

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

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 project “Improving Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Armenia” (PIMS #4245.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	LGGE Improving Energy Efficiency in Buildings			
GEF Project ID:	00059937		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00075196	GEF financing:	1.045	1.045
Country:	Armenia	IA/EA own:	0.15	0.15
Region:	Europe and Central Asia	Government:	2.2	2.2
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	-	12.1*
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CC-SP1-Building EE	Total co-financing:	2.35	14.45
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Nature Protection	Total Project Cost:	3.395	15.495
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Urban Development	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		05 July 2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: July 2015	Actual: July 2016

* To be re-assessed at the Project completion.

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: reverse the existing trends and reduce consumption of electrical and thermal energy and associated GHG emissions in new and restored, primarily residential buildings in Armenia. It will do this by creating enabling regulatory environment, skills and capacity among industry professionals to introduce the principles of integrated building design in Armenian construction practices from the stage of building design through construction to maintenance of the buildings. The support provided by the project combine development of a new regulation framework (EE building codes and certification scheme) with the training of professionals, demonstration of integrated building design and stimulating manufacturing and testing of new EE materials and equipment.

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 method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is 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](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([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 Yerevan, Armenia, including the following project sites: Yerevan, Goris, Gyumri, Akhuryan.

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

Ministry of Nature Protection

Ministry of Urban Development

Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources

Municipality of Yerevan

Municipality of Goris

National University of of Architecture and Construction of Armenia

Shincertificate LLC

Armenia Renewable Resources and Energy Efficiency Fund (R2E2)

Habitat for Humanity REELIH Project

Cascade Hills Property developer: “Al Hamra Real Estate Armenia” LLC

Residents of the Demo building in Avan

Residents of the Demo building in Goris

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, 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 ([Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project

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

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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA & EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
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	Planned	Actual
Grants	0.15	0.15	2.0	2.0			2.15	2.15
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			0.2	0.2			0.2	0.2
• Other						12.1		12.1
Totals	0.15	0.15	2.2	2.2		12.1	2.35	14.45

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 evaluator 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**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 12 days over a time period of 12 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	Before mission
Evaluation Mission	7 days	Between 3 rd week of January and 2 nd week of February, 2016
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	01 March, 2016
Final Report	2 days	31 of March, 2016

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator 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. See [Annex H](#) for an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION

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](#)

The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Education: degree in energy, environment, economics, climate change or similar;
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience;
- Knowledge of and/or experience with UNDP-GEF;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Energy Efficiency in Buildings, Energy Conservation ; Construction sector regulatory framework;
- Knowledge of the CIS, Eastern Europe construction sector specifics.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultant 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'](#).

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft terminal evaluation report
60%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Output Baseline		Output Indicator		Output Target	
	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report
Global Development Objective: Reduce GHG emissions and energy consumption in the Armenian residential building sector	Average thermal energy consumption for space heating in new residential buildings in Armenia	no change recommended at this time	160 kWh/m ² a	185 kWh/m ² .a	96 kWh/m ² a	111 kWh/m ² .a
	Zero reductions below business as usual (BAU) scenario.	no change recommended at this time	Cumulative CO ₂ emission reductions from new residential buildings to be built during project lifetime against the baseline	no change recommended at this time	Approx. 60 ktCO ₂ eq reduced compared to the BAU scenario	no change recommended at this time
Outcome 1: Design and enforcement of new EE Building Codes and Standards	Codes for residential buildings are limited in energy performance to minimal hygienic norms.	no change recommended at this time	Existence and substance of legally binding codes that mandate an improved level of energy performance in four climate zones of Armenia	no change recommended at this time	By end of project, new codes adopted, setting mandatory energy performance targets comparable with MSN/EU standards	no change recommended at this time
	Lack of methodology for assessing energy performance in buildings; lack of protocol for energy audits and performance certification and labeling	no change recommended at this time	Standards and methodology for assessing energy performance in buildings	no change recommended at this time	By the project midterm, audit protocols are in place By the project mid-term, guidelines for energy passport are drafted and approved	By the end of the project, audit protocols are in place By the end of the project, guidelines for energy passport are drafted and

