

**Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project:
Philippine Efficient Lighting Market Transformation Project
(PELMATP)
Terms of Reference**

Purpose

The evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Philippine Efficient Lighting Market Transformation Project (PELMATP) aims to review the performance of the project from the start up to the end of the project, towards achieving its target objective and outcomes.

The review will assess and rate project results, the sustainability of project outcomes, the catalytic effect of the project, and the quality of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems. The evaluation will also identify "lessons learned and best practices" from the PELMAT Project and offer recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other similar UNDP/GEF projects.

Background

The project addresses the barriers to widespread utilization of energy efficient lighting systems (EELs) in the Philippines. It will cover energy efficient versions of linear fluorescent lamps (standard vs. the slim tubes), compact fluorescent lamps (CFL), high intensity discharge (HID) lamps, ballasts (low-loss electromagnetic and electronic), and luminaires. The Project will accelerate integration of EEL programs to the planned DOE activities, enhance private sector's involvement and appreciation of the benefits of EEL and ensure that environmental impacts associated with the use of EELs are mitigated. The project will achieve its objectives by: updating policies, standards/guidelines; institutional capacity building; educating consumers disseminating information; developing and implementing financing mechanisms; and, mitigating environmental impacts of the project. The implementation of the Project will result to an aggregate energy savings of 29,000 GWh equivalent to 21% reduction relative to the Philippines energy efficiency scenario from 2003 to 2012. The equivalent GHG emission reduction is about 4,600 Gg of CO₂ equivalent.

To achieve the above outcomes, the GEF has provided US\$ 3,130,655; and the government and private sector collectively provided a total amount of US\$12,000,000 co-financing.

Specific Objectives

The evaluation of the PELMAT Project should properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. The following areas should be covered in the final evaluation report:

1. General Information about the Evaluation

The final evaluation report should include information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. The final evaluation report will also include the evaluation team's TOR and any response from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report.

2. Assessment of Project Results

The final evaluation will assess achievement of the project's objective, outcomes and outputs and will provide ratings for the targeted objective and outcomes. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term and positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's results, the final evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established.

Assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. An assessment of impact is encouraged when appropriate. The evaluator should assess project results using indicators and relevant tracking tools.

To determine the level of achievement of the project's objective and outcomes, the following three criteria will be assessed in the final evaluation:

- **Relevance:** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- **Effectiveness:** Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objective?
- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of the project's effectiveness and efficiency. Outcomes will be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness and efficiency:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U): The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

While rating the project's outcomes, relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. If separate ratings are provided on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, the overall outcomes rating of the project may not be higher than the lowest rating on relevance and effectiveness. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes, the project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

The evaluators will also assess other results of the project, including positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long-term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess long-term project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, global environment (e.g., reduced greenhouse gas emissions), replication effects and other local effects. Wherever possible evaluators should indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

Capacity Development

The effects of the PELMAT Project activities on strengthening the capacities of the DOE, partner entities from other government offices, lighting industry players, private sector stakeholders/investors, peoples'/community organizations or civil society organization will be assessed.

Leverage

An assessment of PELMATP Project's effectiveness in leveraging funds that would influence larger projects or broader policies to support its goal will have to be conducted.

Awareness Raising

- PELMATP Project's contribution to raise awareness on energy efficiency/environmental issues and of the GEF will be examined;
- PELMATP Project's contribution to promote policy or advocacy activities and collaboration among communities will be assessed.

The following table should be completed to provide a summary of the planned and actual activities of the project as well as the expenditures up to the present.

COMPONENTS/ACTIVITIES		BUDGET		
Planned Activities	Actual Accomplishment	As per WFP	Actual Expenditures	% of Actual vs. Project Budget
Component 1				
Mobilize and Operationalize PELMATP TWG	Multi-sectoral working groups (Policy Advisory Board and Technical Working Group) have been actively involved in providing technical and policy related recommendations	8,930	8,520.33	95.41%
Update Lighting Systems specification in the building energy use guidelines	Completed the updating of Guidelines for Energy Conserving Design of Buildings and the IEEE-ELI Manual of Practice on Efficient Lighting	69,641	69,641.00	100%
Review, update and implement lighting product standards	25 new formulated and updated existing PNS, including MEPS	50,000	50,000.00	100%
	Developed lighting system Standards	13,600	13,600.00	100%
Develop and implement VA scheme with lighting manufacturers and distributors	Developed voluntary agreement (VA) scheme with lighting manufacturers and distributors	16,071	6,702.53	41.71%
Demonstrate and implement EEL systems in government buildings	Prepared Administrative Order and IRR, the AO No. 183 of which was eventually signed by the President directing the use of energy efficient lighting systems (EELs) in government facilities (Palit-Ilaw)	36,250	23,353.84	64.42%
Formulate and implement incentives for EEL product importers and manufacturer and lamp waste recyclers				
Formulate and implement consumer protection guidelines	Developed guidelines on warranty of lamps	5,000	5,000.00	100%
		24,108	24,108.00	100%
	Developed guidelines on eco-labeling of lamps	5,000	5,000.00	100%

