Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for -the Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* -sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled Energy Efficiency Improvement in Public Sector Buildings in China (PSBEE) (PIMS#5395) implemented through the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development.The project started on the *20th November 2018* and is in its *third* year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (Guidance for Mid-Term Review of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects'.).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The public sector in China is comprised of national and local government-owned and operated institutions and facilities that provide service to the general public . These include buildings of government (central and local) ministries/departments, quasi-government organizations and associations whose operating budget comes from the Chinese government. The table below shows the historical energy consumption and corresponding CO2 emissions in the buildings that comprise the public sector in China. Bulk of the energy consumption is accounted for by coal (50.7%), followed by electricity (40.2), petroleum fuels (7.1%), and natural gas (2.0%). In 2012, the public sector in China consumed about 157 million tce (Mtce) of energy and the corresponding amount of CO2 emissions is about 462 million tons (Mtons). During the period 2005-2012, the average annual energy consumption of the public sector was about 147.8 Mtce, which translates to an average annual CO2 emission of about 434.3 MtonsTo facilitate the widespread practice and application of energy conservation and energy efficiency (EC&EE) in the public sector, the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development (MOHURD) established its Department of Building Energy and Science & Technology, making it responsible for advancing, guiding, coordinating and supervising the implementation of EC&EE initiatives in the public sector in China. It has issued a number of administrative actions on EC&EE in the public sector during the 12th Five-Year Plan (12th FYP) period and has so far realized modest achievements. Nevertheless, even though the public sector in China has realized some achievements in EC&EE and in the application of low carbon technologies, the demand for energy in the sector is still expected to increase in the coming years. The expected increase is due to: (1) new building floor area; (2) application of energy-using equipment; and, number of building occupants. With the expected increase in the: (1) level of work activities; (2) expansion of the scope and coverage of public services; and, (3) overall socio-economic development, there will also be commensurate increase in the demand for energy in public sector buildings. With the current level of technical capacity, understanding on the application and implementation of EC&EE as well as low carbon technologies, and the general attitude of the public sector towards energy conservation, further improvement in the energy utilization efficiency and reduction in specific energy consumption in the public sector will be very difficult to realize in the coming FYP periods.

The abovementioned situation is further exacerbated by the existence of certain persistent barriers, which are as follows:

(1) Inadequate policy and regulatory frameworks that promote and support EC&EE improvement initiatives in the public sector - Currently, there are existing general policies and frameworks on EC&EE but there are no specific ones for the public sector, and the implementation and enforcement of these general policies and regulations are inadequate and ineffective. While there are stated (in the 12th FYP) energy targets and the measures that will be taken to realize the target, the implementation plan for the measures to be done to realize the targets is not adequate; EC&EE projects in the public sector are often not sufficiently funded; do not get enough and optimum funding from social funds, and consequently fall short of achieving target energy and energy cost savings. The lax and rather weak implementation of EC&EE policies in the national and local governments further contributes to this major barrier.

(2) Absence of an overall evaluation system for reviewing and analyzing the existing energy management procedures and practices in public sector entities and their facilities - The administrators and managers of the different public sector buildings in the country are not motivated, and in fact not required/obligated to carry out EC&EE and low carbon technology/technique implementation because their operations costs are uniformly financed from government budgets. Those rather few public sector buildings that have already started doing energy management activities are without the benefit of an effective evaluation system to assist in keeping track of their performance and progress, and provide appropriate recommendations for improving individual EC&EE and energy management efforts. Furthermore, there are also industry associations, the public sector in China does not benefit from an established technology evaluation system, which is currently non-existent.

