

Terms of reference



GENERAL INFORMATION

Title: Terminal Evaluation for Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector (PIMS ID: 4900) Project
 Project Name: Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector (PIMS ID: 4900)
 Reports to: UNDP Officer-in-Charge, Programmes Unit
 Duty Station: Jamaica
 Duration of Assignment: 31 working days

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION FROM CONTRACTOR

X	Letter of presentation highlighting main qualifications and experience relevant to this TOR
X	CV
X	Copy of education certificate
x	Completed financial proposal
	Sample of Work

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *medium-sized* project titled Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector (PIMS ID: 4900) implemented through UNDP Jamaica Multi-Country Office. The project started on the 28 July 2016 and is in its final year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)'.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The world is currently facing the COVID-19 pandemic, which is affecting people everywhere and impacting global and local economic activity and transport systems, as well as causing unprecedented disruptions to daily life that undercut the societal fabric of opportunities for human interaction¹. In order to ensure the

¹ Guidance Note: Good practices during COVID-19. OECD/DAC and IEO/UNDP, April 2020.

well-being and safety of UNDP’s staff and contractors, as well as to ensure no harm is done to partners, communities and interlocutors, the implementation of this TE shall be undertaken virtually, as outlined in “Evaluation Approach and Method” of this TOR.

This project sought to advance a low carbon development path and reduce Jamaica’s public sector energy bill through the introduction of renewable energy (RE) and improvement in energy efficiency (EE) in the health sector. The project strengthened relevant capacity in the public sector by increasing the knowledge base of its operatives on matters pertinent to RE and EE as well as developed the appropriate technical skills necessary to support investments in the energy sector. It sought to strengthen the regulatory framework that governed the development and deployment of RE and EE technologies. The project also supported and investigated a potential mechanism involving public private partnership (PPP) to engender a greater uptake of RE and EE. The hospital sector has a high-energy demand and high operational costs and benefitted significantly for RE and EE applications.

Expected outcomes and associated outputs were:

Outcome 1: Increased knowledge in RE and EE for Individuals in the public sector and strong institutional capacity to support RE and EE development in Jamaica’s public sector.

Output 1.1 Recommendations for acceptable industry standards in RETs and EE training and education, particularly in the solar PV subsector developed and capacity of selected training institutions within the RE/EE sector enhanced.

Output 1.2. Technicians within the public sector trained and certified to acceptable industry standards in renewable energy technology and energy efficiency particularly in the solar photo-voltaic subsector.

Output 1.3: Selected staff from financial institutions, have increased knowledge in matters of RE, EE and Energy Performance Contracting.

Output 1.4: Awareness of senior management and maintenance staff at selected hospitals, other public institutions enhanced.

Output 1.5: Relevant institutional capacity within public institutions strengthened to facilitate an increase in the scale-up of RE.

Outcome 2: A supportive legal and regulatory framework to facilitate the deployment of small decentralized RE power generation (notably solar PV) and EE programmes in Jamaica’s public sector

Output 2.1: The legal and regulatory regime to facilitate scale-up of RE and EE reviewed and strengthened.

Outcome 3: An operational Energy Performance Contracting mechanism to facilitate the development of ESCOs and their viability to support RE and EE scale-up in the public sector of Jamaica.

Output 3.1: Uptake of renewable energy strengthened with the Energy Performance Contracting pilot programme:

Output 3.2: Investments in Solar PV, solar water heaters and energy efficiency retrofits in the health sector encouraged

Timeframe

This project was approved for a duration of 48 months by the GEF, commencing August 2016 and terminating in July 2020. A project extension was granted, and the new project closing date is March 26, 2021.

Management Arrangements

Please refer to Section IX of the Project Document for details on the Management Arrangements of the Project.

The following table summarizes key project information:

Table 1: Project Summary

Project Title:	PIMS ID: 4900 Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector			
GEF Project ID:	00094832		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00087974	GEF financing:	\$1, 254,987	
Country:	Jamaica	IA/EA own:	30,000	
Region:	Caribbean	Government:	\$1,361,240	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	\$9,387,514	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CC1: Promote innovation, technology transfer, and supportive policies and strategies CCM2 Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector CCM3 Promote investment in renewable energy technologies	Total co-financing:	\$10,748,754	
Executing Agency:	UNDP Jamaica	Total Project Cost:	\$12,003,741.00	\$12,003,741.00
Other Partners involved:	Development Bank of Jamaica	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		28/07/2016
	Ministry of Health and Wellness	(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 26/03/2021	Actual:

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the “Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, 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.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline tracking tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and the terminal tracking tools that must be completed before the TE begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Jamaica Country Office, the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to organizations and persons listed below; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc (See Annex H).

