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Project Title: Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey (EE Buildings)
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Location: Turkey (Ankara)
Category: Environment and Sustainable Development (ESD)
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Reference Code: MTE/EEB/01
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF Project ID:</td>
<td>PIMS: 3646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP Project ID:</td>
<td>74059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>RBEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal Area:</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Objectives, (OP/SP):</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency:</td>
<td>General Directorate of Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Partners involved:</td>
<td>MoEU, MoNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Operational) Closing Date:</td>
<td>Proposed: 30 July 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Standard UNDP/GEF M&E requirements

This Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) is initiated by the UNDP Turkey as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Turkey Country Office and UNDP-GEF levels) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project’s expected results and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- to promote accountability for resource use; and
- to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.
The MTE is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a tool of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The MTE provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

1.3 Project Context

Background Information:
Turkey's primary energy consumption of approximately 106 million toe ranks Turkey among the 25 most energy-consuming countries in the world. Although Turkey has the lowest per capita energy consumption in OECD countries, the country has great potential for rapid growth rate in energy consumption due to ongoing population and economic growth. Turkey's annual electricity demand has tripled since 1990, reaching 198 TWh by 2008. Turkey’s building sector represents the second-largest energy consumer, accounting for 36% of the total final energy consumption which has led to considerable emissions of CO₂ associated with the combustion of fossil fuels. Without a change to the “business-as-usual” scenario, the estimates are that the building sector’s energy consumption will grow to 47.5 million toe by 2020, with concomitant increases in CO₂ emissions expected to double. Therefore, the building sector presents significant opportunities for cost-effective energy and CO₂ savings, estimated to be 30-50% of the current levels. Even though Turkey has gone a long way to create a regulatory environment favorable for investments in energy efficient buildings, there are still a number of critical barriers hampering further development of the market. To overcome some of the barriers to energy efficient (EE) in buildings, three demonstration buildings will be completed, along with other interventions.

Overall Project Objective:
The objective of the project is to reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions in public buildings in Turkey by raising building energy performance standards, improving enforcement of building codes, enhancing building energy management and introducing the use of an integrated building design approach. This will be achieved by; introducing the use of an integrated building design approach via three demonstration buildings and ongoing training in “integrated building design approach” (IBDA) as well as provide stronger regulations, implementers, and institutions. Since there is little knowledge of IBDA in Turkey and awareness of viable energy efficiency demonstrations in buildings are limited, this project will focus on generating an IBDA that is relevant and adapted to the Turkish situation and climate zones that is illustrated through provision of the three demonstration buildings.

Working together with its partners, the project will achieve the following four outcomes to remove the barriers and make progress towards the long-term solutions:

- **Outcome 1:** Improved energy efficiency in new and existing buildings through stronger regulations, institutions and implementers,
- **Outcome 2:** Cost-effective energy efficiency solutions showcased through integrated building design approach (IBDA) application in three demo buildings.

---

1 An integrated building design approach (IBDA), as promoted by this project, is a process of design that integrates climatic conditions, the capture and the conservation of the free solar and internal gains, the efficient and comprehensive reduction of all heat losses through walls and ventilation, the accurate control of all external energy introduced for providing thermal comfort, light, and hot water, and – last but not least – user awareness of new behaviors regarding energy use and good operations and maintenance practices.
Outcome 3: New tools developed and introduced to facilitate compliance with higher energy efficiency standards and application of integrated building design approach in buildings,

Outcome 4: Building energy consumption, energy savings, and other results of the project monitored, evaluated and reported.

Project concept and design
Mid Term Evaluation Expert (MTE Expert) will assess the project concept and design. MTE Expert should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The MTE Expert will revise and re-assess the relevance of indicators and targets, review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation
The MTE Expert will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the MTE is to assess the Project Management Unit’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact
The MTE Expert will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. MTE should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The MTE Expert should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The ET will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

2. DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

The MTE Expert will look at the following aspects:

2.1 Project Concept

2.1.1 Project relevance and strategy: The extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time as well as the extent the activities contribute towards attainment of global environmental benefits:

a. How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results.
b. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective way towards results.
c. Do the outcomes developed during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)? Consider alternatives.
d. Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation?
e. Does the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project?
2.1.2 Preparation and readiness

a. Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
b. Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
c. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
d. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
e. Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

2.1.3 Stakeholder participation during project preparation

a. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project’s design?