Project Strategy	Output Baseline		Output Indicator		Output Target	
	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report
					<p>By the end of the project, audits are carried out in at least 50% of new buildings and buildings undergoing capital reconstruction</p> <p>By the end of the project, energy passports provided for at least 50% of new buildings and buildings undergoing capital reconstruction.</p>	approved
	<p>Statistics on enforcement do not exist</p> <p>EE requirements not included</p>	no change recommended at this time	<p>Capacity of the MUD inspectorate and independent technical supervision bodies to implement and check compliance with energy efficiency codes</p> <p>Integration of EE requirements into state-funded construction and procurement activities</p>	no change recommended at this time	<p>By project mid-term, code enforcement program in place.</p> <p>By end of project, revision process for codes carried out or underway.</p> <p>By end of project, code enforcement program reaches 50% of new and reconstructed buildings.</p> <p>By end of project, EE</p>	By end of project, code enforcement program in place.

Project Strategy	Output Baseline		Output Indicator		Output Target	
	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report
					requirements factored into all state-funded construction and procurement activities	
Outcome 2: Quality control, testing and certification of EE materials and equipment	Due to the negligible demand for the corresponding services, the laboratories have no incentives to obtain the modern equipment, thus no testing and certification of EE materials is done in country.	no change recommended at this time	Demand for local testing laboratory(ies) testing/certification services	no change recommended at this time	By end of project, at least one laboratory can perform testing and certification of domestic and imported construction materials such as insulation, windows, doors, and heating systems	no change recommended at this time
	5-10%	no change recommended at this time	Increase in share of domestically produced EE materials in the construction market	no change recommended at this time	By end of project, domestically-produced EE materials comprise at least 10-20% of the market.	no change recommended at this time
Outcome 3: Outreach, training and education	IBDA concepts are not used in the country at present	no change recommended at this time	Use of Integrated Building Design Approach (IBDA) concepts in new building constructions	no change recommended at this time	By end of project, all graduating architecture and civil engineering students with an emphasis on residential buildings are aware of IBDA concepts.	no change recommended at this time
	IBDA concepts are not used in the country at present	no change recommended at this time	Use of Integrated Building Design Approach (IBDA) concepts in new building constructions	no change recommended at this time	By project mid-term, key experts at design institutes & in academia are using IBDA concepts. By end of project, at least 4-5 % of buildings constructed annually apply IBDA	By end of project, key experts at design institutes & in academia are using IBDA concepts.

Project Strategy	Output Baseline		Output Indicator		Output Target	
	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report	In ProDoc	MTE Report
	Energy passports and labels are not used	no change recommended at this time	Rate of application of the energy passport and label system by real estate developers	no change recommended at this time	By project mid-term, a majority of real estate professionals are aware of the potential benefits of energy-efficient buildings and understand the energy passport and label. By end of project, at least 10% of new residential building stock is marketed with energy passports and labels	By end of project, a majority of real estate...
Output 4: Demonstrating integrated building design	The standard building design used in housing developments may not comply with current building codes regarding thermal performance	no change recommended at this time	Thermal performance of the demonstration building	no change recommended at this time	By project mid-term, the building design is completed and approved by the developer and MUD. By end of project, demonstration building showing at least 30% better thermal performance than the improved code and 60% better than the existing code	no change recommended at this time

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

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
- Project Implementation Plan
- Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
- Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
- Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
- Project budget and financial data
- Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
- UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

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?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluator:

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 Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
- 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 rated⁶)
- 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 (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)

⁴The 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 See Annex D for rating scales.

- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - 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
 - Report Clearance Form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

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: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

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

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of Improving Energy Efficiency in Buildings (UNDP PIMS #4245)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

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