ANNEX A - ToR

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

I. Position Information	
Position Title:	International Consultant/Evaluator/Team Leader
Type:	Individual Contract (International)
Project Title/Department:	UNDP/GEF Project "Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan" / Environment and Energy Unit
Duration of the service:	25 working days during the period from May – July, 2015
Duty station:	Home-based with one mission to Tashkent, Uzbekistan, including 8 project site visits in Fergana, Kashkadarya, Navoi, Tashkent, and Andijan provinces and the Republic of Karakalpakstan
Reports to:	Head of Environment and Energy Unit, UNDP Uzbekistan

II. Background

In Uzbekistan, buildings account for almost half of the country's total energy consumption, or 17 million tons of oil equivalents, annually. Many buildings are now physically worn out and planned for reconstruction or rehabilitation. Increasing population places growing demand in education and healthcare's services, which requires further renovation of the existing ones and construction of new public buildings. To respond to these demographic and social challenges, the Government of Uzbekistan has embarked on a series of large-scale programmes for renovation and construction of public buildings, which include schools, colleges, kindergartens, hospitals, and athletic facilities as well as residential buildings. Those programmes provide a tremendous opportunity for "building in" energy efficiency through improved design and technologies. The joint project of United Nations Development Programme, Global Environment Facility and State Committee for Architecture and Construction of the Republic of Uzbekistan has been actively worked during its implementation cycle to support the Government in improving energy efficiency of public and residential buildings, thus contributing to national reduction of carbon dioxide emissions.

The implementation of the full-scale UNDP/GEF Project "Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan" was started in October 2009 with an objective to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions in public buildings in Uzbekistan, particularly in the healthcare and educational sectors (schools, colleges, rural health clinics and hospitals), by improving building norms and standards, demonstrating integrated building design approaches, and develop capacity of local specialists in design, construction, and maintenance. The Project is currently in its final year of implementation (June, 2015).

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 *UNDP/GEF **"Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan"*** (PIMS #4158.)

III. Functions / Key Outputs Expected

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	**Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan**			
GEF Project ID:	4158		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project	00070640	GEF financing:	2,913,885	2,913,885

ID:				
Country:	Uzbekistan	IA/EA own:	270,880	724,648
Region:	RBEC/CA	Government (public buildings):	10,200,000	10,200,000
		Government (1 rural building):	0	74,242
Focal Area:	Climate Change	**Other (as per below breakdown):**		**252,558**
		Study Tour to Turin (Italy)	*0*	*17,170*
		KNAUF isolation (applied to the new EE rural house)	*0*	*4,551*
		2 energy efficient boilers (installed at regional rural health clinics)	*0*	*4,777*
		Mupies (banners/posters placed in the city streets and buses, 2012-2014)	*0*	*226,060*
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	13,113,885	13,440,685
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	270,880	724,648
Other Partners involved:	State Committee for Architecture and Construction	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		28.10.2009
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31.12.2014	Actual: 30.06.2015

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to promote energy efficiency of on-going and future state-funded construction and renovation programmes in Uzbekistan by revising building norms and standards, building capacity of relevant government authorities and energy managers, and showcasing integrated building design approach through demonstration projects. The project included five outcomes targeting both new and renovated buildings as follows: Outcome 1 will strengthen norms and regulations applicable to both new and re-constructed buildings, "building in" efficiency into design; Outcome 2 will establish a highly-visible energy management system in all targeted public sector buildings; Outcome 3 will build the capacities of building sector to meet more stringent energy performance requirements for all buildings, both on the design side and the construction technologies side; Outcome 4 will demonstrate the concept of integrated building design in two new and six re-constructed buildings; and Outcome 5 will integrate the results of the project into standard practice in the public sector and share results with the residential and commercial sectors.

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.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[1] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using

[1] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

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. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see *Annex C*) The evaluator is 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 (*Tashkent, Fergana, Kashkadarya, Navoi, and Andijan provinces and the Republic of Karakalpakstan*), including the following project sites:

- Retrofitted secondary school #2 for 360 students in Rishtan district of Fergana region;
- Retrofitted secondary school #35 for 260 students and construction of an additional building for 120 students in Khatyrchi district of Navoi region;
- Retrofitted secondary school #5 for 260 students and construction of an additional building for 40 students in Kanlykul district of the Republic of Karakalpakstan;
- Retrofitted secondary school #20 for 320 students in Karshi district of Kashkadarya region;
- Retrofitted rural health clinic “Oktepa” for 50 visitors per shift in Pskent district of Tashkent region;
- Retrofitted rural health clinic “Dekhibaland” for 50 visitors per shift in Nurata district of Navoi region;
- Newly constructed secondary school for 315 students in Kurgantepa district of Andijan region;
- Newly constructed secondary school for 216 students in Nurata district of Navoi region
- Newly constructed energy efficient and ‘green’ rural family house in local community “Ibrat” in Zangiota district of Tashkent province