2.1.4 Underlying Factors/Assumptions

a. Assess the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project’s management strategies for these factors.
b. Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made.
c. Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

2.1.5 Project organization/Management arrangements

a. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
b. Are the project roles in line with UNDP and GEF programme guides?
c. Can the management arrangement model suggested by the project be considered as an optimum model? If no, please come up with suggestions and recommendations.

2.1.6 Project budget and duration

a. Assess if the project budget and duration were planned in a cost-effective way?

2.1.7 Design of Project Monitoring and Evaluation system

a. Examine whether or not the project has a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives.
b. Examine whether or not the M&E plan includes a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities.
c. Examine whether or not the time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs are specified.

2.1.8 Sustainability and replication strategy

a. Assess if project sustainability and replicability strategy was developed during the project design? And assess its relevance.
2.1.9 Gender perspective:

a. Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing project interventions.

b. How gender considerations are mainstreamed into project interventions?

2.2 Project Implementation

2.2.1 Project’s Adaptive Management

a. Monitoring Systems

- Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
  - Do they provide the necessary information?
  - Do they involve key partners?
  - Are they efficient?
  - Are additional tools required?
- Reconstruct baseline data if necessary. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise.
- Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements.
- Apply the GEF Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.
- Assess whether or not M&E system facilitates timely tracking of progress towards project’s objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually; annual project reports are complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system is used to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs.

b. Risk Management

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why.
- Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
- Assess the project’s risk identification and management systems:
  - Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System appropriately applied?
  - How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen the project management?

c. Work Planning

- Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it:
  - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP/GEF requirements in terms of format and content
  - What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators, if such have on project management
- Assess the use of routinely updated work plans;
- Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
- Is work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning;

---

3 See section 3.2 of the GEF’s “Monitoring and Evaluation Policy”, available at http://207.190.239.143/uploadedFiles/Policies_and_Guidelines-me_policy-english(1).pdf
d. Financial management
   • Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. (Cost-effectiveness: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Also called cost-effectiveness or efficacy). Any irregularities must be noted.
   • Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
   • Did promised co-financing materialize? (Please fill the form on co-financing attached table 1).

e. Reporting
   • Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management;
   • Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

f. Delays
   • Assess if there were delays in project implementation, then what were the reasons?
   • Did the delay affect the achievement of project’s outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

2.2.2 Contribution of Implementing and Executing Agencies
   • Assess the role of UNDP and General Directorate for Renewable Energy (GDRE) against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
     o Field visits
     o Participation in Steering Committees
     o Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up
     o GEF guidance
     o Skill mix
     o Operational support
   • Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP and GDRE in terms of “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination) and suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s and GDRE’s soft assistance to the project management.

2.2.3 Stakeholder Participation, Partnership Strategy
   a. Assess whether or not local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary;
   b. Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms;
   c. Identify opportunities for stronger partnerships;

2.2.4 Implementation of replication approach;
   a. Sustainability: extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end. The evaluators may look at factors such as
establishment of sustainable financial mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies or community production;

2.3 Project Results (Outputs, Outcomes and Impact)

2.3.1 Progress towards achievement of intended outcomes/measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for development of Protected Areas management effectiveness, financial sustainability and capacity to the baseline ones;

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following GEF evaluation criteria:

- Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- Results/impacts – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
- Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The Project will be rated against individual criterion of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact/results based on the following scale:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Satisfactory (S): The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Unsatisfactory (U): The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for sustainability criteria the evaluator should at the minimum evaluate the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

Financial resources:
- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating
activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

**Socio-political:**
a. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
b. 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?
c. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
d. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

**Institutional framework and governance:**
a. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?
b. While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.

**Environmental:**
a. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:
- Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an ‘Unlikely’ rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than ‘Unlikely’.

