

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

GENERAL INFORMATION

Consultancy title: Terminal Evaluation - GEF Project

Project: Securing Energy Efficiency in the Ecuadorian Residential and Public Sectors (SECURE)

Type of Contract: Individual Consultancy

Location: Home Based with one mission travel to Ecuador (Quito and Galapagos Islands)

Period: 30 working days within a period of 60 days

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: *Securing energy efficiency in the Ecuadorian residential and public sectors (SECURE)* [PIMS #5150]

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Securing energy efficiency in the Ecuadorian residential and public sectors (SECURE)			
GEF Project ID:	5114		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	89679	GEF financing:	\$ 1,776,484	\$ 1,776,484
Country:	Ecuador	UNDP:	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Region:	LAC	Government:	\$ 22,587,600	\$ 22,587,600
Focal Area:	Climate Change	In-kind (GoE)	\$ 3,162,400	\$ 3,162,400
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CCM-2: Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector.	Total co-financing:	\$ 25,800,000	\$ 25,800,000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy (MEER)	Total Project Cost:	\$ 27,576,484	\$ 27,576,484
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Industry and Productivity (MIPRO), Coordinating Ministry for Strategic Sectors, (MICSE)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		July 1 st , 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: Jun 30 th , 2017	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Energy Efficiency (EE) is a measure to procure effective energy use to reduce global consumption and thus reduce emissions from the energy sector.

According to the National Constitution (Articles 313, 314, 413 and 414¹) energy efficiency (EE) is a priority for the Government of Ecuador (GoE). The National Development Plan (National Plan for Good Living 2013-2017) also explicitly prioritizes energy efficiency under Objective 7: To guarantee Rights of Nature and promote regional and global environmental sustainability through policies. In this sense, the policy 7.7 states that the Government will “Promote energy efficiency and greater share of sustainable renewable energies as a measure of prevention of environmental pollution”. Furthermore, policy number 7.8 states: “To prevent, control and mitigate environmental pollution in the process of extraction, production, consumption and post-consumption”, and policy number 7.9 states: “To promote patterns of conscious, sustainable and efficient consumption within the limits of the planet”.

In order to, continue the development and implementation of actions aimed at EE, the GoE, through the Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy (MEER), with the support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), is implementing the project “Securing Energy Efficiency in the Ecuadorian Residential and Public Sectors (SECURE)”.

The aim of the project is to increase the use of energy-efficient electric appliances within the residential and public sectors, and thus contribute to the mitigation of climate change. This will be done through the following measures:

- Strengthening of the governance, and legal framework;
- Providing technical support to national EE test laboratories;
- Enhancing the RENOVA refrigerator substitution programme;
- Monitoring and evaluation.

With the implementation of this project, it is expected to accelerate market transformation towards the use of energy-efficient appliances (in the public and residential sectors); and the reduction of barriers and challenges for energy efficiency policies. The ultimate aim of the project is to obtain savings in energy levels in the country of about 16 800 MWh / year, which will result in benefits to about 42 000 low-income households and in GHG emission reductions of 500 -700 kton CO₂eq.

In this context, the Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy (MEER), through the Secretariat of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (SEREE), executing agency of the project, with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as implementing agency of the Global Environment Fund, requires to contract an individual consultancy to conduct the project’s TE according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

¹ **Article 313:** The State reserves the right to administer, regulate, monitor and manage strategic sectors, following the principles of environmental sustainability, precaution, prevention and efficiency. Strategic sectors, which come under the decision making and exclusive control of the State, are those that, due to their importance and size, exert a decisive economic, social, political or environmental impact and must be aimed at ensuring the full exercise of rights and the general welfare of society. The following are considered strategic sectors: energy in all its forms, telecommunications, nonrenewable natural resources, oil and gas transport and refining, biodiversity and genetic heritage, the radio spectrum, water and others as established by law. **Article 314:** The State shall be responsible for the provision of the public services of drinking and irrigation water, sanitation, electricity, telecommunications, roads, seaport and airport facilities, and others as established by law. The State shall ensure that public services and the provision thereof observe the principles of obligation, generality, uniformity, efficiency, responsibility, universality, accessibility, regularity, continuity and quality. The State shall take steps to ensure that the prices and fees of public services are equitable, and shall establish the monitoring and regulation thereof. **Article 413:** The State shall promote energy efficiency, the development and use of environmentally clean and healthy practices and technologies, as well as diversified and low-impact renewable sources of energy that do not jeopardize food sovereignty, the ecological balance of the ecosystems or the right to water. **Article 414:** The State shall adopt adequate and cross-cutting measures for the mitigation of climate change, by limiting greenhouse gas emissions, deforestation, and air pollution; it shall take measures for the conservation of the forests and vegetation; and it shall protect the population at risk.