(3) Limited market-oriented financing mechanism for funding EC&EE technologies/products in the public sector - The public sector in China is also a big energy consuming segment of the national economy but the application of EC&EE technologies in this sector has been limited. Apart from the low level of knowledge and confidence to apply building-related EC&EE (and low carbon) technologies in the public sector, there is also the problem of lack of funding from other sources such as the financial sector (i.e., private banks and financial institutions) and from energy service companies and entities that provide energy supply outsource services, to supplement limited government and social funds. In regards to engineering, procurement and construction (EPC) in the public sector, China's public buildings represent less than 1% of the country's current EPCs

(4) Low level of capacity and awareness of public sector technical and management personnel on the application of EC&EE and low carbon technologies - In general, this is true especially in the public sector in provinces and small to medium cities/towns in the country, where generally there are no capacity development programs designed and catered to the public sector on EC&EE and low carbon technologies and techniques/practices applications. Public sector personnel (e.g., government authorities, policy and decision-makers, public sector administrators, buildings and facilities managers, etc.) and the citizenry have low level of awareness about the various EC&EE and low carbon options and opportunities that can be applicable in public buildings and facilities, let alone the socio-economic and environmental benefits that can be derived from these.

In many developed countries, Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) play a key role in the design, financing, and implementation of EC&EE projects in buildings (commercial and government). In China, local ESCOs are active in such kind of projects in private commercial buildings. ESCOs have not been successful enough in doing business in government buildings. The barriers that prevent ESCOs from

engaging in public sector EC&EE projects such as those in national and local government buildings and facilities are mainly linked to the abovementioned 4 main barriers. The non-involvement of the ESCOs (and private sector financing institutions) in public sector EC&EE activities are by and large effects of 3 of the 4 main barriers, and contributes to the barrier of limited market-oriented and/or performance-based financing mechanism for funding EC&EE technologies/products in the public sector. The ESCO industry just like any other profit-oriented industry would definitely be interested in investing resources (expertise, time and money) in profitable EC&EE projects. The lax and rather weak implementation of policies on EC&EE in the national and local government agencies and facilities mainly prevent private sector ESCOs interest and investment in the public sector EC&EE projects. The main barriers for ESCOs entering public building segment are on the demand side: (a) there are no rules and best practices identified to support the use of engineering, procurement and construction (EPC) contracts in public procurement; and, (b) energy budgets are decreased when energy efficiency is achieved (since budgets are determined by the previous years' actual expenses). This reduces the interest of both ESCOs and public building managers in pursuing EPC since the payment allowance reduces public institutions' ability to pay for the services. The project has a potential and ambitions to leverage significant amount of private sector co-financing from Chinese ESCOs by removing the underlying, demand-side barriers, to foster investment in the public buildings sector.

There a number of services that the private sector can provide in the area of EE/RE applications in the public sector buildings. Currently, the services of private engineering firms are being engaged by some public sector buildings that are keen in doing EC&EE. In the past 5 years, the MOHURD has contracted private consulting firms to carry out energy auditing and energy management services in some of the major public buildings in the major cities. The ESCO scheme is something that the public sector buildings are keen to carry out but the ESCO-related barriers are hindering the MOHURD in doing this. There is also the possibility of engaging the services of the private sector (once the current barriers are removed, and some of the financing schemes will be adopted) to carry out outsourced energy services for the public buildings, including the implementation build-operate-transfer or build-operate-own projects, or variations of these.

a) The main strategy that is employed to achieve the project objective is barrier removal. The enabling conditions that will be created through the barrier removal activities of the proposed GEF project will facilitate the achievement of the required outcomes that will contribute in the achievement of the project objective. Specific interventions that will remove barriers to EC&EE and LC initiatives that bring about reduction of CO2 emissions from the operation of energy consuming equipment/appliances and service facilities in public sector buildings will be carried out. Involving the private sector, particularly banks/financial institutions, as well as entities that are willing to finance EC&EE and LC technology applications through ESCO and PPP modalities, forms part of the strategy for the proposed project. The strategy to attract private sector partners and investment is essentially based on 3 core elements: Knowing and understanding of the current energy utilization – This involves laying the foundation for better and more efficient energy management in the public sector through the establishment of a system that generates up to date and accurate information of energy use that can be monitored on-line using modern ICT technology.