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team. The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses of the methods and approach of the evaluation.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf).

The Results Framework provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in Annex C.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators

- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. **Project Implementation**

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. **Project Results**

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

TOR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating²
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 31 *working days* over a time period of 8 *weeks* starting on *February 8, 2021*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
<i>January 29, 2021</i>	Application closes
<i>February 1-5, 2021</i>	Selection of TE Consultant
<i>February 8, 2021</i>	Preparation period for TE Consultant (handover of documentation)
<i>February 9, 2021</i>	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report

² Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

2-4 days	
February 15, 2021	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
Mid-February 10-15 days	TE mission: Virtual stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc.
February 24, 2021	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
February 26, 2021 (recommended 5-10)	Preparation of draft TE report
March 8, 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
March 17, 2021	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
March 22-24, 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
March 26, 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE Consultant clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: February 15, 2021	TE Consultant submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: February 24, 2021	TE Consultant presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: March 10, 2021	TE Consultant submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: March 17, 2021	TE Consultant submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.³

³ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is the UNDP Jamaica Multi-Country Office. The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE consultant to provide all relevant documents, to include an itinerary of the confirmed stakeholder interviews.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

One international independent evaluator will conduct the TE. The consultant shall have prior experience evaluating UNDP-GEF financed projects. The evaluator will assess emerging trends with respect to legal and regulatory framework for decentralized RE power generation, budget allocations, institutional capacity to support RE and EE development, impact of renewable energy and energy efficient technology on the health sector, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.)

The evaluator cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of an evaluator will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Sciences, Agriculture, Engineering, Rural Development or other closely related field.

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change
- Proven experience evaluating GEF projects;
- Experience working in the Caribbean Region;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender Climate Change ; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%⁴:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁵

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁶ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)⁷);
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address procurement.jamaica@undp.org in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector” or by email at the following address ONLY: procurement.jamaica@undp.org by (January 29, 2021 at 4:00pm). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

⁴ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

⁵ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁶ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psu/Support%20documents%20on%20C%20Guidelines/Template%20of%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁷ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

13. TOR ANNEXES

(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail
- ToR Annex I : Tracking Tool

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector (GEF ID: 5843; PIMS 4900)						
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 CCM						
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: <u>Outcome A</u> : GHG emissions avoided; <u>Outcome 2.1</u> Appropriate policy, legal and regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced; <u>Outcome 2.2</u> Sustainable financing and delivery mechanisms established and operational; <u>Outcome 3.1</u> Favorable policy and regulatory environment created for renewable energy investments; <u>Outcome 3.2</u> Investment in renewable energy technologies increased.						
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: <u>Indicator A</u> : Indicator: Tons of CO2 equivalent; <u>Indicator 2.1</u> : Extent to which EE policies and regulations are adopted and enforced; <u>Indicator 2.2</u> : Volume of investment mobilized; <u>Indicator 3.1</u> Extent to which RE policies and regulations are adopted and enforced; <u>Indicator 3.2</u> : Volume of investment mobilized.						
Project Objective:		To advance a low carbon development path and reduce Jamaica’s public sector energy bill through the introduction of renewable energy (RE) and improvement in energy efficiency (EE) in the health sector.				
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value (EOP)	Means of verification	Assumptions	Status Update
	A. Total direct GHG emission reductions (ton CO ₂ eq); B. Volume of investment in RE and EE technologies mobilized (US\$/yr); C. Extent to which EE policies and regulations are adopted and enforced (aligned with GEF CC tracking Tool). D. Annual electricity production (RE) and savings (EE) of installed demonstration pilots (MWh/yr); E. Number of beneficiaries with	A. No reductions (0 ton CO ₂ eq); B. No investment mobilized (US\$ 0/y) C. “1” (no regulation) D. No energy produced or saved (0 MWh/yr); E. No beneficiaries	A. 16,919 ton CO ₂ eq (over lifetime); B. US\$ 6 mln per year (from DBJ); C.”3” (regulation proposed but not adopted) D. 3.583 MWh/yr; E. 50 hospital clients per day (25m/25f).	▪ Project final report as well as annual report on energy consumption & reductions for each RE project. Annual report on hospital energy consumption and expenditure on electricity	▪ The country continues to experience economic growth Government is committed to supporting RE development in Jamaica. RE systems are in place and are functioning effectively.	