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

#	Organization
1	UNDP Uzbekistan, Country Office, Environment and Energy Unit
2	Project team of UNDP/GEF project “Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan
3	GEF Operational Focal Point, Uzhydromet
4	State Committee for Architecture and Construction (Gosarchitectstroy) (National Implementing Agency)
5	Ministry of Public Education
	Ministry of Heath
	State Committee for Nature Protection
	Ministry of Economy
	Ministry of Finance
	Republican Center of Certification and Standardization in Construction Industry under Gosarchitectstroy
	Institute of Energy and Automation under the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan
	Tashkent State Technical University
	Tashkent Architecture and Construction Institute
	“ToshUyjoyLITI” State Design Institute

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, in particular evaluator shall validate the data in the GEF CCM Tracking tool (how the tool is filed in and confirmed the figures there filled in by the project team), project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), 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. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***rating***
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:	

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
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

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.

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.[2]

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IV. Deliverables and timeframe

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Uzbekistan. 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.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

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

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	*3* days	*25-27 May, 2015*
Evaluation Mission	*12* days)	*1-12 June, 2015*
Draft Evaluation Report	*8* days	*19-26 June, 2015*
Final Report	*2* days	*23-24 July, 2015*

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',

[2] 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

detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international evaluator and 1 national evaluator.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. 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.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'

V. Payment Conditions

This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy and international travel costs (in-country travel cost will be covered by the project), accommodation and meal (DSA or per diems in Tashkent and provinces) and visas costs required to produce the above deliverables. *This payment schedule is indicative, and is filled in accordance with UNDP's standard procurement procedures)*

%	Milestone
20%	At submission of the mission report
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

VI. Recruitment Qualifications	
Education:	Advanced university degree in energy, energy economics or related area
Experience:	• Extensive (at least 10-year) experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in energy efficiency; • Technical knowledge in the targeted climate change mitigation; • Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on energy efficiency (relevant experience in the CIS region is a requirement; and relevant experience within UN system would be an asset); • Familiarity with energy efficiency principles and relevant international best-practices; • Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures; • Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
Language Requirements:	Excellent English communication and writing skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset
Others:	Demonstrable analytical skills

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online through the UNDP website at http://www.undp.uz. Application shall be submitted by indicated deadline. Incomplete applications or applications received after the closing date will not be given consideration. Application should contain a current and complete C.V. with indication of the

e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs)..

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

VII. Signatures - Post Description Certification		
Incumbent *(if applicable)* Name	Signature	Date
Head of Programme Unit **Mr. Abduvakkos Abdurahmanov, EEU** Name / Title	Signature	Date

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

GEF-format Results and Resources Framework

Project strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators				
Goal	Reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Uzbekistan by improving energy efficiency in the buildings sector				
	Indicators	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Means of Verification**	**Important assumptions**
Project objective: Reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions new and existing buildings in the education and healthcare sectors	Average thermal energy consumption in new/renovated public buildings	Thermal energy demand of new and existing building on average: 185 and 200 kWh/m^2 respectively	Thermal energy demand reduced to an average of 140 and 150 kWh/m² (by 25%) for new and retrofitted buildings respectively	National statistics augmented by data from the energy and GHG monitoring system to be established by the project	Government continues to construct and retrofit facilities at the planned rates Monitoring established by the project is accurate and indicative
	CO_2 emissions savings from new and reconstructed education, healthcare or other buildings in 2014	141,000 tons CO_2 in 2014 (lifecycle emissions are 2.8 million tons CO_2) and 352,500 tons CO_2 in 2020 (lifecycle emissions are 7.05 million tons CO_2)	By the end of the project (in 2014): 35,000 tons CO_2 annual savings, i.e. 20-year lifecycle direct project savings of 700,000 tons CO_2.		
Outcome 1. New energy efficient standards and regulations are applied to more than 2 million m^2 of public space in the educational and healthcare sectors commissioned annually.	Approval of updated versions of the seven building codes relevant to energy consumption in public buildings	Codes for public buildings are outdated and allow energy consumption that is significantly higher than international standards	Updated codes for public buildings reduce allowable consumption by at least 25%. By the end of Year 3, all healthcare and educational facilities will be constructed or reconstructed (approx. 2 million m^2) using designs that ensure a minimum 25% reduction in energy consumption from the baseline year assuming constant conditions.	Published regulations. Comparison with other codes in the region and international best practice (through international databases).	Government will approve the revised codes.
	Capacity of Gosarchitectstroy to implement energy efficiency codes	No government organization works specifically on improving energy efficiency in buildings codes; staff lack training in efficient codes	Approximately 20 staff trained in efficient codes and able to oversee implementation and provide guidance to design organizations by the end of Year 2.	Annual report of Gosarchitectstroy. Institutional analysis. Structured interviews with staff and clients.	Government will support capacity-building of the department and dedicate staff to training. Trained staff will remain with the agency.
Outcome 2. Government is aware of performance in existing healthcare and educational facilities and can prioritize investments in efficiency	Existence and operation of system of mandatory energy audits of public buildings as a part of larger system of certification of buildings	Energy audits are not carried out in the public buildings sector	National programme on energy performance certification, including energy audit for public buildings drafted, accepted by Gosarchitectstroy, and submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers of Uzbekistan for adoption as an official Resolution	Project documentation, legislative record, interviews and documentation from implementing agency	Government provides and enacts necessary regulations to mandate the audits Auditing equipment for public buildings is available and accessible to auditors
	Capacity to monitor performance of existing buildings	No certification of energy performance in existing buildings, no consolidated energy information system to allow for benchmarking	Energy performance certificate scheme introduced in at least two pilot regions by the end of the project. Data collected during certification process is available through the information system.	Project documentation; data from certification system. Review of information system and cross-check with certificates issued.	Governments in two pilot regions support the certification process Implementing agency staff are tasked with system administration
	Functioning system of energy managers in at least one	Building maintenance personnel do not take energy	By Year 3, Job duties of building maintenance personnel in pilot regions	Project documentation on training courses. Record	Ministries will enroll pilot facilities.

