



**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPING PROGRAM
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY
ENERGY EFFICIENCY GENERAL DIRECTORATE
MINISTRY OF ENERGY AND MINES**

UNDP GEF Project

UNDP PIMS No. 4128 ATLAS No. 77443

GEF Project ID # 3791

“Energy Efficiency Standards and Labels in Perú”

Mid-Term Evaluation Report

MTR time frame: July 1 through September 30, 2015

GEF Focal Area: Climate Change

GEF Strategic Program: CC1

Consultant: Alfredo Caprile

October 20, 2015

The analysis and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the opinions of UNDP, its Executive Board or of the Members of the United Nations. This publication only reflects the opinion of the author.

Acknowledgment

This report has been prepared by Alfredo Caprile, President of Sustainable Development Advisors S.A. (www.sd-advisors.com.ar) in its capacity as Independent Consultant. The author would like to express his gratitude to all of the Project participants with whom he has met and interviewed during the Mid-Term evaluation mission in Lima between the 19th and 25th of July 2015. The hospitality and gratitude that they have demonstrated in providing their opinions with regard to the results and impacts that have been accomplished by the Project have been critical for the preparation of this report.

In particular, the author would like to thank Jorge Alvarez Lam, UNDP Program Officer at UNDP office in Lima and Juan Olazábal Reyes, National Project Coordinator at the Ministry of Energy and Mines for their valuable contribution, as well as to the rest of members of the Project team (Walter Carrasco Chacón y Yudith Arzapalo Victorio) who have taken the time to coordinate the interviews with the most relevant Project participants and have provided all of the requested information. The author would also like to thank Rosa Luisa Ebentreich Aguilar, Energy Efficiency Director General, for her time in analyzing the progress of the Project, its main achievements and the strategy that has been developed to complete the pending activities.

The Evaluator had the support of all the persons that have been interviewed to understand the context in which the Project has been developed, analyze the progress to date of the different activities that have been programmed and elaborate the conclusions and recommendations presented in this report.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

APR	Annual Progress Report
ASPEC	Peruvian Association of Consumers and Users
CENERGIA	Energy Conservation and Environmental Center
CEPLAN	National Strategic Planning Center
CONFIEP	National Confederation of Private Business Institutions
COPANT	Pan-American Standards Commission
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
DGEE	Energy Efficiency Directorate General of MINEN
DS	Supreme Decree
EE	Energy Efficiency
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gases
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MEF	Ministry of Economy and Finance
MEPS	Minimum Energy Performance Standards
MINAM	Ministry of Environment
MINCETUR	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Tourism
MINEM	Ministry of Energy and Mines
NEX	National Execution Modality
INACAL	National Institute of Quality
INDECOPI	National Institute for the Defense of the Competition and Protection of Intellectual Property
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRODOC	Project Document
PRODUCE	Ministry of Production
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PUCP	Pontifical Catholic University of Peru
RIA	Regulatory Impact Analysis
S&L	Standards and Labels
SNI	National Society of Industries
SUNAT	National Superintendence of Tributary Administration
TA	Technical Assistance
TJ	Tera Joules
UEC	Unit Energy Consumption
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
US\$	United States dollars

Index

Acknowledgment	ii
Abbreviations and Acronyms	iii
Index	iv
Executive Summary	1
Project Information	1
Project Description.....	1
Project progress summary.....	2
MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table	3
Summary of Conclusions.....	6
Summary of Recommendations.....	6
Introduction	10
1.1 Evaluation objective	10
1.2 Scope and Evaluation Methodology	10
1.3 Structure of the MTR report	12
2 Project description and background context.....	13
2.1 Development context.....	13
2.2 Key barriers for market transformation.....	13
2.3 Project Description and Background Context	14
2.4 Project implementation arrangements.....	14
2.5 Project timing and milestones.....	15
2.6 Key Stakeholders	15
3 Findings	15
3.1 Project Strategy	16
<i>Project Design</i>	16
3.1.2 Logical Framework	17
Progress Towards Results.....	18
3.2.1 Progress towards results analysis	18
3.2.2 Remaining barriers to achieve Project objectives.....	29
3.3 Project Implementation and adaptive management.....	30
3.3.1 Management arrangements	30
3.3.2 Work planning.....	31
3.3.3 Finance and co-finance	31
3.3.4 Project level monitoring and evaluation systems	33
3.3.5 Stakeholder engagement	33
3.3.6 Reporting.....	34