	access to improved energy services in Jamaica's health sector (m/f).	reached (0m; 0f).				
Component 1.	Individual and institutional RE and EE knowledge and capacity strengthening in Jamaica's public sector.					
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value (EOP)		Assumptions	
Outcome 1. Increased knowledge in RE and EE for individuals in the public sector and strong institutional capacity to support RE and EE development in Jamaica's public sector.	(1a) Quality standards for RE and EE tertiary education formalized (y/n); (1b) Number of building managers and O&M staff certified (m/f); (1c) Number of BSJ staff certified to perform RE/EE compliance tests (m/f)	(1a) No quality standards; (1b) No people trained and certified (0); (1c) No BSJ staff trained and certified (0).	(1a) Quality standards adopted by tertiary education sector and formalized by Government; (1b) 20 people certified (26m/14f); (1c) 6 BSJ staff certified (3m/3f)	official publications, project reports, interviews with stakeholders; educational material developed, project visits	Interest and willingness among educational institutions to implement certified RE/EE curricula. Adequate coordination and synergies between institutions and the Project. Sufficient interest and demand from prospective students, engineers and technicians to enroll in RE/EE curricula. Adequate implementation of planned project activities.	Partially completed
1.1 Recommendations for acceptable industry standards in RETs and EE training and education, particularly in the	(1.1a) Quality standards for RE and EE tertiary education developed.	(1.1a) No quality standards;	(1.1a) Quality standards adopted by	official publications, project reports,		Partially completed

<p>solar PV subsector developed and capacity of selected training institutions within the RE/EE sector enhanced.</p>	<p>(b) Number of RE/EE training curricula enhanced.</p>	<p>(b) No RE/EE curricula enhanced.</p>	<p>Ministry of Education. (b) At least two (2) RE/EE curricula enhanced.</p>	<p>interviews with stakeholders; educational material developed, project visits</p>		
<p>1.2 Technicians within the public sector trained and certified to acceptable industry standards in RE and EE with a focus the solar photo-voltaic subsector. M&V</p>	<p>(1.2a) Number of Government officers trained; disaggregated by building managers and operations & technical staff. Disaggregated by sex (m/f); (b) Awareness of senior management and maintenance staff at selected hospitals and other public institutions enhanced.</p>	<p>(1.2a) No Government officers trained and certified (0); (b) No public institutions addressed (0);</p>	<p>(1.2a) 41 Government Officers trained (31m/10f) (b) 6 hospitals and other public institutions reached</p>	<p>Training reports; official registers; project documents project reports, interviews</p>	<p>Development Bank of Jamaica (DBJ) \$25,000 in grant funding which was originally earmarked for the energy audits to be re-allocated to support capacity building for Government Officers.</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>1.3 Selected staff from financial institutions have increased knowledge in matters of RE, EE and Energy Performance Contracting.</p>	<p>(1.3) Number of staff from financial institutions sensitized on RE, EE and EPC. Disaggregated by sex (m/f)</p>	<p>(1.3) No financial staff addressed (0)</p>	<p>(1.3a) 40 people reached in financial institutions (26m/14f)</p>	<p>training reports, registers; project documents, interviews</p>	<p>Development Bank of Jamaica (DBJ) to provide \$15,000 in grant funding to support capacity building for financial institutions.</p>	<p>Partially completed</p>
<p>Component 2.</p>	<p>Regulatory development for the deployment of RE and EE promotion in Jamaica’s public sector.</p>					
	<p>Indicator</p>	<p>Baseline value</p>	<p>Target value (EOP)</p>	<p>Means of verification</p>	<p>Assumptions</p>	