	region for two ministries: Ministry of Health and Ministry of Public Education	savings into account in operations and maintenance work	include energy management tasks.	of certificates issued. Interviews with energy managers and ministry personnel.	School and hospital directors will designate energy managers and allocate time for training and EE-focused tasks.
Outcome 3. Uzbek design and construction professionals have the capacity to design efficient buildings and manage their performance	Ability of practicing architects to 1) comply with more efficient codes; and 2) integrate more efficient design into their buildings	Designs do not emphasize energy efficiency and are above international standards for energy consumption	Submitted designs meet and exceed the requirements of more efficient codes by the end of the project. At least 300 architects trained by the end of the project.	Review of prototype efficient designs. Survey of first-time acceptance rate for plans and statistics on building commissioning. Independent review of energy performance of a sample of designs submitted. Structured interviews. Documentation on use of advisory services.	Architects and engineers will be interested in participating in training. Design institutes will be willing to allocate staff for training.
	Ability of students in engineering and architecture to understand energy management in buildings and use efficient techniques and technologies in their work	No option for studying energy management in buildings; architecture students not exposed to efficient design concepts	Bachelors and masters program in energy management expanded to cover a specialization in buildings. Integrated building design introduced as a subject for architecture students.	Review of model curriculum; structured interviews	Proposed curricula will be approved by the Ministry of Higher Education.
	Awareness of building sector professionals of the efficient construction materials and technologies market and ability to apply them in new building designs.	Low awareness of available materials that can save energy. Efficient materials market is almost non-existent.	100% of designs of new public buildings and newly reconstructed (capital reconstruction) public buildings meet at least second level of the revised building code KMK 2.01.04-97* by the end of the project.	Sales records, number of companies and products on the market and company performance, number of new products certified, trade show documentation structured survey of builders assessing awareness.	Overall market conditions will be favorable to manufacturers and distributors.
Outcome 4. Energy- and cost-saving potential of integrated building design demonstrated in two new buildings and six re-constructed buildings	Construction and commissioning completed for pilot buildings that meet at least the second energy efficiency level of the revised building code KMK 2.01.04-97*	Buildings not currently designed to emphasize efficient use of energy.	Six energy-efficient buildings reconstructed by the end of 2012. Two new energy-efficient buildings constructed by the end of 2012. Energy performance documented by the end of the project, first draft developed by the end of 2013.	Public records, analysis of designs, audit records (including baseline audits for reconstructed facilities and audits for current prototype schools and hospitals; i.e., a control group).	Government will construct and reconstruct public buildings as planned.
	Project facilitates the replication of results	Design institutes currently lack prototype plans on efficient buildings.	Plans and prototype information on energy efficiency measures used, costs and calculated energy savings in pilot buildings circulated to 36 leading design institutes and other design organizations by the end 2012, updated with monitored energy performance in 2013 and 2014.	Project documentation. Review of designs submitted under construction tenders for public buildings. Selected review of buildings funded by budgetary and extra-budgetary construction funds for schools, hospitals and athletic facilities.	Efficient designs will be replicable and incorporated by architects.
	Awareness of the findings and	Results from a limited number	Designs and performance information	Project documentation;	Pilot buildings will be operational and