b) Creation of the necessary demand for better energy management and increased energy efficiency - This can be done e.g., by introducing mandatory EE targets for the public sector (at the different levels) and mandating public procurement standards incorporating EE, combined with the right incentives (budget process reform, by allowing the public entities to retain all or part of their energy savings).

c) Stimulation of supply of energy management services and EE measures from the market (i.e., the private sector) by promoting EPC contracting between public entities and private ESCOS (assist the public sector with tendering out the EPC contracts) and establish the required appropriate financial mechanism(s) (guarantees of various sorts, or other credit enhancement measures like concessional lending (from public sources); or some sort of combination) allowing the ESCOs to get access to capital on the right terms to finance EE projects in public buildings.

Lastly, the strategy to continuously facilitate the effectiveness of the established enabling conditions through their institutionalization will be applied. Towards the end of the project, as part of the project activities, a suitable follow-up action plan that comprise of the appropriate actions that will ensure sustainability of whatever policies, regulations, and institutional frameworks that will be established and enforced and implemented in the public sector buildings in China will be developed

Project Summary

The public sector in China include the national and local government-owned and operated institutions and facilities that provide service to the general public. These include buildings of government (central and local) ministries/departments, quasi-government organizations and associations whose operating budget comes from the Chinese government. To facilitate the widespread practice and application of energy conservation and energy efficiency (EC&EE) in the public sector, the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development (MOHURD) established its Department of Building Energy and Science & Technology, making it responsible for advancing, guiding, coordinating and supervising the implementation of EC&EE initiatives in the public sector in China. It has issued a number of administrative actions on EC&EE in the public sector during the 12th Five-Year Plan (12th FYP) period and has so far realized modest achievements. Even though the public sector in China has realized some achievements in EC&EE and in the application of low carbon technologies, energy utilization efficiency and reduction in specific energy consumption in the public sector can be further improved in the coming 13th FYP periods. This existing situation can be greatly improved through improving barriers, including: integrating policy and regulatory frameworks, evaluations systems, market-oriented financing mechanism, and improved outreach and professional capacity building.

The PSBEE project is designed to include the following innovative features:

a) Introduction of ICT solutions and "smart" technologies for building energy management to monitor building energy use, spot immediate and most cost-effective opportunities and effectively monitor performance and improvement. Without a good EMIS it is impossible to move on with any market-based instruments because savings should be objectively monitored to be "monetized".
b) Establishment of EE targets/obligations (in particular in the public sector) to boost demand and uptake of EE measures in public sector buildings. This is in line with the fact that if there are no targets/obligations, there is no market solution, because the public sector tends to be very inert (as in most, if not all countries). But, the target system will only work and generate private interest and investment if there is a robust MRV system (i.e., energy savings verification system (ESVS) underpinning it. Hence, the need for a world class EMIS.
c) Promotion of EPC contracting. EPC contracting has proven to be effective to bring the private sector on board. But it is still new in China, and is still very rarely applied in the public sector (even in developed counties) because of the many barriers and inertia typically in place.

The EMIS is in line with what are considered as emerging global "state of the art" in the building sector, including public buildings, is the proliferation of ICT solutions and "smart" technologies for building energy management to monitor building energy use, spot immediate and most cost-effective opportunities and effectively monitor performance/improvement. UNDP has an excellent track record of piloting EMIS, which received nationwide replication in Croatia and is now being rolled out in other countries. The Croatian EMIS has been listed as international best practice for ICT solutions in buildings. These innovative features are also fully consistent with recommendations from Berkeley Lab/Pacific Northwest Lab on promoting EPCs in China (April 2015).

Expected outcomes:

Goal: Well-managed growth rate of energy consumption and associated GHG emissions from the public sector in China.