[Constitution of The Republic of Ecuador](#), National Assembly, published on Registro Oficial N. 449, October 20th 2008

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.

This includes contribution to capacity development and the attainment of global and country specific environmental goals. It is expected to review the project's results with the main stakeholders: MEER, SEREE, MIPRO. Additionally, it is considered as a significant opportunity to provide donors, government and project partners with an independent assessment of relevance and achievement of objectives and impact indicators, to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method² 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 Quito-Ecuador, including the following project sites: Santa Cruz and San Cristobal Islands in Galápagos Islands. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy (MEER), Ministry of Industry and Productivity (MIPRO), Ministry of Environment of Ecuador (MAE), Coordinating Ministry for Strategic Sectors (MICSE), Ecuadorian Normalization Service (INEN), National Institute for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (INER), Ecuadorian Accreditation Service (SAE), Electricity Regulation and Control Agency (ARCONEL), Santa Elena Peninsula State University (UPSE), National Polytechnic School (EPN), Governing Council Special Regime Galapagos (CGREG) and Galapagos Provincial Electric Company (ELECGALAPAGOS).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, 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

² 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	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution – Executing Agency	
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	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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the evaluation plan of the UNDP country office.

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.³

The project expects the evaluation to answer some of the following questions:

- Has the project achieved the results and products expected at the terminal implementation?
- What is the progress towards each Outcome, output and impact indicator?
- Which factors have contributed or hinder the achievement of the expected results?
- What level of appropriation, support and technical support has provided the executing agency (MEER) for
- the project's achievement of results?
- How do the main stakeholders plan to provide sustainability to the project's results in the future?
- How has the UNDP contribution helped the project's achievement of Outcomes?

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 Ecuador. 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 30 days of work over a period of 60 days, according to the following plan:

Activity/ Output	Timing
Desk review of documents and preparation and submission of inception report	3 days
Submission of comments to inception report (UNDP, MEER and	3 days

³ 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](#)

SECURE)	
Finalization of the Inception report	1 day
Evaluation Mission: stakeholder consultations, field visits	7 days (this includes travelling time)
Presentation of initial findings (mission report)	2 days
Submission of Draft Final Terminal Evaluation Report	5 days
Submission of comments to the Draft report	7 days
Final Terminal Evaluation Report Submission after incorporation of comments (Spanish version)	3 days
Revision and approval of Final Version	3 days
Final Terminal Evaluation Report and Annexes translated into English	5 days
Review and approval of Final Report English version	3 days
Complete tracking tool of the Project	1 day
Managerial Responses to TE comments	3 days

CONSULTANCY DELIVERABLES

The consultant is expected to deliver the following:

N°	Deliverable/ Output	Content	Timing (in calendar days)	Responsibilities
1	Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	7 days upon signature of the contract	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	2 days upon completion of field mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO, reviewed by project management, MEER
3	Draft Final Report	Draft full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 5 days upon delivery of output N°2.	Evaluator submits to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs, MEER
4	Final Report* (Spanish version)	Revised report	Within 3 days upon receiving comments on the draft report	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.
5	Final Report and annexes translated into English	Report in English	5 days upon approval of the Final Version of the Report (Spanish version)	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.
6	Tracking Tool	Tracking tool	1 day upon review and	Sent to CO for uploading to

N°	Deliverable/ Output	Content	Timing (in calendar days)	Responsibilities
	of the Project	completed	approval of final report (English version)	UNDP ERC.
7	Managerial Responses in English	Matrix with managerial responses	3 days upon delivery of output N°6	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.

TECHNICAL PROFILE REQUIRED

The consultant selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

Education:

- Advanced university degree (Master's or PhD) in natural sciences, environmental management, development studies, economics, climate change or related discipline.

Experience:

- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in Environmental Sciences, Climate Change impacts, mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk management or related field;
- Previous demonstrated experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge of the energy sector is desirable, but not essential;
- Substantive and proven experience with terminal evaluation/review of donor driven projects (preferably GEF, UN, IDB, or World Bank projects);
- Fluency in oral and written English and Spanish are required.

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'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

At the request of the MEER within the framework of the SECURE project, UNDP will sign a contract for the agreed amount plus taxes (VAT). The person selected for this consultancy will be responsible for his/her tax obligations,

whereas UNDP is not tax withholding agent. The individual consultant will be responsible to be informed about Ecuador's tax obligations related to consulting services provided by foreigners.

Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables/project and the MEER, and the reception of an invoice and according to the following table of detail:

Payment	Deliverable	Payment Date
40% of the contract value	Upon submission and approval of outputs 1 to 3	Up to 21 days upon the signature of the contract
60% of the contract value	Upon submission and approval of outputs 4 to 7	Up to 60 days upon the signature of the contract

* *Travel costs (fixed and non-negotiable) for above mission travels shall be included in financial proposal of applicants. The consultant is expected to arrange her/his own travel and be responsible for ticketing, visa and accommodation. The fare will always be "most direct, most economical" at no additional cost to UNDP and any difference in price with the preferred route will be paid for by the consultant.*

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online. To formalize the participation, the applicant should send an email to the following address: aplicaciones.ec@undp.org with the reference number of the application and attaching the following documents:

- a) Personal History Form ([P11 form](#));
- b) Technical proposal mentioning how it will comply with the required outcomes, schedule and observations to TOR.; (max 5 pages);
- c) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price including Final Report translation costs and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc., within the country and outside - if necessary), supported by a breakdown of 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.

CONSULTANT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Applications are reviewed based on Technical Profile stated above and based on the technical evaluation criteria outlined below. Applicants will be evaluated based on cumulative scoring. When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Being responsive/compliant/acceptable; and

- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation where technical criteria weighs 70% and Financial criteria/ Proposal weighs 30%
- Candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% (49 points) of the maximum obtainable points for the technical criteria (70 points) shall be considered for the financial evaluation.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA -70%

a) Personal History Form (P11 form) [30%]

- Advanced University degree (Master's or PhD) in natural sciences, environmental management, development studies, economics, climate change or related discipline. (7 %)
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in Environmental Sciences, Climate Change impacts, mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk management or related field (8%);
- Previous demonstrated experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (5%);
- Technical knowledge of the energy sector is desirable, but not essential (2%);
- Substantive and proven experience with terminal evaluation/review of donor driven projects (preferably GEF, UN, IDB, or World Bank projects) (5%);
- Fluency in oral and written English and Spanish are required (3%).

b) Technical proposal [40%]

- To what extent the applicant understands the nature of the work and meets the terms of reference? (15%)
- Has the consultant developed the relevant aspects of the work with a sufficient level of detail? (10%)
- Has been adopted an appropriate conceptual framework for the work to be undertaken? (5%)
- Have been described processes of follow-up, monitoring and interinstitutional coordination that add value to the consultancy? (5%)
- Are the sequence of activities, work schedule and planning appropriate? (5%)

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL / EVALUATION CRITERIA- 30%

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

$x = y (z/n)$, where:

x = points for the financial proposal being evaluated;

y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal;

z = price of the lowest priced proposal;

n = price of the proposal being evaluated

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Strategy		Indicators	Baseline	Target (End of Project)	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Project Objective: To increase the share of energy-efficient electric appliances in the residential and public sectors.		Number of households participating in RENOVA programme (hh/year)	Approx. 19,000 households per year	42,000 households per year	Official documents from RENOVA/ MEER; terminal evaluation	
		Extent of change in energy efficiency coverage by users and specific sectors	0 MWh reduced as result of project	Extent of change in energy efficiency coverage by users and specific sectors	0 MWh reduced as result of project	
		Number of laboratories accredited by OAE (for EE compliance verification of household appliances)	No laboratory fully habilitated for EE(0).	At least one (1) laboratory fully habilitated	Project reports, visual inspection, official documents, independent verification.	
		NAMA on EE for residential sector	No NAMA (0)	NAMA on EE for residential sector designed and approved (1)	Project reports, official documents	
Outcome 1⁴: The governance and legal framework for adopting the use of EE appliances in the public and residential sectors, has been strengthened.	1.1 An enhanced governance structure for energy efficiency policy has been designed and implemented.	(a) EE committees in line ministries in place; (b) Number of sector plans or policies covering EE issues.	Decreets in place. (a) No committees (0); (b) None (0)	(a) EE committees operational in at least four (4) ministries and three (3) municipalities; (b) EE included in at least three (3) sector plans or policies.	Official publications, project reports	Sustained government commitment to strengthen policy framework and sector governance; Effective communication between ministries