3.3.7	Communications	34
3.4	Sustainability	34
4.	Conclusions	38
5.	Recommendations	39

Tables

Table 1	Project Information	1
Table 2	MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table	3
Table 3	Recommendations Summary Table	6
Table 4	Project Outcomes	14
Table 5	MTR Ratings.....	18
Table 6	Progress towards results matrix.....	20
Table 7	Breakdown of expenses incurred through June30, 2015.....	31
Table 8	Co-financing table.....	32
Table 9	Reporting Mechanisms	34
Table 10	Sustainability and Risks	35
Table 11	Recommendations.....	39

Annexes

Annex I	MTR ToR
Annex II	Glossary of Terms
Annex III	MTR Evaluative Matrix
Annex IV	Example questionnaire used for data collection
Annex V	Rating Scales
Annex VI	MTR mission activities
Annex VII	List of documents reviewed
Annex VIII	Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
Annex IX	Signed MTR final report clearance form

Executive Summary

Project Information

The following table summarizes the Project information

Table 1 Project Information

	ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS AND LABELS IN PERU		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS#):	4128	PIF Approval Date:	31 st March 2009
GEF Project ID (PMIS#):	3791	CEO Endorsement Date:	21 st June 2011
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID	00061206	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date:	19 June 2012
Country:	Peru	Date Project Coordinator hired:	March 2013
Region:	LAC	Inception Workshop date:	August 2013
Focal Area	Climate Change	Mid Term Review completion date:	20 October 2015
GEF: Focal Area Strategic Objective	CC-1	Planned closing date	19 June 2015
Trust Fund	GEF	If revised, proposed closing date	31 st December 2016
Executing Agency / Implementation Partner	Ministry of Energy and Mines		
Other execution partners			
	<i>at CEO endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at Mid Term Review (US\$)</i>	
[1] GEF financing:	2,000,000	2,000,000	
[2] UNDP contribution:			
[3] Government	4,800,000	4,800,000	
[4] Other partners:			
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3 + 4]:			
PROJECT TOTAL COST [1+ 5]	6,800,000	6,800,000	

Project Description

The Energy Efficiency Standards and Labels in Peru project aims at removing key barriers to the widespread commercialization of energy efficient domestic appliances such as refrigerator, lighting products, and air-conditioners, as well as, electric motors among others. The Project will support the implementation of the energy efficiency standards and labeling program carrying out activities to: (i) strengthen the implementation structure of a mandatory standards and labeling program by the Peruvian Ministry of Energy and Mines, (ii) provide technical assistance to manufacturers and (iii) promote the demand for such appliances by, inter alia, implementing a consumer awareness campaign, all of which are based on five components:

- **Capacity development of key public and private agencies** looking to analyze the institutional capacity of government agencies and train public authorities to develop and implement policies and programs related to mandatory energy efficiency standards

and labels including: (i) training courses to staff of ministries, regulatory entities and institutions in charge of inspecting and controlling the enforcement of such regulations; (ii) the establishment of a data base on energy consumption and end-use technologies; (iii) the strengthening of standardization institutes and testing laboratories, and (iv) the establishment of a coherent verification and application system for energy efficiency labels.