Objective: Facilitation of the energy conserving and energy efficient operation of buildings and building services in the public sector in China

1. Public Sector EC&EE Policy and Regulatory Frameworks

This component comprises activities that collectively address the barriers related to the inadequate policies and regulations that help promote and support EC&EE applications and practices in public sector buildings in China. With the delivery of the expected outputs from these activities, a strict enforcement of approved enhanced policies and rules and regulations on energy efficiency and low carbon operation and maintenance of public sector buildings is the expected outcome.

2. Energy Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System for Public Sector Buildings

This component of the project will enable the comprehensive tracking and control of the energy performance of the buildings in the public sector in China. This consists of activities that will deliver outputs that will contribute to better control and enhanced management of the energy performance of public sector buildings. The following major activities will deliver the expected outputs that will help bring about such expected outcome: (1) Review and verification, including the provision of supplemental baseline energy information in the various major segments of the public sector; (2) Design, establishment and operationalization of a public sector building energy audit system; (3) Conduct of energy audits of public sector buildings in at least four buildings per building type, in two public sector sub-sectors; (4) Design, establishment and operationalization of a public sector buildings energy (supply and consumption) management information system (EMIS); (5) Design, establishment and operationalization of a supplementary system of the EMIS for the measurement & verification of reported energy savings in EMIS energy report submissions; and, (6) Design and operationalization of a Public Buildings EMIS database. The EMIS will cover all levels of government and that there should also be a hierarchy of targets from national to local with a clear system for their enforcement.

1. EC&EE Improvement Promotion and Demo Programs for Public Sector Buildings

This major component of the project is meant to address the low level of knowledge and experience in the application and benefits of EC&EE (as well as low carbon) technologies, as well as the financing of these initiatives in public sector buildings. There are two sets of activities within this component. The first set addresses the inadequate resources for implementing EC&EE interventions, and the other set will focus on facilitating the implementation of these technologies. The first set of activities are intended to deliver outputs that collectively contribute to the increased availability of resources (technical capacity, information and financing) for EC&EE initiatives in public sector buildings and facilities. The proposed activities include: (1) Establishment and operationalization of a system for providing information about the features, technical specifications and costs of new EC&EE low carbon technologies (including products) for the public sector; (2) Publication of a directory of recommended applicable and cost-effective new EC&EE and low carbon (LC) technologies (systems and products) for public sector building administrators/managers; (3) Conduct of a comprehensive assessment of market-based financing scheme options and design of appropriate market-based financing of new EC&EE/LC technology (system and product) applications; and, (4) Identification and selection of 5 EC&EE/LC projects that will be financed through market-based financing scheme in public buildings in selected public sub-sectors in three to five cities or regions; (5) Conduct of feasibility analyses and design of EC&EE/LC technology application demonstrations.

2. **Public Sector EC&EE Capacity and Awareness Enhancement Program**

The achievement of enhanced awareness and knowledge of public sector authorities and personnel and the citizenry on the cost-effective application of EC&EE technologies is the expected outcome from the outputs that will be delivered under this project component. This project component is intended to remove the low level of technical capacity and awareness within the public sector in the application and practice of EC&EE and low carbon technologies/techniques. The Intended activities for delivering the expected outputs are the following: (1) Organization and conduct of project promotional campaigns and workshops in target segments of the public sector; (2) Design and conduct of trainings for MOHURD and DOHURD authorities and technical staff on the implementation of the various EC&EE programs: *(a) energy audit; (b) EMIS; (c) ESMS; and, (d) EC&EE/LC demonstration; (e) energy management and technology*; (3) Establishment and operationalization of an information network for the promotion and dissemination of knowledge on public sector EC&EE/LC technology applications; (4) Design, establishment and operationalization of public sector EC&EE/LC management and education training centers in the different climate regions; and, (5) Design, conduct and post-evaluation of EC&EE/LC capacity development programs for the public sector

Funding:
Total Budget (USD): 79,032,420, including USD 8,932,420 from GEF

Implementation Period: 2018-2022

3. MTR PURPOSE

The objectives of this Mid-Term Review (MTR) seek to fulfill the following overarching objectives of the monitoring and evaluation of GEF projects:

The objective of the MTR is to gain an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTR will identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTR will assess early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework (see Annex 1) and various Tracking Tools.