Component 2				
Accreditation of DOE-LATL	BPSLAS (now PAO) Accreditation to APLAC	51,460	49,566.51	96.32%
Upgrade testing capability of DOE LATL	Improvement of testing capability of LATL through the purchase of major equipment and construction of test facility for light sources and luminaires	1,258,806	1,209,380.44	96.07%
Conduct R & D Works on local applications on EEL Systems		40,385	7,847.65	19.43%
Develop lighting product monitoring program		43,541	38,891.44	89.32%
Establish local manufacturing capacity and lighting services industry	Support to local lighting product manufacturers through the establishment of a comprehensive database of lighting product manufacturers, assessment of capabilities of local lighting product manufacturers, potential improvements and efficient designs for locally made lighting products, capacity building for lighting manufacturers (ongoing)	163,600	133,818.90	81.79%
Review/ update DSM Framework and plan templates		66,557	67.13	0.1%
Training DSM Plan Templates		27,000	17,754.44	65.76%
Design and implement EEL Leasing Model		15,000	15,000.00	100%
Design and Implement Street lighting guidelines	Completed the template for local ordinance on the application of Roadway Lighting Guidelines (combined with Activity 1.2)	14,285	2,540.98	17.79%
Design of EEL Savings Calculator		6,000	1,757.09	29.28%
Design of Training Module on Application of EEL System		3,786	3,094.22	81.73%

Disseminate PELMATP Program and EEL system application demonstration activities to C & I establishments	Implementation of EEL Programs in the Industrial Sector through EEL systems application demonstration in industries, energy audit conducted in Philippine Steel Corporation, and Maitland Smith, and pledge of commitment of support by the Mactan Economic Zone – Facilities, Maintenance and Environmental Association (MEZ-FAMEA) members	28,464	28,464.00	100%
Implement EEL systems application demonstration to industrial and commercials establishments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EEL systems application demonstrations in commercial sector, energy audit conducted in Gaisano, Cebu Holdings, St. Luke's Medical Center, Manila Science High School. – Collaboration with Oro Chamber, Cebu Chamber and respective LGUs in a Pledge of Commitment to Support Lighting Efficiency 	53,864	39,739.82	73.79%
	Initiated the dialogue with lighting industry stakeholders, both Philippine Lighting Industry Association (PLIA) and non-PLIA member which is envisioned to lead to a single lighting industry association (initially, it may take the form of coalition)			
Component 3				
Joint promotion of EEL products by government and private sector	Joint government-private sector promotion of EEL technologies through annual fora, including the lighting convention with IIEE, ENMAP (presently, the Energy Efficiency Practitioners Association of the Philippines or ENPAP), DOE Energy Week, Pollution Control Association of the Philippines (PCAPI), Consumer Trade Fair, and umbrella organizations like the League of Corporate Foundations (LCF), Gawad Kalinga Movement (GK), Chambers of Commerce and Industry (e.g., Cagayan de Oro CCIF, Cebu CCI, Mandaue CCI, Philippine CCI), export processing zones (MEZ-FAMEA), PLIA and non-PLIA, USAID Eco-Asia Clean Development and Climate Program (CDCP), USAID-Energy and Clean Air Program (ECAP), International CFL Initiative, among others.	20,000	20,000.00	100%
	Another activity that includes the joint government-private sector promotion is the "Palit-Ilaw Activities," where a certain portion of a target marketplace, school, hospital or community is chosen for retrofitting initiatives. The EEL products used for the			

	Palit-ilaw activities came from the partners companies in the lighting industry.			
	Initiated the awareness of Lamp Waste Management through presentation in national convention and forum.			
Promote EEL products to household	<p>IEC materials developed and distributed to various stakeholders</p> <p>Intensified project promotion through tri-media campaign</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Television:Konsumer Atbp., Bandila Magandang Umaga Pilipinas, Para Sa Iyo Bayan, ABS-CBN News Channel or ANC and others) 2. Radio: DZMM's Konsumer Atbp. 3. Newspaper: Philippine Daily Inquirer, Manila Bulletin,and other tabloids <p>Partnership with distribution companies, such as, Manila Electric Company (MERALCO), Visayas Electric Company (VECO) and Cagayan de Oro Electric Power and Light Company (CEPALCO) in the inclusion of the campaign of Palit-ilaw and efficient light use to be placed in the message box of their respective electrical bills, and possibly doing IEC with PELMAT as part of their value added services to clients</p>	59,375	58,780.83	99%
Consolidate and disseminate data generated from results of PELMATP and other related activities	Operational project website	9,715	9,715.00	100%
Design, test and implement EEL courses	Inclusion of Illumination Engineering Design subject in the New Draft Electrical Engineering Curricula to be implemented in school year 2008-2009 to senior electrical engineering students	8,000	8,000.00	100%
Component 4				
Design and implement of micro financing model	Consultation with 27 cooperatives in Davao and Metro Manila for draft microfinancing scheme model	31,857	23,772.76	74.62%
Develop and implement ESCO Led projects	<p>Drafted ESCO accreditation for DOE-Energy Utilization Management Bureau (EUMB) consideration and adoption</p> <p>Designed two draft model energy performance contracts for implementation by the Development Bank of the Philippines</p>	61,960	23,819.19	38.44%

