****

**Terms of Reference for Mid-term Evaluation**

# POSITION INFORMATION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Position Title:** | International Consultant on Mid-Term Evaluation of UNDP/GEF project |
| **Type:** | Individual Contract (IC) |
| **Project Title:** | Improving Energy Efficiency in the Residential Buildings Sector of Turkmenistan |
| **Duration of the service:** | 20 working days in the period from April 2014 to August 2014 |
| **Duty station:** | Home-based with one mission to Ashkhabad, covering 5 working days |
| **Reports to:** | Programme Specialist on Environment |

# INTRODUCTION

The objective of the UNDP/GEF project on improving energy efficiency in residential buildings in Turkmenistan is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by improving energy management and reducing energy consumption in the residential sector in Turkmenistan.

The project has been designed to:

* strengthen building codes and associated normative documents on energy efficiency in buildings, develop capacity at Turkmengas State Corporation and other state entities to identify end-use energy savings in their housing stock and implement investments to reduce end-use energy consumption,
* introduce improved highly-efficient design measures to major housing designers and developers, and
* replicate these measures through protocols for energy-saving measures in prototype buildings and through mainstreaming EE issues into state construction and housing policies and programs.

The project seeks to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gases in residential sector in Turkmenistan and is structured into four project components:

* Energy efficient building codes and supporting capacity strengthening
* Demand-side management : partnership with Turkmengas State Corporation
* Improved design measures for major residential building designers and developers
* Replication through partnership with other developers and support for policies that encourage energy efficiency

At present, neither new construction nor refurbishment projects consider the energy performance of the buildings involved. The buildings being constructed and refurbished now without any attention to energy efficiency are effectively “locking in” patterns of energy consumption – and associated greenhouse gas emissions -- for the next several decades at needlessly high levels. Even before the construction boom, emissions in the residential sector totaled more than 3 million tonnes of CO2, or nearly 10% of total CO2 emissions from fuel combustion. Now, these emissions play an increasing role in the overall share of greenhouse gas emissions in Turkmenistan, and the residential sector is the third largest source of emissions in the country. Without intervention, these emissions will continue to grow unchecked.

# OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This mid-term evaluation is initiated by UNDP in Turkmenistan and will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP-GEF procedures.

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the efficiency of the project, identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons-learned and to make recommendations to improve the project.

The mid-term evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Its main objectives are:

1. To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the Project;
2. To ensure accountability for the achievement of the UNDP/GEF objective;
3. To enhance organizational and development learning;
4. To enable informed decision-making;

The mid-term review will assess the overall performance of the project against the baseline data set atthe beginning of the project.

1. **Evaluation Audience**

This mid-term evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course corrective actions, if needed.

It aims to provide managers 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 Evaluation will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions, and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.

1. **Scope of the Evaluation**

The scope of the evaluation is expected to cover the following:

* Review of the status of the project activities and the possibility of achieving all the outcomes in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed at which the project is proceeding. Review of the effectiveness of the project implementation and the use of its financial resources, including adaptive management applied for the revision of the project implementation mechanisms and other actions to overcome the obstacles identified during the implementation of the project,
* Review the current monitoring procedures and methodologies in place,
* Assessment of co-financing and leveraged resources,
* Provide recommendations for actions necessary for the long-term sustainability and replicability of the achievements,
* Provide recommendations on any changes needed, including the finalization of a concrete action plan to address the eventual pending needs or possible corrective action.

Project concept and design

The evaluator will assess the project design. He/she should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, outcomes, outputs, planned activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation 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 assessed. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impacts achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass the following:

Attainment of objectives and planned results:

* Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives are being achieved, taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In addition, the evaluatorwill assess the indicators matrix for its utility indetermining sustainability and replicability impact.

Achievement of outputs and activities:

* Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced so far in relation to its expected results.
* Assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the work plan in implementing the components of the project.
* Assess the quality, appropriateness and timeliness of the project concepts, project proposals, progress reports with regard to:

*In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions:* Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory *with an explanation of the rating.*

1. **DELIVERABLES**

The main product expected from the mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive report following the structure in Annex I and including the Table attached in Annex II on the assessment of co-financing.

1. **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the evaluator is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards. They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The mid-termevaluation will be based on information obtained from reviewing relevant documents,such as the project document, project brief, Annual Project Reports/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIRs), minutes of Project Board Meetings, Project Technical Reports and minutes from relevant meetings.

The evaluator should also rely on information gathered through meetings and interviews with target beneficiaries and project staff, including government officials and/or consultants. Interviews should include the State Corporation “Turkmengas”, Ministry of Construction, Ministry of Communal Services, Ashgabat Municipality, UNDP and key stakeholders. The methodology that will be used by the evaluator should be presented in detail in the report. It shall include scrupulous information on documentation review, interviews held, field visits, participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The evaluation should provide as much gender-disaggregated data as possible.

The methodology to be used by the evaluator should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation reviewed;
* Interviews;
* Field visits;
* Questionnaires;
* Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Although the evaluator should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to his/herassignment, he/sheis not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

UNDP Turkmenistan will contract the consultant and be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up stakeholder interviews and coordinate meetings with the Government Officials. The Project Management Unit will provide the evaluator with relevant project documentation and will accompany the evaluator in the meetings, as deemed necessary. The mid-term evaluation will be reviewed by the UNDP Country Office and by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, and will be formally approved for submission to the Global Environment Facility by the Regional Technical Advisor.

1. **TIMING AND DURATION**

The evaluation consultancy will be for 18 working days within the period of 45 days and the activities of the evaluator are broken down as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe** |
| Desk review | 5 working days |
| Meetings with the stakeholders | 5 working days |
| Writing draft report | 8 working days |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft) | 2 working days |

1. **PAYMENT CONDITIONS**

This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy and travel costs required to produce the above deliverables. The final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of consultancy.

Payment will be released in one installment: 100% upon timely submission of respective deliverables and their acceptance by the Programme Specialist on Environment.

1. **REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS**

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by an independent consultant whohas not participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and does not have any conflict of interest with project-related activities. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the executing of national implementing agency or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

The independent consultant will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the report.

Required qualifications:

* Advanced university degree in in the field of energy, environment, engineering, architecture or construction and/or related discipline;
* At least seven years of work experience in the field of energy efficiency and five years’ work in practical experience on energy efficiency policies and programs (in the building sector in particular);
* Experience in practical experience in implementation and energy monitoring of energy-efficiency buildings an asset;
* Previous evaluation experience of GEF-funded energy-efficiency projects, preferably with the United Nations system;
* Familiarity with Results Based Management (RBM) approach;
* Familiarity with issues related to the UNFCCC;
* Familiarity with greenhouse gas emission reduction calculations;
* Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
* Excellent English communication skills; strong writing and analytical skills coupled with experience in monitoring and evaluation techniques. Skill in written and spoken Russian is strongly preferred;
* Computer literacy
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**Annex II:. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources**

(For projects that have undergone a mid-term, phase or a terminal evaluation)

A. Co-financing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co financing (Type/**  **Source)** | **IA own  Financing (mill US$)** | | **Multi-lateralAgencies (Non-GEF)**  **(mill US$)** | | **Bi-laterals**  **Donors (mill US$)** | | **Central Government (mill US$)** | | **Local Government (mill US$)** | | **Private Sector (mill US$)** | | **NGOs (mill US$)** | | **Other Sources\***  **(mill US$)** | | **Total Financing (mill US$)** | | **Total**  **Disbursement (mill US$)** | |
|  | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** |
| Grant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-grant Instruments**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Types**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
* Please describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Please explain “Other Types of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Please explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels must provide explanations. Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s global environmental objective.