	application among key stakeholders in Uzbekistan and abroad. Capacity to develop Integrated Building Design and integration of new IBD as a typical building design into national investment programs	of pilot projects in EE/RE in public buildings (10 identified over the past 2 decades) are not widely available.	for pilot buildings will be available nationally and internationally by end of Year 4. At least one new building design (public school or rural family house) is developed and fully based on IBD, i.e. it reaches at least energy efficiency level two with standard investment costs (minimum incremental costs) as buildings with the same total area. New full IBD is submitted to the government for approval as a new typical building design to be constructed, financed and replicated within one of its national investment program	media review; records from international meetings, databases.	provide performance data according to schedule.
Outcome 5. Project findings influence construction practices and public administration practices in Uzbekistan	Good practices related to energy-efficient buildings disseminated and integrated into public administration policies and procedures.	Tendering, construction programs, procurement regulations, and budgetary allocations do not provide incentives for using energy more efficiently. Buildings codes for the residential sector are also relatively inefficient.	Guidance manual on building codes published and disseminated, information on energy efficiency performance of pilot projects disseminated to potential investors in public and other sectors, including residential, energy efficiency best practice and policy manual/strategy paper disseminated to key relevant national and regional governmental stakeholders, energy efficiency policies adopted by public sector administration (incl. focus on level two and three of a building code, effective system of energy performance certification of public buildings implemented, building certificates/labels publically displayed and publicized, energy auditing scheme of public buildings in place).	Review of project documentation and structured interviews. Review of government regulations as appropriate.	Ministries will be motivated to reduce the operating costs of their facilities.

UNDP-format Results and Resources Framework

Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework: Obligations under international environmental conventions and agreements fulfilled through improved effectiveness of environment management and development of clean energy sources						
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: *Indicators:* Improved capacity in environmental management through reorganization of environmental governance structures. National renewable energy strategy and national waste management strategy adopted and implementation started; *Baseline:* National policy/strategic plans in place, but poorly implemented; *Target:* Uzbekistan meets obligations under United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, United Nations Convention on Biodiversity and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and timely reports on implementation						
Applicable Key Result Area (from 2008-11 Strategic Plan): Mainstreaming environment and energy						
Partnership Strategy: State Committee for Architecture and Construction is the National Implementing Agency. Other partners are Ministry of Health, Ministry of Primary Education and Ministry of Higher Education, municipal and regional governments, National Technical University, Tashkent Institute for Architectures and Building Constructors, State Committee for Nature Protection, National Centre for Hydrometeorological Services (Uzhydromet), building companies, design institutes, NGOs						
Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan; Project ID: # 00070640 (Atlas Award 00057241)						
INTENDED OUTPUT(S)	**OUTPUT BASELINE(S)**	**OUTPUT INDICATOR(S)**	**OUTPUT TARGETS**	**INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES**	**RESPONSIBLE PARTIES**	***INPUTS***
Output 1: Reduced energy consumption and associated GHG emissions in new and existing buildings in the education and healthcare sectors	1. Codes for public buildings are outdated and allow energy consumption that is significantly higher than international standards. The thermal energy demand for new and existing buildings on average: 185 and 200 kWh/m^2 respectively. There is no government organization that works specifically on improving energy efficiency in building codes. Staff lack training on efficient codes. 2. Energy audits are not carried out in the public buildings sector. There is no certification of energy performance in existing buildings, and no consolidated energy information system to allow for benchmarking.	1.1 Number and content of approved updated versions of national building energy codes relevant to public buildings in Uzbekistan 1.2 Strengthening of institutional capacity of Gosarchitectstroy to implement energy efficiency codes 2.1 Existence and operation of system of mandatory energy audits of public buildings as a part of larger system of certification of buildings 2.2 Functioning system of energy managers in public buildings in at least one region for two ministries: Ministry of Health and Ministry of Public Education. 3.1 Improvement	**2009** **Target 1** 1.1 At least 5 existing building codes and norms revised, reducing allowable energy consumption for heating by 25% or more. 1.2 The first draft on proposal for the establishment of Energy Efficient Building Code Department prepared. **Target 2** 2.1 Analytical report on mandatory energy audit and certification system implementation strategy prepared. **Target 3** 3.1 Methodological base for new training modules and educational programs prepared. **Target 4** Concept of Integrated Building Design Approaches prepared and approved. **Target 5** Justification report on inefficiency of current construction and tendering policies prepared	**1 Activity Result** New energy efficient standards and regulations applied to more than 2 million m^2 of public space in the educational and healthcare sectors commissioned annually **Actions:** • Review and revise building codes for public buildings and other relevant norms and standards to incorporate mandatory provisions for integrated building design and energy performance standards; • Implement capacity-building on enforcement of energy-related requirements of national building codes for staff of the Department of Monitoring of Activities of Design Organizations of Gosarchitectstroy; • Design and deliver training on the new code revisions to public servants involved in the compliance process (approval and commissioning), such as the clerks in charge of permitting at the State Committee for Architecture and Construction and the staff of the Construction Quality Control Inspectorate responsible for checking facilities during the construction and usage of building	**Activity 1** Gosarchitectstroy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Primary Education and Ministry of Higher Education, building companies, design institutes	**TOTAL for the Activity 1 - $964,261.00 (UNDP: $270,880.00; GEF: $373,381.00; Government in-kind contribution for 2009-2014 is $320,000.00)** **Year 2009: $35,680.00 (UNDP: $21,880.00; GEF: $13,800.00)** (contract, services, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2010: $209,766.00 (UNDP: $61,896.00; GEF: $147,870.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2011: $140,876.00 (UNDP: $46,776.00; GEF: $94,100.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2012: $111,236.00**