	(DBP), which is in line with the activity for a Model ESCO Transaction Project" by DBP. Developed Guidelines and framework to establish monitoring and verification protocols for future ESCO contracts.			
Build capacity of EEL business financing institutions	Education of 9 financing institutions on the economic and financial benefits of EEL systems initiatives, through training conducted in Metro Manila and Cebu (including Mindanao participants as well) in the evaluation of EEL system project proposals and help them develop their EEL project portfolio Assist DBP in the design of EEL financing promotional materials	22,000	22,000.00	100%
Component 5				
Formulate and implement policies and guidelines on managing Hg containing lamp wastes	Partnership arrangements with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources-Environment Management Bureau (DENR-EMB) for the lamp waste management program development	35,000	33,477.32	95.64%
	Developed guidelines on lamp waste management and development of national and local guidelines	24,501	5,353.91	21.85%
Establish lamp waste processing facility	Partnership arrangements with DoloMatrix on the transport, recycling and disposal of lighting products.	10,000	9,487.07	94.87%
	Started disseminating proper lamp waste management/disposal to various sector.			
Component 6				
Project Management and Administration		697,778	630,071.35	90.29%
Project Monitoring and Evaluation:		50,000	50,000.00	100%
Survey of compliance of project activities		69,500	31,221.86	44.92%
Evaluation of Project Results		17,120	5,188.85	30.31%
Financial and Management Audits		12,500	12,500.00	100%

TOTAL		3,130,654	2,697,236.45	86%
-------	--	-----------	--------------	-----

3. Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

The final evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this. Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- **Financial resources:** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining the project's outcomes)?
- **Socio-political:** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- **Institutional framework and governance:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- **Environmental:** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The final evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project, outcomes will be rated as follows:

Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

4. Catalytic Role

The final evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the catalytic role.

5. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation System

The final evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the Project M&E plan. GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project. Given the long duration of many GEF interventions, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring provisions to measure mid-term and long-term results (such as global environmental effect, replication effects, and other local effects) after project completion. The final evaluation report will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project M&E plan and of implementation of the M&E plan.

M&E during Project Implementation

M&E design. Projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

M&E plan implementation. The final evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress towards the project objective and outcomes by collecting information on chosen indicators continually through the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and, projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities. In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, a separate mention will be made of: whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted at the project planning stage; and, whether M&E was adequately and timely funded during implementation.

Project monitoring and evaluation systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory (S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be solely based on the quality of M&E plan implementation. The ratings on quality at entry of M&E design and sufficiency of funding both during planning and implementation stages will be used as explanatory variables.

Monitoring of Long Term Changes

M&E of long term changes is often incorporated in GEF supported projects as a separate component and it may include determination of environmental baselines, specification of indicators, provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis and use. This section of the final evaluation will describe the actions and accomplishments of the project in the establishment of a long term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?

What were the accomplishments and short comings in establishment of this system?

Is the system sustainable, i.e., is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and has financing?

Is the information generated by this M&E system being used as originally intended?

6. Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results

Among other factors, when relevant, it is suggested that the evaluation team considers the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. However, evaluators are not expected to provide ratings or separate assessment on the following issues but they could be considered while assessing the performance and results sections of the report:

- **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

- **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks that are in line with the project's objectives?

- **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?

- **Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize?

- **Implementing/Executing Agency's supervision and backstopping.** Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did the Implementing/Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the GEF projects?

- **Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

- **Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

7. Lessons and Recommendations

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations in the final evaluation report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Evaluators should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead they should seek to provide a few well formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to GEF's overall portfolio. Final evaluations should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the final evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.

