

## APPENDIX A – MISSION TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Energy Efficiency in New Construction in the Residential and Commercial Buildings Sector. The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### 2. PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Energy Efficiency in New Construction in the Residential and Commercial Buildings Sector, MON/09/3			
GEF Project ID:			<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00070071	GEF financing:	0.975	0.872
Country:	Mongolia	IA/EA own:	xxxx	xxxx
Region:	East Asia	Government:	0.50	0.50
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	2.790	0.755
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CC-SP1	Total co-financing:	2.840	0.805
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	3.815	1.677
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		May 2009
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Oct 2013	Dec 2013

### 3. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Government of Mongolia signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on 12 June 1992, the Great Khural (Parliament) ratified it on 30 September 1993, and the date of entry into force was 15 December 1999.

The Government of Mongolia recognizes the major contribution that improved building energy efficiency would provide to meeting its UNFCCC and other environmental commitments, as well as the related need to reduce major local environmental effects of excessive and inefficient building fuel use (esp. extreme urban air pollution in winter, growing deforestation due to excessive fuel wood and construction timber use), reduce fuel poverty (particularly in urban *ger* areas where the majority of poor urban families live), and improve economic development through enhanced insulation materials and building energy saving systems leading to lower energy, and in particular heating, costs for buildings.

The project GOAL was the reduction in the annual growth rate of GHG emissions from the buildings sector in Mongolia. BEEP contributed to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions through the

transformation of the Mongolian buildings market towards more energy-efficient building technologies and services, sustainable private house insulation and energy efficiency financing mechanisms. The project was funded by UNDP, KEMCO, GEF and with financial contribution of the Government of Mongolia and began in 2009 and will be terminated by December 31, 2013.

This Project needs to undergo evaluation upon completion of implementation to identify performance levels, achievements and lessons learned. A result oriented evaluation of the project is to ensure that all key milestones were met and the degree to which these milestones have had a lasting impact on the Mongolian Government's tendency to maintain and build strong energy efficient policy in the future.

## OBJECTIVE

The objective of the terminal evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefit from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

In order to achieve the project objective, the project key Components are as follows.

Outcome 1: Updating and Strengthening of Mongolian Energy Efficiency Building Codes, Norms, and Standards (BCNS)

Outcome 2: Training and Awareness

Outcome 3: Facilitating Access to Energy Efficiency Financing

This is a medium sized project with project implementation duration of 48 months, and funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and UNDP. The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## 4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>16</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. The international consultant will be the team leader and coordinate the evaluation process to ensure quality of the report and its timely submission. The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, translation etc. The evaluation team is expected to become well versed as to the project objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, activities and status of accomplishments. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted. The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Ulaanbaatar, including the project sites. Interviews will be held with the following individuals and organizations at a minimum, but not limited to:

- National Project Director (NPD)

<sup>16</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

- Project Technical Manager
- Project Manager
- Project Administrative Assistance
- UNDP financial Office
- UNDP procurement officer
- Project Steering Committee members
- Relevant project stakeholders and personnel, but not limited to:
  - Relevant departments of the Ministry for Environment and Green development
  - Ministry of Construction and Urban Development
  - Ministry of Energy
  - MCA Mongolia
  - Xac Bank
  - NGOs as Building Materials Manufacturers' association of Mongolia, and Mongolian Windows and Doors Manufacturers' association
  - Mongolian Civil Engineers Association
  - Main stakeholders as Energy conservation centers and ATA trade LLC and representatives of households
  - Research institutions and experts in the country, where applicable
  - Relevant personnel at UNDP country office in Mongolia

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, inception workshop report, annual work and financial plans, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR (2011 to 2013), project budget revisions, quarterly reports, Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings, Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any), Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc., midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment such as terms of reference for past consultants' assignments and summary of the results; past audit reports (if any). Documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator.

## 5. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	

3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## 6. PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

## 7. MAINSTREAMING

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

## 8. IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>17</sup>

## 9. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

<sup>17</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## 10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mongolia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Throughout the period of evaluation, the evaluation team will liaise closely with the UNDP Resident Representative/Deputy Resident Representative/Programme Analyst/Senior M&E Adviser/Project Manager, UNDP GEF RTA, the concerned agencies of the Government, any members of the international team of experts under the project and the counterpart staff assigned to the project. The team can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfil its task, the team, however, is not authorized to make any commitments to any part on behalf of UNDP/GEF or the Government.

### Logistics

The team will conduct a mission visit to Ulanbataar and selected project sites, to meet with relevant project stakeholders. This visit will also include meetings with the officials of UNDP, the Implementing Partner, stakeholders from other institutions and ministries related to the project.

After the initial briefing by UNDP Resident Coordinator/DRR/Programme Analyst/Project Manager, the review team will meet with the National Project Director, the officials of the Implementing Partner, and GEF Operational Focal Point as required.

## 11. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	2 days	<i>9 September</i>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	12 days	<i>12-23 September</i>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	6 days	<i>4 October</i>
<b>Final Report</b>	5 day	<i>14 October</i>

## 12. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

### 13. TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluator<sup>18</sup>. The individual experts in the team needs to have good technical knowledge of the Energy Efficiency in the commercial and residential buildings sector and climate change projects and national context of energy efficiency project and program implementation in Mongolia, possess good evaluation experience, and writing skills to carry out the assignment. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. International evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for quality and timely submission of the report. The allocation of tasks in the execution of this TOR shall be decided mutually between the International and National consultants. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The international consultant must present the following qualifications and professional background:

- Minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized professional technical experience in energy efficiency (in the construction sector) and climate change projects Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
- Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
- Post-Graduate in Engineering, Management or Business;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly, distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
- Familiar with developing countries context or regional situations relevant to that of Mongolia;
- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported energy efficiency and climate change projects;
- Comprehensive knowledge of international energy efficient construction industry best practices;
- Excellent report writing and communication skills in English.

The evaluation team shall conduct debriefing for the UNDP Country Office, Project Manager, and Implementing Partner towards the end of the evaluation mission. The international consultant shall lead presentation of the draft review findings and recommendations. Lead drafting and finalization of the terminal evaluation report. The evaluation team shall review the tracking tool. If it is not available, review the required information to complete the tracking tool as required for climate change mitigation projects.

---

<sup>18</sup> Also called consultant