Outcome 2. A supportive legal and regulatory framework to facilitate the deployment of small decentralised RE power generation (notably solar PV) and EE programmes in Jamaica's public sector.	(2a) Implementation level of RR/EE regulation under national legislation including Electricity and Building Act; (2b) Implementation status of green procurement in Jamaica's public sector.	(2a) Legislation submitted for approval but no specific RE/EE regulation drafted; (2b) No guidelines for green procurement.	(2a) RE/EE regulation drafted and proposed for approval; (2b) Guidelines for green procurement proposed and accepted.	official publications, minutes legislative working groups or sector committees, project reports; interviews with stakeholders	Ongoing high-level dialogue between line ministries involved, legislative committees, JPC, BSJ, CSO, UNDP, and multilateral financiers. Adequate implementation of planned Project activities.	Partially Completed
2.1 The legal and regulatory regime to facilitate scale-up of RE and EE reviewed and strengthened.	(2.1) Number of proposals and studies delivered to support RE/EE policy development (-)	(2.1) No proposals delivered (0)	(2.1) At least 2 proposals and studies delivered.	proposals delivered, project reports, interviews with stakeholders,		Being carried out by Ministry of Energy and IDB. Revisions to be made through dialogue with UNDP Regional Advisors. Support to be given to the BSJ in the updating of the building codes. Activity is ongoing
2.2 Adoption of RE/EE technologies in the public sector has been strengthened by increased coordination with line ministries and public procurement.	(2.2a) Establishment knowledge exchange platform (y/n); (b) National guidelines/manual developed for the handling, installation and monitoring of Solar PVs.	(2.2a) No platform established; (b) No national guidelines for the handling, installation and monitoring of Solar PVs	(2.2a) Knowledge exchange platform active among public institutions and education centres; (b) Guidelines for the handling, installation and monitoring of Solar PVs	minutes and event records of platform; delivered publications; interviews with stakeholders; delivered guidelines, project reports		Activity is ongoing and on target to be completed within Project Timeframe. Draft guidelines shared with the BSJ in April 2019.

			partially completed			
2.3 A project M&E Plan designed and implemented, including GEF Terminal Evaluation.	(2.3) Status GEF TE (y/n).	(2.3) No GEF Terminal Evaluation	(2.3) GEF Terminal Evaluation conducted and reported	TE report and management response		Not yet started
Component 3. (\$810,000)	Economic and fiscal instruments to facilitate the uptake of RE and EE technologies in the Jamaica's public sector.					Partially completed
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value (EOP)	Means of verification	Assumptions	
Outcome 3. An operational Energy Performance Contracting mechanism to facilitate the development of ECSOs and their viability to support RE and EE scale-up in the public sector of Jamaica.	(3a) EPC business model for RE/EE installation and operation designed and implemented (y/n); (3b) Number of hospitals retrofitted with RE and EE Technologies	(3a) No EPC models for RE/EE in place in Jamaica; (3b) No hospital retrofitted with RE and EE technologies	(3b) EPC business models and contracts for RE/EE implemented (tentatively: 5 contracts); (3b) Four hospitals retrofitted with RE and EE Technologies)	records of EPC contract; project reports and procurement contracts, field visits and visual inspections	Appropriate business model and contracting modalities can be defined and are adopted by project parties Procurement processes are appropriate and started timely. Sufficient interest from service and equipment suppliers. Local capacities are in place to implement, operate and maintain the envisaged RE/EE projects.	

<p>3.1 Uptake of renewable energy strengthened with the Energy Performance Contracting pilot programme. (Technical Assistance)</p>	<p>(3.1a) Status of model contracts for RE/EE procurement and EPC contracting (y/n); (b) Status EPC business model.</p>	<p>(3.1a) No EPC model contracts; (b) EPC business model not detailed and assessed.</p>	<p>(3.1a) Model contracts designed and approved by Technical Working Group.; (b) EPC business model detailed and approved by PCJ.</p>	<p>delivered model contracts, interviews, project reports</p>	<p>DBJ to provide \$380,000 to establish an Energy Line for Credit for EPC/ESCO to access.</p>	<p>Partially completed</p>
<p>3.2 Investments in Solar PV, solar water heaters and energy efficiency retrofits in the health sector encouraged.</p>	<p>(3.2a) Number of hospitals retrofitted with solar PV systems. (b) Number of hospitals retrofitted with solar water heaters (b) Number of hospitals retrofitted with energy efficient technologies.</p>	<p>(3.2a) No hospital retrofitted with solar PV systems. (b) No hospital retrofitted with solar water heaters (b) No hospital retrofitted with energy efficient technologies</p>	<p>(3.2a) Solar PV systems installed and operational at two (2) hospital. (b) solar water heaters installed and operational at five (5) hospitals (b) EE retrofits installed and operational in five (5) hospitals</p>	<p>procurement reports, visual inspections, RE/EE equipment performance records</p>	<p>PCJ to provide \$1.3M in investment for RE retrofits.</p>	<p>Partially completed.</p>

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
 - ii. Acknowledgements
 - iii. Table of Contents
 - iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
 2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
 3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
 4. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁸)

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

4.1 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

4.2 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)

⁸ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Gender equality and women’s empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - GEF Additionality
 - Catalytic/Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
 - TE Rating scales
 - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed TE Report Clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

This is a generic list, the evaluator can add questions as necessary.