- **Strategy for the implementation of a market transformation** based on: (i) the consolidation of market structure information, (ii) the techno-economic analysis for priority technologies and measures to be undertaken, and (iii) the design of a market transformation strategy
- **Strengthening of the legal the regulatory framework** through (i) an increase in the awareness among key decision makers in government and private sector with regard to the benefits of having a mandatory energy efficiency standards and labels system, and (ii) the elaboration of final regulations to be endorsed by the government.
- **Consumer awareness and outreach** through (i) a more effective participation by industry (i.e., importers, suppliers distributors, and retail chains) including training of sales staff and the design of incentives for the phase out of inefficient equipment.
- **Monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management**

Project progress summary

The design that has been adopted to achieve the domestic appliances market transformation in Peru and the characterization of the current situation are adequate. Also, both the anticipated goals and the identification of the barriers which will have to be removed are conceptually well thought out.

More than 3 years have passed from the signature of the PRODOC and the Project still shows a low execution level¹ mainly due to major delays that occurred at Project outset² in addition to the early resignation of the National Project Coordinator³ and the unexpected contract cancellation of the international consultant in charge of elaborating the Technical Regulations. The original end date of the Project has been established for December 2015 but during the last Project Steering Committee meeting a new rescheduling of the budget was agreed and a request for extension of the end date to December 2016 was submitted to the GEF.

As a result of the delays that have been experienced in the development of the proposed activities, it is probable that certain targets may not be achieved and there is some uncertainty with respect to the feasibility of having laboratories and companies ready to take on the accreditation and verification processes This might put at risk the feasibility of achieving the target of having a mandatory standards and labels system in operation by the end of the Project.

¹ As of June 2015 the level of execution was US\$ 782 103, equivalent to 39% of the total de GEF funds

² CEO endorsement happened in June 2011 whereas the PRODOC was approved in June 2012 and the start of activities was delayed until March 2013

³ April In 2014

MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table

The following presents the summary of the MTR Ratings and Achievements

Table 2 MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	n.a.	The Project was designed to assist in the removal of key barriers which are preventing the implementation of a market transformation strategy for a mandatory energy efficiency labels and standards program for domestic appliances and electric motors, in accordance with systems which already exist in other countries of the region and the world. Both the characterization of the current situation and the expected results such as the definition of the barriers which need to be removed conceptually are well described. At the same time, the Project is aligned with the country development priorities and during its design and implementation the perspective of different stakeholders have been taken into consideration.
Progress towards results	Objective: To reduce CO ₂ emissions through the implementation of a (mandatory) energy efficiency standards and labels program MS	From the results of the market study and the technical regulations it will be possible to begin evaluating the trend on the reduction of GHG emissions. However, due to the delays that occurred in the implementation of the Project, it would be unlikely that the proposed indicators at Project end will be met. The proposed calculations to estimate the GHG emission reductions will have to be revised, as well as, the percentage of domestic appliances which would be compliant at Project end.
	Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities of key public and private agencies to design, implement and enforced a mandatory S&L program MS	About 50 staff have participated in Project workshops and training events. The Web page is operational but the website address should be simplified to facilitate access by the general public. The data base is developed. However, the strengthening of the standardization institutes and testing entities is delayed. The same occurs with the establishment of the certification and accreditation

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
		processes. In this regard, there is a low probability that Project will be able to meet the proposed targets, in particular with regard to the target that states that the Project ought to have at least 5 accredited public and private and internationally recognized labs before Project end. The possibility of establishing a progressive implementation of the mandatory labeling system based on the availability of accredited labs and accredited certification companies in operation should be considered.
	Outcome 2: Market transformation implemented with public and private sector involvement base on consolidated information and on the market structure MS	Information on the market structure is available and will serve to: provide reliable statistics on domestic appliances sales and related energy consumption and to establish reference values and estimates of the lower life cycle running cost for each appliance category. However, due to delays in the definition of MEPS and its implementation strategy, it is very likely that the Project will have to consider an implementation of the mandatory labeling system and the MEPS in stages with the objective of at a minimum showing partial results at Project end. At the same time, it is important to note the particular interest and commitment of the manufacturers in relation to the proposed mandatory labeling system evidence among others by the valuable contribution of comments to the Technical Regulations draft based primarily on their experience with similar labeling systems of other countries in which they are involved.
	Outcome 3: Strengthened legal framework for mandatory S&L and endorsed final technical regulations MU	The development of the legal framework and the technical regulations has suffered important delays but has been completed. Both documents have already been subject to public consultation of interested parties. However, there is uncertainty with regard to the time that would be required to obtain approval of the draft of the Supreme Decree by MEF. Such approval has been conditioned to the