The evaluator(s) should develop detailed methodology and work plan for MTE during the preparatory phase of the MTE. The MTE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:
- Desk review;
- Interviews with Project Management Unit and key stakeholders, including UNDP Country Office in Turkey, General Directorate for Renewable Energy (GDRE) of the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU), Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and any other stakeholders as deemed necessary (Annex 3: Tentative List of Meetings).
- Questionnaires.
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

An indicative outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report is presented below.
4. INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

Title and opening page
- Provide the following information:
  - Name of the UNDP/GEF project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Executing Agency and project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements

Executive Summary
- 2 -3 pages that:
  - Briefly describe the project evaluated
  - Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience
  - Describes key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods
  - Summarizes principle conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual)

Introduction
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Briefly explain why the terminal evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the project is being evaluated at this point in time, why the evaluation addressed the questions it did, and the primary intended audience.
- Key issues addressed
- Providing an overview of the evaluation questions raised
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions. The Evaluation ToR may also elaborate additional objectives that are specific to the project focal area and national circumstances, and which may address the project's integration with other UNDP strategic interventions in the project area
- Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation, including how the level of stakeholder involvement contributes to the credibility of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Structure of the evaluation
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users

Evaluation Team
- Briefly describing the composition of the evaluation team, background and skills and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation.

Ethics
- The evaluators should note the steps taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more

---

5 UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008
information).\textsuperscript{6} Attached to this report should be a signed 'Code of Conduct' form from each of the evaluators.

**Project Description and development context**
- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project seeks to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders

**Findings**
- (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) should be rated\textsuperscript{7})

**Project Formulation**
- Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, including management arrangements

**Project Implementation**
- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Financial Planning
- Monitoring and evaluation: design and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Executing Agency execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

**Project Results**
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Catalytic Role & Impact
- Conclusions, recommendations & lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- Annexs.
- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed

\textsuperscript{6} UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008.

\textsuperscript{7} Using a six-point rating scale: 6:Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.
5. TIME FRAME OF WORK

The duration of the assignment will be 40 days upon signature of the Contract.

The work will be undertaken during a period of 25 man/day throughout the time-frame below;

Contract Start Date: 04 February 2013
Contract Completion Date: 15 March 2013

6. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EVALUATION EXPERT

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by MTE Expert. He/She will receive the support of UNDP Country Office and Project Management Unit, and will be assisted by a translator/interpreter (when needed). It is expected that the evaluation expert will work closely with the Monitoring and Evaluation Administrator hired within the UNDP Environment and Sustainable Development Programme.

Mid Term Evaluation Expert
The international consultant will be responsible to deliver the expected output of the mission

Duties and Responsibilities:
- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and MTE outline;
- Debriefing with UNDP and GDRE, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTE report;
- Interviews with PMU, UNDP Turkey, GDRE and project partners;
- Debriefing UNDP and project partners and will provide an aide memoire;
- Development and submission of the first MTE report draft. The draft will be shared with the key project stakeholders for review and comment;
- Finalization and submission of the final MTE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;
- Supervision of the work of the national expert (during entire evaluation period).

Monitoring and Evaluation Administrator will:
- Provide support in collection of background materials
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO and GDRE representatives; Organize the mission program together with the Project Management Unit, arrange and facilitate meetings with key stakeholders;
- Assistance to the MTE Expert in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project partners:
• Necessary support will be provided to MTE Expert in circulation of the draft MTE report among the key project stakeholders for review and commenting.

7. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING

The products expected from the evaluation are as follows:
• Inception Report with detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
• Aide memoire following to the finalization of the country visit;
• Mid-term evaluation report with findings;
  o Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for the revision of project strategy, approach, outputs and activities, if necessary;
  o Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of biodiversity projects, for other countries in the region;
  o Description of best practices, and an “action list” in a certain area of particular importance for the project.

The core product of the Mid-Term Evaluation will be the Mid-Term Evaluation Report given in section 4 supplemented by Co-financing given in Annex 4 and Rate Tables given in Annex 5.

