influence of the intervention on human rights? What measures can be taken up to improve the involvement of stakeholders, social inclusion, human rights and environmental protection in similar initiatives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project stakeholders / partners Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation review Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has concrete example(s) of how the initiative takes into account the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups such as low-income groups, disabled persons. How has the project programmed social inclusion into the output/activity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thematic Analysis Comparative Analysis
<p>GENDER EQUALITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality? To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? Has the project sufficiently mainstreamed gender concerns in the activities? What is the anticipated influence of the intervention on gender equality? What measures can be taken up to improve the involvement of stakeholders and gender equality? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project stakeholders / partners Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation review Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has concrete examples of contribution to gender equality. The project results can be disaggregated by gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thematic Analysis Comparative Analysis

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>OWNERSHIP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the HOUSES Project have well designed and well-planned exit strategies? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability if any? Is the level of ownership among HOAs sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained after project closure? Will the resources (such as advisory, consultancy and grants) available to HOAs during the HOUSES Project continue to be available after project closure? Can the HOA capacity building courses developed by the HOUSES Project continue to be implemented and updated even after project closure? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project stakeholders / partners Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation review Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has planned and put in place an exit strategy There is evidence of ownership among HOAs to allow for the project benefits to be sustained after project closure HOAs have sufficient resources available that can enable to sustain themselves after project closure The capacity building courses developed for HOAs continue to be implemented and updated after project closure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thematic Analysis Comparative Analysis
<p>SYNERGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the synergies of the HOUSES Project with other development partners (such as EEF, EU, IFC and GIZ) have contributed to a magnified development results? Did the synergies and coordination by reinforcing a common strategy among project partners resulted in higher achieving results? Did the HOUSES Project collaborate and cooperate with other international agency/organization project efforts which resulted in higher achieving results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project stakeholders / partners Project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation review Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders/ partners and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are evidences of inter-linkages between project activities There are partnerships bringing together complementary efforts concerned within single shared outcomes/outputs There are evidences of synergies and coordination by reinforcing a common strategy among project partners towards results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thematic Analysis Comparative Analysis