⁴

All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target (End of Project)	Sources of verification	Assumptions	
	1.2 Government staff and public officers (100 persons) are trained on the application of EE standards and practices for the public and residential sector.	(a) Number of public officers trained; (b) Number of entities involved.	(a) 0 people; (b) 0 entities	(a) 100 people; (b) 10 entities	Project reports, interviews	Sustained government commitment to strengthen policy framework and sector governance
	1.3 Energy-efficient technologies and appliances in the public and residential sectors are receiving financial support through the implementation of one or more NAMAs.	NAMA on EE for residential sector	No NAMA (0)	NAMA on EE for residential sector designed and approved (1)	Official publications, project reports	Sustained government commitment to strengthen policy framework and sector governance
	1.4 Technical assistance is provided to increase the competences of the public entities involved with the implementation and enforcement of EE standards.	enforcement plans and protocols in place	No (0) plans in place	One or more plans designed and implemented	Official reports, resolutions, work plans; project reports	Sustained government commitment to strengthen policy framework and sector governance; Effective communication between stakeholders
Outcome 2: Designated national test laboratories have been prepared to verify compliance of household appliances with applicable EE standards.	2.1 Laboratory facilities (at least 1) of the National Institute for Normalization (INEN) have been upgraded to verify compliance of household appliances with EE standards.	Number of laboratories habilitated for EE compliance verification of household appliances.	No (0) laboratories fully habilitated.	At least one (1) laboratory fully habilitated.	Project reports, visual inspection, official documents, independent verification.	Appropriate equipment is successfully procured; Laboratories have genuine interest to be accredited in EE; Supporting baseline activities are effectively implemented..

Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target (End of Project)	Sources of verification	Assumptions	
	2.2 Technical staff (15 persons) from INEN and other designated laboratories have become trained to verify compliance of electric household appliances and lighting with applicable EE standards.	(a) Number of laboratory staff and energy professionals duly trained; (b) Number of laboratory staff certified to perform EE compliance verification tests; (c) Number of designated laboratories with skilled staff.	(a) No trained laboratory staff (0); (b) No certified staff (0); (c) No laboratories with skilled staff (0).	(a) fifteen (15) people; (b) nine (9) staff; (c) at least one (1) laboratory.	Qualification certificates of trained staff, project reports, project evaluations	Laboratories have genuine interest to be accredited in EE; Project activities can be implemented according to plan.
	2.3 Work groups (at least 3) within INEN have been strengthened by making available technical staff (4 person-years) and expertise to support development of national EE standards under the baseline program.	(a) staff hired by Project (person-years); (b) staff continued after Project Termination; (c) number of workgroups on EE standards for household appliances.	(a) 0 person-years; (b) 0 people; (c) 0 workgroups	(a) 4 person-years; (b) at least one (1) person; (c) at least three (3) workgroups	Project reports, minutes of work groups; contracts of staff hired by INEN	Sustained government commitment to develop EE standards and provide institutional support to INEN; Project activities can be implemented according to plan.
Outcome 3: The institutional and technical capacity of the RENOVA programme has been strengthened to ensure the replacement of obsolete household refrigerators by	3.1 The managerial and technical capacity of the RENOVA Management has been expanded (with 3 person-years), including the implementation of an effective MRV system.	(a) staff hired for RENOVA Management (person-years); (b) software-based MRV tool designed, procured and implemented	(a) no staff hired (0); (b) no MRV tool (0)	(a) one consultant hired (3 person-years); (b) MRV tool implemented (1)	Project reports; official reports from MEER/ RENOVA; contracts of staff hired by MEER; field visits, independent evaluation	Sustained government commitment to RENOVA; Project activities can be implemented according to plan.

Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target (End of Project)	Sources of verification	Assumptions	
energy-efficient units.	3.2 Training and technical backstopping are provided (by 1 part-time consultant) to national electricity distribution companies to reach their substitution targets under the RENOVA programme.	(a) increased substitution rate RENOVA programme by least-performing electricity companies (replaced refrigerators per year); (b) number of electricity companies recurring to technical backstopping	(a) continuation of baseline performance ⁵ ; (b) electricity companies not actively seeking support (0)	(a) at least 20% improvement of least-performing companies compared to baseline (refr/years); (b) ten (10) companies seeking regular support to improve business	Project reports; official reports from MEER/ RENOVA; independent evaluation	Sustained government commitment to RENOVA; Effective communication with electricity distribution companies
	3.3 The recycling processes for obsolete household refrigerators have been strengthened in collaboration with MIPRO and recycling agents.	(a) recycling capacity for household refrigerators; (b) percentage of ODS refrigerant recovered and/or destroyed.	(a) recycling capacity approx. 20,000 units; (b) estimated below 50 (%)	(a) recycling capacity for at least 60,000 units per year; (b) contracts with two (2) companies; (c) at least 95% of ODS recovered.	Project reports, official documents, independent verification	Project activities can be implemented as planned; Selected private companies have sustained interested to deliver environmental services.
	3.4 Residential customers and public officers have become aware of the benefits and potential of EE appliances through a promotional and educational campaign.	Awareness raising campaign on EE by MEER, MIPRO and MAE.	No campaign (0)	Campaign designed and implemented (1)	Project reports, interviews and surveys; ex-post evaluation	Project activities can be implemented as planned;
	3.5 A total of 42,000 EE household refrigerators have been purchased by customers eligible under the RENOVA programme, including the environmentally responsible recycling of obsolete equipment and removal and/or destruction	(a) Number of households participating in RENOVA programme (hh/year); (b) Number of obsolete units retired from the market	(a) Approx. 18,000 households per year; (b) 18,000 (estimated)	(a) 42,000 households/year; (b) 42,000 units.	Official documents from RENOVA/ MEER; terminal evaluation	Sustained government commitment to RENOVA; Project activities can be implemented according to plan.

⁵ As defined in RENOVA preliminary Evaluation, January 2014.

Strategy		Indicators	Baseline	Target (End of Project)	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	of harmful refrigerants.					
Outcome 4: The Monitoring & Evaluation plan for the Project has been executed.	4.1 A detailed M&E Plan, including progress indicators and targets, has been agreed upon and is implemented.	(a) Inception workshop; (b) Annual progress monitoring reports	(a) No inception workshop held (0); (b) No progress reports.	(a) Inception workshop held (1); (b) Progress monitored and reported annually (3).	Project reports, inception reports.	Sector stakeholders show sustained commitment to the objectives of the Project; Envisaged activities can be executed as planned
	4.2 The project Terminal Evaluation has been conducted.	Evaluation Report	No evaluation report (0)	Terminal Evaluation report completed (1)	evaluation report	Envisaged activities can be executed as planned.
	4.3 The Project has been audited, and lessons learnt have been collected and disseminated.	Report with lessons learnt	No report (0)	Report with lessons learnt (1)	project report, terminal evaluation	Envisaged activities can be executed as planned.

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

1. UNDP Project Document
2. Project Steering Committee's minutes
3. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
4. Monthly and quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
5. Project Annual Progress Report
6. GPR⁶ Monitoring and Follow-up report
7. Finalized UNDP-GEF focal area tracking report tools
8. Training reports, Communication Plan reports.
9. Published knowledge materials
10. Consultancy Reports
11. Mission reports
12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)

⁶ Gobierno por Resultados –GPR (Government by Results)

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <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 	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<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

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 Form⁷

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: _____

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

- i. Opening page:
 - c) Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - d) UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - e) Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - f) Region and countries included in the project
 - g) GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - h) Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - i) Evaluation team members
 - j) Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - k) Project Summary Table
 - l) Project Description (brief)
 - m) Evaluation Rating Table
 - n) Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁹)
1. Introduction
 - o) Purpose of the evaluation
 - p) Scope & Methodology
 - q) 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 rated¹⁰)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - r) Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - s) Assumptions and Risks
 - t) Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - u) Planned stakeholder participation
 - v) Replication approach
 - w) UNDP comparative advantage
 - x) Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - y) Management arrangements

⁸The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹⁰ 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.

3.2 Project Implementation

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

3.3 Project Results

- ff) Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- gg) Relevance(*)
- hh) Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- ii) Country ownership
- jj) Mainstreaming
- kk) Sustainability (*)
- ll) Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- mm)** Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- nn)** Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- oo)** Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- pp)** Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- qq)** ToR
- rr)** Itinerary
- ss)** List of persons interviewed
- tt)** Summary of field visits
- uu)** List of documents reviewed
- vv)** Evaluation Question Matrix
- ww)** Questionnaire used and summary of results
- xx)** 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: _____