MTE Expert will be responsible to submit the following deliverables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Date</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Professional Days to be invested*</th>
<th>Milestone/Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08 February 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inception Report: Desk review, development of methodology, updating time table, drafting mission programme. Incorporating comments received from UNDP Country Office (if necessary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 February 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-country field visits, interviews, preliminary mission findings briefing(s), debriefings with project partners and providing aide memoire. Delivering a presentation on aide memoire (finding(s) and recommendation(s)) to Project Partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 March 2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Submission of Draft MTE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 March 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery of the comments of the relevant stake holders regarding the Draft MTE Report from UNDP CO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Submission of the Final MTE Report in line with the comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of days</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of days may change among different activities and deliverables but the total days to be invested cannot exceed 20 days for the content of this TOR. UNDP has the right to request from the Consultant additional number of days to be invested for additional activities, based on the needs of the project.

The final version of the evaluation report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) to UNDP Country Office in Turkey no later than **March 15, 2012**.

**Reporting Line**

The international consultant will work under the coordination of PIMS 3646: Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey Project Coordinator and be responsible to UNDP Environment and Sustainable Development (ESD) Programme Manager for completion of the tasks and duties assigned in Section 7. The deliverables shall be submitted to the UNDP Environment and Sustainable Development (ESD) Programme Manager for final approval. All of the deliverables are subject to approval from UNDP ESD Programme Manager in order to realize the payments to the consultant. He/she will work in close collaboration with GDRE, and other project partners.

**Reporting Language**

The reporting language should be in English.

**Title Rights**

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this TORs will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

8. **PLACE OF WORK**

The place of work is both home-based and Ankara. The MTE Expert is required to be in Ankara for the interviews with the project stakeholders within the time frame given in the below table.

Assignment-related travel and accommodation costs (outside home base) of the below given mission shall be borne by MTE Expert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective of the Mission</th>
<th>in Ankara (estimated dates)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview panels with project partners and stakeholders (please refer to Annex 3)</td>
<td>Between 10 and 16 February 2013</td>
<td>7 days (including 2 days for travel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of missions and their travel periods are subject to change and can be mutually rearranged based on the circumstances and the needs.
9. TERMS AND PAYMENT

The international consultant will be paid in USD.

If the selected consultant will be Turkish with international experience s/he will be paid in TL (UN monthly exchange rate will be used as official conversion rate from USD to TL).

- **Contracting Authority**
  
  Contracting Authority for this ToR is UNDP, and the contract amount will be provided through UNDP-GEF budget under “PIMS 3646: Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey” Project.

- **Contracting Modality**

  IC-Individual Contract of UNDP.

- **Payment schedule**

  The MTE Expert shall be paid upon submission and approval of UNDP for the deliverables specified in below table, following successful completion of the tasks listed throughout this ToR (specified in Section 7) and assigned by UNDP.

  The payments for each deliverable will be based on the number of days to be invested for the respective deliverable. The payments shall be effected only if the deliverables required in this ToR are submitted to UNDP within the time frames stipulated in the ToR and they are approved by UNDP. Without submission and approval of the deliverables, the consultant shall not receive any payment even if he/she invests time for this assignment.

  The amount paid to international and local consultant shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Report</th>
<th>Expected Date of Payments</th>
<th>Estimated Number of days to be invested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>08 February 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the Aide Memoire</td>
<td>15 February 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final MTE Report</td>
<td>15 March 2013</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tax obligation**

The subscriber is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the subscriber.

10. SERVICES AND FACILITIES PROVIDED BY UNDP/DGRE

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office in Turkey. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, coordinate with the GDRE.

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, UNDP Country Office in Turkey and
GDRE. These three parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion.

If requested, the MTE Expert will be provided with an office space located in Ankara and project site with an access to the Internet and a local telephone line.