	Building maintenance personnel do not take energy savings into account in operations and maintenance work. 3. Current building designs do not emphasize energy efficiency. They do not meet international standards in terms of energy consumption. There is no option for studying energy management in buildings. Architecture students are not exposed to efficient design concepts, including integrated building design. There is low awareness of available materials that can save energy. The market for efficient building materials is almost non-existent. 4. Buildings are not currently designed to emphasize efficient use of energy. Design institutes currently lack prototype plans on efficient buildings. Results from previous pilot projects in energy efficiency and renewable energy in public buildings are very limited in number and are not widely available. 5. Current tendering, construction	and/or expansion of training modules, educational programs, and specializations on energy management and integrated building design. 3.2 Number and types of new study programs introduced in Tashkent Institute on architecture and construction and Tashkent State Technical University. 3.3 Awareness of building sector professionals about efficient construction materials and technologies and ability to apply them in new building designs 4.1 Demonstration of integrated building design and construction in compliance with at least the second energy efficiency level of the revised building code KMK 2.01.04-97* showcased in pilot and other buildings 4.2 Replication of pilot project designs and results in Uzbekistan 4.3 Dissemination of findings and results, and energy and cost saving potential due to application of integrated building design 4.4 Capacity to develop Integrated Building Design and	and accepted by government. **2010** **Target 1** 1.2 Energy Efficient Building Code Department established in the Head Office of Gosarchitectstroy. At least 20 staff of this department trained on building energy codes. **Target 2** 2.1 Monitoring data on the energy consumption and cost collected at 6 project demonstration sites before the retrofitting works in the buildings. **Target 3** 3.1 At least two training workshops with architects and enginners conducted. 3.2 Context of proposed training modules and curricula on energy efficiency in buildings for study programs at Tashkent Institute on Architecture and Construction and Tashkent State Technical University discussed and designed. **Target 4** Analytical paper on advantages and cost-effectiveness of implementation of Integrated Building Design approaches in project demonstration sites prepared and used by stakeholder. **Target 5** At least one analytical report on economic, environmental and social benefits of integrated building design and on locally available and tested technologies, materials and other EE	**2 Activity Result** Government is aware of performance in existing healthcare and educational facilities and can prioritize investments in efficiency **Actions:** • Expand current regulations on mandatory energy audits to include auditing and reporting in public buildings; • Design and complete a study tour for key personnel in the Codes Office to relevant countries that are using audits and certificate schemes to support code compliance and/or monitor consumption in existing buildings; • Develop, approve, and apply methodology to monitor building energy performance for each targeted building type; • Develop and introduce a system of energy performance certificates ("energy passports") for new and existing public buildings to display performance data and ensure compliance with revised norms and standards; • Develop an energy information management system to systematically collect, store and analyze data on energy consumption and the costs and benefits of energy saving measures and quantify energy savings, financial savings, and GHG emission reductions from the new, energy-efficient norms; • Work with Ministries of Education and Health to establish a system of energy managers in medical and educational buildings, design and deliver continuing education modules for facilities managers and a unit on energy management at the secondary school level, and determine the feasibility of financial incentives for institutions that reduce energy consumption in their facilities	**Activity 2** Gosarchitectstroy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Primary Education and Ministry of Higher Education, State Committee for Nature Protection, National Centre for Hydro meteorological Services (Uzhydromet), municipal and regional governments	**(UNDP: $46,776.00; GEF: $64,460.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2013: $80.096.00 (UNDP: $46,776.00; GEF: $33,320.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2014: $66,607.00 (UNDP: $46,776.00; GEF: $19,831.00).** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **TOTAL for the Activity 2 - $839,181.00 (GEF: $519,181.00; Government in-kind: $320,000.00)** **Year 2009: $20,100.00 (GEF: $20,100.00)** **Year 2010: $169,138.00 (GEF: $169,138.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2011: $154,238.00 (GEF: $154,238.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2012: $58,492.00 (GEF: $USD 58,492.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin

	programs, procurement regulations, and budgetary allocations do not provide incentives for using energy more efficiently. Building codes for the residential sector are also relatively inefficient.	integration of new IBD as a typical building design into national investment programs 5. Good practices related to Energy Efficient Buildings disseminated and integrated into public administration policies and procedures	practices in buildings prepared and disseminated to all beneficiaries and to 36 leading design institutes. **2011** **Target 1** 1.1 At least the first draft for 5 updated codes for public buildings prepared. **Target 2** 2.1 Monitoring data on the energy consumption and cost at 6 project demonstration sites collected after the reftofitting works in the buildings **Target 3** 3.1 At least 4 training modules developed for current practicing architects and engineers. 3.2 Proposal at least for one educational curricula and study program (specialization) on energy efficiency in buildings prepared and submitted to the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education. **Target 4** Two new building designs improved based on the integrated building design principles. **Target 5** Midterm independent evaluation conducted and Evaluation report prepared, published and findings disseminated to all beneficiaries. **2012** **Target 1** 1.1 5 revised energy efficient building codes and standards approved and in	**3 Activity Result** Uzbek design and construction professionals have the capacity to design efficient buildings and manage their performance **Actions:** • Work with the Tashkent Architectural-Construction Institute (TACI) to design and deliver training modules on the new building codes to familiarize architects and engineers with the codes and to provide an overview of compliance; • Work with Tashkent State Technical University (TSTU) to expand its energy management programs at the bachelors and masters level to include a specialization in energy savings in buildings and include course content on energy savings in buildings and integrated design in the model program for academic disciplines for post-secondary institutions with architecture and buildings engineering programs. Introduce sustainable buildings information in curricula for post-secondary and technical schools; • Develop and distribute information on integrated building design for practicing architects and developers through continuing education modules and master classes, publish a how-to guide on applying integrated building design to new and existing buildings in Uzbekistan • Provide advisory services to architects and engineers on low or no-cost design measures and best available technologies and materials; • Develop and maintain a database of best available technologies, materials, and services in the sustainable buildings sector; • Organize presentations on the potential for efficient building technologies at trade fairs and other key events attended by	**Activity 3** Gosarchitectstroy, National Technical University, building companies, design institutes, Tashkent Institute for Architectures and Building Constructors	&management cost, travels) **Year 2013: $95,492.00 (GEF: $95,492.00**) (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2014: $21,721.00 (GEF: $21,721.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **TOTAL for the Activity 3 - $503,769.00 (GEF: $183,769.00; Government in-kind: USD 320,000.00)** **Year 2009: $1,300.000 (GEF: $1,300.00)** **Year 2010: $36,882.00 (GEF: $36,882.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, audio&video and printings, travels) **Year 2011: $32,083.00 (GEF: $32,083.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2012: $100,527.00 (GEF: $100,527.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2013: $10,527.00 (GEF: $10,527.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle,

			force. Revisions to codes and standards implemented in practice for new and renovated buildings in Uzbekistan. **Target 2** 2.1 Methodological base and its concept to monitor energy performance for each targeted building type and software developed. **Target 3** 3.1 Theoretical aspects of integrated building design approach developed and How-to guide reference book on applying integrated building design approach published for practicing specialist and educational modules of universities. **Target 4** Two new energy-efficient demonstration buildings constructed using the integrated design principles. Six existing demonstration buildings retrofitted to increase their energy efficiency. **Target 5** At least one guidance manual to accompany the release of 5 newly revised building codes and standards developed. **2013** **Target 1** 1.2 At least 25% reduction in energy consumption in buildings achieved due to enforcement of revised building codes and standards. **Target 2** 2.1 Government regulations on mandatory system of energy performance certificates	professionals in the construction materials, building technologies, and heat and power industries **4 Activity Result** Energy- and cost-saving potential of integrated building design showcased in project demonstration sites **Actions:** • Work with local architects and engineers to ensure that the proposed new buildings selected are designed and constructed according to the principles of integrated building design and will comply with more efficient codes. In the case of buildings that will undergo retrofitting or capital reconstruction, work will include all of the above principles with the exception of building location; • Co-finance key energy efficient technology options in eight pilot buildings; • Monitor pilot building energy performance and quantify energy savings, financial savings, GHG emission reductions, and other non-energy benefits; • Based on the results of the monitoring, encourage the replication of successful design and construction approaches in other schools and hospitals covered by state-funded programmes; • Promote results of the pilot buildings and integrated building design work nationally through the professional literature and the broader media, regionally through the CARnet network and globally through the UNDP-GEF Framework for Promoting Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions Building and through Uzbekistan's governmental affiliations; • Revise existing building designs and develop one new building design for rural homes. Present new designs to government.	**Activity 4** Gosarchitectstroy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Primary Education and Ministry of Higher Education, State Committee for Nature Protection, National Centre for Hydro meteorological Services (Uzhydromet), OOO Qishloqqurlishloiikha, municipal and regional governments, building companies, design institutes, National Technical University, Tashkent Institute for Architectures and Building Constructors, NGOs **Activity 5**	equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2014: $3,750.00 (GEF: $3,750.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **TOTAL for the Activity 4 - $10,563,932.00 (GEF: $1,643,932.00; Government: $8,600,000.00 (construction of project demonstration buildings[1]); Government in kind: USD 320,000.00)** **Year 2009: $0 (GEF: $0)** **Year 2010: $159,160.00 (GEF: $159,160.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2011: $774,980.00 (GEF: $774,980.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2012: $689,006.00 (GEF: $689,006.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2013: $16,986.00 (GEF: $16,986.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost,