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
2. Executing agencies (including but not limited to senior officials and task team/ component leaders: key experts and consultants in the demonstration areas, PSC members;
3. The Chair of Project Steering Committee
4. Project stakeholders, to be determined at the MTR inception meeting; including academia, local government.

The team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP), the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

---

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
    - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:
- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

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

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

---

[2] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[3] Populate with data from the Project Document
[4] If available
[5] Colour code this column only
[6] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Work Planning:
- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
  - The identified types of risks[7] (in the SESP).
  - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP) .
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

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

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)

---

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

- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

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

iv. Sustainability

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

Financial risks to sustainability:
- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:
- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:
- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 20 working days, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	*5 days*	*(date)*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	*1 day*	*(date)*

Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	*10 days*	*(date)*	
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	*4 days*	*(date)*	

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR start	MTR team submits to the UNDP and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR interview	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft MTR Report**	Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR interview	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The UNDP China will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within China for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A. **International Lead Consultant** （one person）

Budget : Consultant fee

Numbers of working days: 20 days

Profile
- Minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized experience in the Energy Efficiency and climate change area
- Minimum of five years experience of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework
- Familiarity with China
- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported project environments
- Comprehensive knowledge of international project best practices
- Very good report writing skills in English

Responsibilities
- Define the evaluation methodology and schedule, and report to the PMO
- Documentation of the review
- Leading the MTR Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labor within the team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the debriefing for the UNDP China Office and the TNC PMO
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the MTR report

B. National Consultant (two person)

Budget : consultant fee

Numbers of working days: 20 days

Location: Beijing

Profile

- At least ten years' experience of project development and implementation.
- A minimum of five years of project management experience in EE/RE or related climate change projects
- EE/RE and climate change training and technical experience
- Knowledge of EE/RE projects
- Multilateral and bilateral funded project development and implementation
- Familiarity with Energy Conservation national development policies, programs and projects

Responsibilities

- Define the evaluation methodology and schedule, and report to the PMO
- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the evaluation plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined by the International Lead Consultant
- Contributing to presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations at the evaluation

wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the evaluation report.

10. ETHICS

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 100% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by UNDP and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

12. APPLICATION PROCESS[8]

(Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[9] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[10]);
c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (fill address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for (*project title*) Midterm Review" or by email at the following address ONLY: (fill email) by *(time and date)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

---

[8] Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx
[9] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx
[10] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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

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

(The Commissioning Unit is responsible for compiling these documents prior to the recruitment of the MTR team so that they are available to the team immediately after contract signature.)

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the (*Project Title*) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Any additional documents, as relevant.

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[11]

   i. Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR team members
- Acknowledgements

   ii. Table of Contents
   iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
   1. Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

---

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

- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

2. Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
   - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
   - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
   - Structure of the MTR report

3. Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
   - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
   - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
   - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
   - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
   - Project timing and milestones
   - Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*

   4.1 Project Strategy
   - Project Design
   - Results Framework/Logframe

   4.2 Progress Towards Results
   - Progress towards outcomes analysis
   - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

   4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
   - Management Arrangements
   - Work planning
   - Finance and co-finance
   - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
   - Stakeholder engagement
   - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
   - Reporting
   - Communications & Knowledge Management

   4.4 Sustainability
   - Financial risks to sustainability
   - Socio-economic to sustainability
   - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
   - Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*

   5.1 Conclusions
   - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

   5.2 Recommendations
   - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
   - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
   - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes
   - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
   - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
   - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
   - Ratings Scales
   - MTR mission itinerary
   - List of persons interviewed
   - List of documents reviewed

- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.) or Core Indicators*
- *Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')*

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

(Draft questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit with support from the Project Team)

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

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

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[12]

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ *(Place)* on _____ *(Date)*

Signature: _____

---

[12] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

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

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

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

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #)*

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):

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