In preparation for the evaluation mission, the project manager, with assistance of UNDP CO, will arrange completion of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Results of METT should be used by an international project evaluation consultant, who will provide his/her comments and track the progress in management effectiveness of project sites. Upon incorporation of the evaluator’s comments the METT will be finalized and the results should be attached as a mandatory Annex to the MTE evaluation report.
### 11. QUALIFICATIONS AND SKILLS

Required Qualifications and Competencies for International MTE Expert:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum Requirements</th>
<th>Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General Qualifications**           | • Master’s degree in Energy, Environmental Economics, Architecture, Building Physics, Engineering or other related areas.  
• Fluent in English both written and spoken.  
• Computer literacy.                                                                 | • Higher degree in related fields is an asset.                          |
| **Professional Experience and Qualifications** | • 5 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to energy efficiency projects. | • Knowledge and proven experience of European regulations and/or international practices on  
  • EPBD and other related legislation,  
  • Energy efficient architecture design,  
  • Building energy certificates or building certificates such as LEED, BREEAM, DGNB, etc.  
  • Energy efficiency in buildings,  
  • Energy management in buildings,  
  • and other related fields.                                                                 |
| **Specific Experience and Qualifications** | • Experience in monitoring and evaluating energy efficiency projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project). | • Sound knowledge in results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation).  
  • Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and procedures. |

**Competencies:**
- Ability to critically analyze issues, find root-causes and suggest optimum solutions;
- Ability to interact with a wide range of partners: government officials, development agencies and etc.;
- Excellent team working and management skills;
- Excellent analytical and report writing skills
- Excellent time management skills;

**Notes:**
- Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.
- Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.
- Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.
- Experience gained prior to completion of undergraduate studies is not considered professional experience.
- Documents that demonstrate participation to project cycle management are not considered an internationally recognized project management certificate.
12. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS
The candidates have been identified from the “Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States Vetted Experts Roster for GEF Climate Change Mitigation” through the qualifications and skills stated in Section 11 of this ToR. The availability for the assignment and the price proposal form of the shortlisted candidates will be requested. The consultant will be selected in accordance with the least cost selection method.
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ANNEX 1. GEF TERMINOLOGY AND PROJECT REVIEW CRITERIA

**Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project’s logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:
- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

**Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans.

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:
- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project’s objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:
- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project’s collaboration with industry associations

**Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

- Information dissemination
  - Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation
Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities.

**Stakeholder participation**
- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure.
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders.
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

**Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.).
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholder’s consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

**Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project’s achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project’s outcomes in other regions.

**Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:
Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing.

- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

**Co-financing includes:** grants, loans/concessional (compared to market rate), credits, equity investments, in-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

**Leveraged resources** are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

**Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:
- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

**Monitoring & Evaluation.** Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project’s logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project’s achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

---

8 Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.
ANNEX 2: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

- Project document and its annexes;
- Project CEO Approval Document;
- Inception Report;
- 2011 and 2012 Annual/ work plans endorsed by Steering Committee;
- Project financial work plans and expenditure reports;
- Annual/Quarter operational and progress reports;
- 2012 UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Reviews (PIR);
- Minutes of Steering Committee Meetings;
- Project consultant reports;
- METT scores for project sites;
- Financial Sustainability Scorecard (if available);
- Capacity Assessment Scorecard (if available);
- GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
- UNDP Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results;
- Other upon request.
## ANNEX 3: TENTATIVE LIST OF MEETINGS TO BE HELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP Turkey CO</td>
<td>UNDP ESD Programme Manager, Deputy Residence Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Directorate of Renewable Energy (DGRE), (Ankara)</td>
<td>Deputy General Director (EE Buildings Project Director) and key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP – Global Environment Facility</td>
<td>Regional Technical Advisor (Tele Conference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU) (Ankara)</td>
<td>Head of Departments and key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education (MoNE)</td>
<td>Head of Departments and key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKI)</td>
<td>Head of Departments and key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Operational Focal Point</td>
<td>Head of Departments and key staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 4 - CO-FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>In-kind</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDRE</td>
<td>7,600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>8,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoEU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoNE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>2,620,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,280,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,580,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 5: PROJECT RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT FORMULATION</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization/Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of the logical framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/establishment of information technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational relationships between the institutions involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and dissemination of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local resource users and NGOs participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement and support of governmental institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT RESULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome .....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT &amp; IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 6: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Consultant: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed at (place)on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct