

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 **Improving the energy efficiency of lighting and other building appliances** (PIMS 4231).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Improving the energy efficiency of lighting and other building appliances			
GEF Project ID:	3832		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (est.)</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project Atlas Award ID: Atlas Output ID:	4231 (PIMS) 00060162 00075645	GEF financing:	4,450,000	4,450
Country:	Egypt	IA/EA own:	400,000	400,000
Region:	Arab States	Government:	12,000,000	12,000,000
Focal Area:	CC	Other:	2,655,000	2,655,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	15,065,000	15,065,00
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy	Total Project Cost:	19,505,000	19,505,000
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature:		01/06/2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2018	Actual: June 2019

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The objective of the project is to facilitate a comprehensive market transformation of the Egyptian market towards the use of more energy efficient electrical appliances at a level where cost-efficiency is proven. This is envisaged to be achieved through the combination of regulatory tools such as minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) and information labels, enhanced public awareness, capacity building and attractive financing mechanisms. The project will strengthen the regulatory and institutional framework, develop monitoring and enforcement mechanisms, and provide training to public authorities and other relevant stakeholders. It will explore and test different financial incentives complemented by extensive public outreach campaigns.

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 indicative 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 **Egypt** including the following project sites in **Greater Cairo**. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy

UNDP

Egyptian Organization for Standardization

General Organization for Import and Export Control

New and Renewable Energy Authority

Selected public and private Sector beneficiaries

Selected LED and home appliances suppliers

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 (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

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

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.

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**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Egypt. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of Daily Subsistence Allowance 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 22 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date	
Preparation	4 days	<i>1 October 2018</i>	
Evaluation Mission	7 days	<i>1 November 2018</i>	
Draft Evaluation Report	9 days	<i>30 November 2018</i>	
Final Report	2 days	<i>31 December 2018</i>	

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. (15 October 2018)	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission (7 November 2018)	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (30 November 2018)	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (31 December 2018)	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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](#)

*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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar climate change mitigation or energy efficiency 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:

- Advanced university degree in engineering, energy or related discipline (20%)
- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of climate change mitigation (20%)
- Familiar with UNDP, GEF and UNFCCC (5%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (20%)
- Good communication and analytical skills (5%)
- Good command of English language, both written and spoken (20%)
- Previous work experience in the region is an asset (5%)
- Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis (5%)

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

%	Milestone
10%	Acceptance of Inception Report prior to the field visit
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply by 23 July 2018. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for this position either online on UNDP website or by email to Ms Heba Helmy, Environment Programme Assistant, UNDP Egypt heba.helmy@undp.org. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English including the e-mail and phone contact, together with a financial offer including a lumpsum for the fees excluding the travel costs that will be covered as per UNDP rules and regulations.

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.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective³ To improve the energy efficiency of end-use equipment, namely building appliances and lighting systems manufactured, marketed and used in Egypt	The level of compliance of the targeted appliances with the adopted minimum energy performance standards (<i>a priori</i> the MEPS to be adopted in Egypt are expected to be in line with those adopted in EU.)	From 10% to 50% higher energy consumption (depending on the appliance) when comparing to the planned MEPS (for further details see Annex 7-4).	Over 80% of the appliances sold in the Egyptian market are in compliance with the requirements of those MEPS and labeling schemes that are expected to be in force by the end of the project (for further details see Annex 7-5).	Market monitoring and compliance checking reports produced in the frame of the project	Effective implementation and enforcement of the adopted EE policies
	Amount of reduced CO ₂ emissions compared to the projected baseline	See the baseline scenario presented in Annex 7-4.	Direct incremental reduction of GHG emissions by 0.95 million tons of CO ₂ eq by the end of the project and estimated cumulative indirect GHG emission reduction of at least 53 million tons of CO ₂ eq by 2025 on the basis of a conservative policy scenario and a GEF causality factor of 60%.	Market monitoring reports and official energy statistics. Post project market monitoring and evaluations	See above
Outcome 1⁴ Accelerated growth of the EE lighting market in Egypt, in line with the Global UNEP-UNDP EE Lighting initiative.	Total volume or the market share of the CFLs and other EE lighting appliances in Egypt	CFLs: No new MEPS adopted + annual sale of 25 million CFLs reached by 2015 as a result of a continuing natural growth. LFLs and HIDs: No new EE requirements formally adopted and reflected in public procurement processes.	CFLs: Annual sale of 35 million CFLs reached by 2015 resulting from project's market promotion activities + new MEPS adopted for completely phasing out incandescent light bulbs as per the schedule elaborated in Annex 7-5. LFLs and HIDs (street Lighting): The second set of EU consistent EE requirements have entered into force ⁵ , they are reflected in the technical specifications for public procurement and less than 10% of the random samples tested show non-compliance.	Market monitoring reports	Competitive prices and consumers' trust on the quality and performance of EE lighting Availability of different EE lighting products that meet the needs of consumers for different lighting applications

³ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

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

⁵ for further details see page 43

<p>Outcome 2</p> <p>A comprehensive S&L scheme for building appliances developed and effectively implemented, matching international and regional best policy and technology practices, and with energy efficiency requirements set at a level where cost effectiveness is proven.</p>	<p>The status and content of the legal and regulatory acts and the agreed implementation arrangements dealing with appliance minimum energy performance standards (MEPS), labeling schemes and their enforcement.</p> <p>The share of non-compliant products.</p>	<p>Minimum energy performance standards and/or labeling schemes developed and adopted for 5 appliances (CFLs, refrigerators/freezers, washing machines, air-conditioners and electric water heaters), but not adequately enforced and monitored yet.</p>	<p>Strengthened implementation, enforcement and market monitoring of the S&L schemes adopted for the first five appliances to cover both import and local production as demonstrated by verified annual statistics on the sale of the different appliances sold as per the different energy classes.</p> <p>Expanded S&L, implementation, enforcement and market monitoring schemes formally adopted for new appliances consisting of: TVs and their accessories, information and communication appliances (ICT), stand-by power, external power supply (EPS), electric fans and electric motors as per the schedule presented in Annex 7-5.</p> <p>Fewer than 10% of all the random samples tested at the end of the project show non-compliance.</p>	<p>Official Gov't publications</p> <p>Local and international testing reports</p> <p>Project reports and final evaluation</p>	<p>Interest of the key policy makers and Government entities to strengthen, expand and ensure effective implementation and enforcement of the new S&L schemes</p>
<p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Sustained project results</p>	<p>The level of information available for adaptive management and for measuring the impact of the project.</p> <p>The status of recommendations contributing to institutional sustainability.</p>	<p>Insufficient information for adaptive management and for measuring the impact of the project.</p> <p>Insufficient institutional mechanisms in place to ensure sustainability of project results.</p>	<p>Annually updated information on the sale of each targeted appliance as per its energy performance class and the level of compliance with the adopted standards and regulations available.</p> <p>Sustained institutional and financial mechanisms in place to promote the market for EE appliances and related market monitoring.</p>	<p>Annual project market monitoring reports</p> <p>Project final evaluation</p>	<p>Agreements and institutional arrangements for regularly obtaining the required market data in place</p> <p>Successful completion of the prior project activities</p>

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

1. Project document
2. Annual Project Review (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR)
3. Mid Term Evaluation Report
4. Project Technical Reports
5. Project Achievement Report
6. Lighting case studies
7. Project brochures and awareness materials
8. Project financial budgets

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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the challenges that the project was meant to address at its initiation • How the project approach was able to set the links between global and national benefits • How would you assess the national ownership of the project • How relevant is the project to: development priorities of Egypt - UNDP thematic areas • How did the project approach contribute to GHG emission reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Interviews
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the project status with respect to target outputs in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness? What factors impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs • How useful are the outputs to the needs of the direct beneficiaries. Is there a general acceptance of the outputs by these beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIRs • Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Interviews
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the project use its resources to produce target outputs • To what extent are local expertise (by gender) and indigenous technologies and resources used • How did the project has selected the consultants and contractors who supported the project implementation • What are the areas that needed international consultants/contractors and why 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMU 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a mechanism been put in place to ensure the sustainability of the project results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIRs • Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis

- How has the project contributed to the development of the capacity of the direct beneficiaries to carry out their tasks in an environment of change in terms, a). individual learning, by gender, and b). improving organizational structures and interrelationships?
- What are the likely impacts of the project beyond the direct beneficiaries?
- Are there any signs of potential contribution to enabling environment or to a broader development context (ie. Institutional, socio-political, economic and environmental)?
- Are the project results systematically disseminated?
-

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

- Are there any plans to replicate and upscale the pilot projects

•

- stakeholders

- Interviews

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>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>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁶

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: _____

⁶www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁷

- 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 Manual⁸)
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 rated⁹)
- 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)

⁷The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁹ 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.

- 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 (*)
- 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
- Report Clearance Form
- *Annexed in a separate file: TE audit trail*

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 (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #*)

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

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