Methodology

The evaluation will consist of a desk review of relevant project documents and reports related to the planned evaluation and of the GEFs. The expert will then conduct focused group discussions, meetings, and interviews with the Project Director and other partners on topics and issues that relate to the implementation and impact of the project. The Expert is expected to become well versed as to the objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, project activities and already documented "lessons learned" of the project. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. More specifically, the evaluation will be based on the following sources of information:

- Review of documents related to the project such as project document, quarterly and annual progress reports, other activity/component specific deliverables, reports and evaluation, if there are any, etc.
- Structured interview with knowledgeable parties, i.e., Project Director, Project Personnel, Sub-Contracting Parties/Entities, National Consultants, UNDP Country Office Counterparts, members of the Project Steering/Advisory Committee/s, Community-Based/Peoples Organization/s, Project Beneficiaries or grantees, etc.
- A number of visits to various pilot project sites, if feasible. The site visits should be discussed with the Project Coordinator and UNDP.

Timing and Submission of the Report

The PELMAT Project evaluation will begin on the second (2nd) week of July 2010 and should be completed by the second (2nd) week of August 2010. The first draft evaluation report will be prepared by the expert/expert team within the evaluation period and initially will be submitted to the PELMATP-PMO, preferably electronically, and shared with the Implementing Party and the Executing Agency (i.e., the Department of Energy or DOE and the UNDP Environment Portfolio Unit) to solicit comments or clarifications. The draft report shall be presented to the Policy Advisory Board (PAB) and the other stakeholders for further deliberations and in order to obtain

feedback necessary for its finalization. The final report shall be prepared and delivered within two weeks after the evaluation exercise highlighting important observations, analysis of information, and key conclusions including the corresponding recommendations. The report, incorporating all the substantive corrections/modifications and recommendations primarily by the DOE, UNDP and the key stakeholders should there be any, shall be prepared and submitted to the PELMATP-Project Management Office (PMO), in ten (10) copies along with the CD containing the electronic file of the report.

Roles and Responsibilities

The PELMATP-PMO shall assist the experts/evaluation team in preparing for the final evaluation of the project. The evaluation team, which shall be composed of a highly qualified independent expert together with one independent national consultant, shall be directly supervised by the Project Manager during the evaluation exercise. The PELMATP-PMO shall provide advance copies of the necessary documents needed by the experts in preparing for and other pertinent information/documents in the course of the evaluation. Likewise, the PELMATP-PMO shall provide the list of contact persons representing the various stakeholders of the project, which will be the basis for the tentative itinerary/schedule of activities, which the expert/evaluation team will prepare. The PELMATP-PMO will finalize the schedule of activities in consultation with the expert/evaluation team and the UNDP CO staff. The PELMATP-PMO shall coordinate the logistical arrangements for the evaluation.

Budget

All the costs incurred for the conduct of the evaluation shall be charged against project funds. The interested individuals or group of consultants should submit a proposal with a budget estimate for consideration by the Selection Committee. Payment of Expert/s' professional fees shall be made in accordance with the Service Contract to be issued in this regard.

Outputs

The following are the required outputs of the final evaluation:

- A succinct written review of the status of the PELMAT Project discussing the above points and that may include relevant diagrams/figures/charts or tables pertinent to the review, where available/applicable. The report should be delivered to the PELMATP-PMO and the Chair of the Policy Advisory Board of the project not later than 16th of August 2010 in hard copy form plus CD with the electronic file in MS Word.
- Presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations to the DOE, UNDP and PMO.
- Complete Final Evaluation Report (hard copy and in electronic format as above).

Team Composition

- One (1) international consultant knowledgeable about Energy Management and/or Efficiency, with solid experience in project management (implementation, monitoring and evaluation process), market transformation and familiarity with promotional activities in the areas of energy and environment.
- One national consultant who have extensive knowledge of the energy and power situation in the Philippines, with experience in developing performance indicators, project appraisal and evaluation of development projects.

Qualification Requirements

- Evaluators must be independent of both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance to the PELMAT project. They should not have been engaged in the activities to be evaluated, or responsible in decision-making roles for the design, implementation or supervision of the project. In cases where a member of an evaluation team has been involved with some aspects of the project, this member should refrain from evaluating those aspects. In cases where project evaluation team members are not independent, are biased and are not free of conflict of interest, UNDP will put in place a final evaluation quality control review by its independent evaluation office.
- Evaluators will be impartial and will present a comprehensive and balanced appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the project or activity being evaluated.
- The evaluation team should comprise of professionals with strong evaluation experience, with requisite expertise in the subject matter of the project, and with experience in economic and social development issues.
- Evaluators should be knowledgeable about the relevant policies of the GEF/UNDP.
- Evaluators should ensure that while conducting the final evaluation they take into account the views of all relevant stakeholders. The TOR for this GEF project's final evaluation and its schedule should be made known to key stakeholders.
- Evaluators should become familiar with the project document and should use the information generated by the project including, but not restricted to, baseline and information generated by its M&E system. Evaluators should also seek the necessary contextual information to assess the significance and relevance of results.