			("energy passports") developed and adopted. 2.2 Behavioral and attitude change of energy managers in buildings achieved, as reflected in brief written reports from at least 10 energy managers, documenting change in practice toward greater attention and more effective maintenance of energy-efficient building performance. **Target 3** 3.3 Databases of best available technologies, materials and services in the sustainable building sector developed and disseminated to all beneficiaries by CD. **Target 4** 4.1 Energy performance, energy savings, financial savings, GHG emission reductions in project demonstration sites monitored and documented. Existing standard designs of rural houses revised, and at least one new building design (public school or rural family house) developed and fully based on IBD, i.e. it reaches at least energy efficiency level two with standard investment costs (minimum incremental costs) as buildings with the same total area. 4.2 Information on applied energy efficiency measures, costs and calculated energy savings in pilot buildings updated based on monitoring energy performance in pilot buildings, and circulated to	**5 Activity Result** Project findings provided regarding efficient buildings influence construction practices and public administration practices. Best practices disseminated across other sectors which are not directly targeted by the project **Actions:** • Work with the media and directly with major building constructors and owners to raise their awareness on economic, environmental and social benefits of integrated building design and on locally available and tested technologies, materials and other EE practices in buildings; • Develop, publish, and disseminate guidance to accompany the release of the new efficient building codes; • Conduct two independent evaluations of the project: a mid-term evaluation and a final evaluation and disseminate the findings through key channels; • Develop a strategy paper outlining the approaches for incorporating good practices from the project into public administration (i.e., codes, tendering practices, bulk procurement, policies, sectoral development programmes, municipal finance, etc.) and organize a high-level roundtable to discuss implementation	Gosarchitectstroy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Primary Education and Ministry of Higher Education, State Committee for Nature Protection, National Centre for Hydro meteorological Services (Uzhydromet), municipal and regional governments, building companies, design institutes, National Technical University, Tashkent Institute for Architectures and Building Constructors, NGOs	travels) **Year 2014: $3,797.00 (GEF: $3,797.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) [1] Construction of project demonstration buildings is planned for 2009-2014 **TOTAL for the Activity 5 - $512,325.00 (GEF: $192,325.00; Government in kind: $320,000.00)** **Year 2009: $2,500.000 (GEF: $2,500.00)** **Year 2010: $1,712.00 (GEF: $1,712.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2011: $4,212.00 (GEF: $4,212.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2012: $27,371.00 (GEF: $27,371.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2013: $75,371.00 (GEF: $75,371.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract, services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels) **Year 2014: $81,159.00 (GEF: $81,159.00)** (ICs, NCs, contract,

			36 leading design institutes and other design organizations. At least 5 new state funded buildings replicate the best results of project demonstration sites in design and construction process. **Target 5** Guidance manual enabling practical application of energy efficient building codes published and disseminated. Information on energy efficiency performance of pilot buildings disseminated among potential investors in public and other sectors, including residential. **2014** **Target 1** 1.1 Thermal energy reduction to an average of 140 and 150 kWh/m^2 (25% reduction) achieved for new and retrofitted buildings respectively due to revised building codes and standards. Revised approved building codes and standards are applied to other construction sectors (commercial buildings etc.) 1.2 Gosarchitectstroy' department calculated average energy consumption reductions for various building categories for various regions based on code requirements and weighted based on available statistics for construction volumes in these categories and/or regions **Target 2** 2.1 Effective system of			services, vehicle, equipment admin &management cost, travels)