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 a the local, regional and national level?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies PIF 	Desk review
Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically?	The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategies (Vision 2030, Medium Term Socio-Economic Framework) Draft Energy Policy, PIF 	Desk review
Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified?	The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	Desk review
Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document UNDP CPD, MSDF, SP 	Desk review
Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. <p>Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) <p>Stakeholder Consultation Reports</p>	

Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area	A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Stakeholder Interviews
Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Stakeholder Interviews
Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?	The SES checklist was completed appropriately, and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document SES Annex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?	The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) Monitoring Reports Beneficiary testimony Site visit/field reports Pilot Data Analysis/Reports Project Document (table 8), PIR, tracking tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries Site visits
Is the installed solar PV capacity adequate to enable the realization of the intended cumulative reduction in emissions?	The installed PV capacity is sufficient to achieve the desired emission reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports (PIR) Monitoring Reports Beneficiary testimony Site visit/field reports Pilot Data Analysis/Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document (table 8), PIR, tracking tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visits
Has the project achieved any direct Emissions Reductions based on the energy interventions.	The project has achieved emission reductions and monitoring is ongoing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Beneficiary testimony • Site visit/field reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports • Project Document (table 8), PIR, tracking tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries • Site visits
Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making?	Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATLAS Risk Log • M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?	The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government	Steering Committee Meeting Minutes	Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation • Policy Documents • Action/Implementation Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Stakeholder consultation
Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?	The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff,

			stakeholders and beneficiaries
Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A gender mainstreaming plan was completed • The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. • Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective <p>The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Mainstreaming Plan • Project Document <p>Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents <p>Stakeholder consultation</p>
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities • Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation • Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee <p>Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony <p>Revised Project Results Framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review <p>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</p>
To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. <p>Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VFM, RFI, Market Surveys <p>Procurement Evaluation Documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review <p>Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</p>

<p>Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified <p>Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans Steering Committee Meeting Reports Quarterly Reports <p>Annual Reports (PIR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents <p>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</p>
<p>Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. <p>Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) Quarterly Reports <p>Annual Reports (PIR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents <p>Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel</p>
<p>Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds <p>The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HACT Assessment(s) Capacity Assessments 	<p>Desk Review</p>
<p>Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) <p>Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document M&E Plan AWPs FACE forms Quarterly Narrative Reports <p>Site visit reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents <p>Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</p>

Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice <p>Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement/Recruitment reports FACE forms <p>CDRs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents <p>Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</p>
Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. <p>Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Audit Reports 	Desk Review
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy <p>Risk Log</p>	Desk Review
Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy <p>Risk Log</p>	Desk Review
Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy <p>MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log <p>MOU(s)</p>	Desk Review
Are there ongoing activities that may pose an	The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy <p>Risk Log</p>	Desk Review

environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same		
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions	The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly/ Semi-annual Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports Pilot Data Analysis/Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review Stakeholder Consultation
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:		
Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)		
Name:	_____	
Signature:	_____	Date:

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)		
Name:	_____	
Signature:	_____	Date:

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of Deployment of Renewable Energy and Improvement of Energy Efficiency in the Public Sector (GEF ID: 5843; PIMS 4900)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
Ministry of Science, Energy and Technology				
Ministry of Health and Wellness				
Development Bank of Jamaica				
Jamaica Productivity Centre				
South East Regional Health Authority				
Southern Regional Health Authority				
Jamaica Tertiary Education Commission				
National Chest Hospital - South East Regional Health Authority				
Sir John Golding Rehabilitation Centre - South East Regional Health Authority				
May Pen Hospital - Southern Regional Health Authority				
Savanna-la-mar Hospital - Southern Regional Health Authority				
Black River Hospital - Southern Regional Health Authority				
Bellevue Hospital				
Private Sector Organization of Jamaica				
Ministry of Finance and Planning				
Bureau of Standards Jamaica				
Planning Institute of Jamaica				
UNDP Jamaica				
UNDP Regional Hub LAC				

Approval



Signature

Name Denise Antonio, Resident Representative, UNDP

28-Jan-2021

Date