			energy performance certification of public buildings implemented, building certificates/labels publically displayed and publicized, energy auditing scheme of public buildings in place).National programme on energy performance certification, including energy audit for public buildings drafted, accepted by Gosarchitectstroy, and submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers of Uzbekistan for adoption as an official Resolution 2.2 Data collected during the certification process is available through the energy information management system implemented in at least one region for two ministries: Ministry of Public Education and Ministry of Health. **Target 3** 3.1 At least 300 architects trained. 100% of designs of new public buildings and newly reconstructed (capital reconstruction) public buildings meet at least second level of the revised building code KMK 2.01.04-97* by the end of the project. **Target 4** 4.1 Information on energy performance, energy savings, financial savings, GHG emission reductions in project demonstration sites documented and is available 4.2 Information on applied energy efficiency measures, costs and calculated energy savings			

			in pilot buildings updated based on monitoring of energy performance in pilot buildings4.4. New full IBD submitted to the government for approval as a new typical building design to be constructed, financed and replicated within one of its national investment program **Target 5** Energy efficiency best practice and policy manual/strategy paper developed and disseminated to key relevant national and regional governmental stakeholders. Energy efficiency policies adopted by public sector administration (incl. focus on 2nd and 3rd energy efficiency levels of the adopted building code KMK 2.01.04-97*. Final independent evaluation conducted and Evaluation report prepared, published and findings disseminated to all beneficiaries.			

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. Project Document endorsed by GEF CEO
2. UNDP/GEF Project Document signed by UNDP and National Implementing Agency
3. Project Inception Report
4. Mid-Term Evaluation Report
5. Management Response to recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluation
6. Project quarterly (QORs and QPRs) and annual reporting (PIRs and APRs)
7. Minutes of Project Board meetings
8. Reports on monitoring of project office and pilot sites
9. ROARs
10. Project briefs and success stories
11. Project knowledge products
12. Government documentation (as an evidence of project outcomes achieved)

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
• Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans in accordance with the national legal and regulatory frameworks?	• % of reduced energy consumption in public buildings	• Project reporting, national statistics and reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review
• How does the project relate to the GEF Strategic objective CC – 1 "To promote energy-efficient technologies and practices in the appliances and buildings" through improved energy performance in public buildings?	• # of adopted and mandatory energy efficient building codes • Extent of application of Integrated Building Design principles	• Project reporting, national statistics and reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review
• How did the project contribute to GHG emissions reduction within the project implementation cycle and beyond?	• # of tons of CO2-equv. Emission reductions	• Project reporting, national statistics and reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Are the achieved project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?	• Yes/No	• Project reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project reporting review
• Whether the project outcomes provided the most effective way	• Yes/No	• Project reporting,	• UNDP/GEF

towards results?		national statistics and reporting	Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review
• What is effectiveness of project awareness raising and outreach activities/products on promoting energy efficiency in public buildings among all project stakeholders?	• Extent of influence the design and construction and public administration practices, including in sectors other than public buildings (e.g. residential and commercial)	• Project reporting, national statistics and reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• How efficient was the financial management of the project, including specific reference to cost-effectiveness of its interventions?	• Extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible	• Project reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project reporting review
• What was the role of UNDP and National Implementing Agency in meeting the requirements set out in UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures?	• Extent of influence to ensure meeting the required international standards	• Project reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project reporting review
• Are the systems for accountability and transparency of project management approach/results and meeting the relevant national norms and standards in place?	• # of national norms and standards met	• Project and national reporting	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Whether the risks identified in project document and PIRs were appropriate and corresponding risk management strategies/systems were adopted and implemented?	• Extent of risk appropriateness • Yes/No	• Project reporting, UNDP-GEF Risk Management System	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies

• Whether or not national stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making have ownership for project outcomes and their further replication and scaling-up?	• Yes/No	• Project reporting, government reporting/documentation	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review
• Was the project sustainability strategy relevant and efficient?	• Yes/No	• Project reporting; national evidences	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review
• Are there any environmental risks that may pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes?	• Yes/No	• Project reporting, government reporting/documentation	• Project and government documentation review
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• What contribution did the demonstration energy efficient buildings (green homes and other buildings built with indirect influence of project interventions, if any) have on improving the environment situation in their locations?	• # of tons of CO2-equv. Emission reductions	• Project reporting, government reporting/documentation/statistics	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review
• How the project did enable reducing pressure on corresponding natural resources (e.g. through reduced use of primary energy sources, and/or use of renewables)?	• # of toe of primary energy resources saved • Type of renewable energy source used	• Project reporting, government reporting/documentation/statistics	• UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	***Sustainability ratings:***	***Relevance ratings***
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) ***Impact Ratings:*** 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND 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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[3]

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: _____

[3] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[4]

i. Opening page:
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed 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
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary
- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[5])

1. Introduction
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context
- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated[6])

3.1 Project Design / Formulation
- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)

[4]The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).
[5] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008
[6] 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.

- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. 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

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by
UNDP Country Office
Name: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA
Name: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____