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
		presentation of the RIAs, which preparation has not yet been contracted for.
	Outcome 4: Increased consumer awareness and acceptance of S&L programs MS	The engagement of a specialized group to develop a massive public media campaign with print, radio and/or television press is under negotiation. The design of a strategy to provide incentives to consumers with the participation of suppliers and importers, distributors and retail chains as part of the raising of consumer awareness is still pending.
	Outcome 5: Information and knowledge on S&L generated and shared S	Starting with the appointment of the current National Project Coordinator, the Project progress reports and budget revisions have been prepared with a high degree of detail. Nevertheless, the lack of detail in the definition of several indicators in the logic framework will encumbered their achievement. Due to the delay in the development of the activities, the frequency of the PSC meetings should be increased.
Project implementation and adaptive management	MS	Throughout its implementation, the Project has been forced to take advantage of adaptive management mechanisms in dealing with different issues and unforeseen circumstances with success
Sustainability	MU	Even though key stakeholders have been engaged both with regard to participants from key public and private sector entities, no measures have been undertaken to engage and train sales staff of the key retail chains on the performance of energy efficient domestic appliances and to raise consumer awareness on the benefits of selecting energy efficient appliances. Both activities are key for the implementation of the mandatory labeling system and the MEPS. Delays in the conduct of these activities might exposed the sustainability of the Project. The design of financial instruments and mechanisms to guarantee the sustainability of the Project in the medium and long term once GEF funding is no longer available is still pending.

Summary of Conclusions

A summary of the key conclusions of the MTR is presented below:

- The implementation of those activities which according to the PRODOC had to be completed at midterm show important delays. This setback is directly reflected in the low level of GEF funds execution which as of June 2015 has reached just 39%, in spite of the fact that more than 3 years have passed since the start of the Project.
- Under this context, it is unlikely that all of the activities that have been included in the PRODOC will be completed by the current Project end date (i.e., December 2016), as currently planned.
- To date, there are at least six critical tasks which, if are not completed as intended before the Project end date, might jeopardized the possibility that Peru will have a mandatory energy efficiency label program in place by then and not even as a partially implemented system, as mentioned in the recommendations below.
- The most critical activities which are still pending are:
 - Promulgation of the Supreme Decree (DS) to approve the proposed S&L system mandatory
 - Design and implementation of a compliance system for the certification of the energy efficiency labeling system
 - Availability of accredited laboratories to undertake the variety of tests which are foreseen under the Technical Regulations
 - Existence and accreditation of interested entities to take part in the certification, validation and compliance processes
 - Implementation of awareness raising campaign among consumers
 - Design of a strategy to guarantee the sustainability of the S&L program

Also, it is important to note, that for technical reason the evaluation of the MEPS has been postponed until 2016. Consequently, there is a risk that it may not be possible to guarantee the enforceability of the MEPS by the end of the Project.

Summary of Recommendations

Table 3 Recommendations Summary Table

Rec #	Recommendation	Responsible Entity
A	Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities of key public and private agencies to design, implement and enforced a mandatory S&L program	
A.1	Key recommendation: The early completion of the study of the compliance system for the certification of the energy efficiency labeling system and enforcement of the MEPS is key. Consequently, a very high priority should be given to the selection and monitoring of the company that would be selected to undertake such study in order to avoid potential delays and guarantee that the study outputs become available as soon as possible.	MINEN /UNDP

A.2	Having 5 accredited laboratories is a difficult target to be met. In lieu it is suggested to have at least one moderately accredited laboratory for each of the 9 equipment categories which will be subjected to the mandatory labeling system by Project end date. There is also uncertainty regarding the feasibility of being able to have accredited certification companies in Peru in the short term. At least there should be one agreement in place with internationally accredited certification companies for each of the 9 equipment categories by Project end date.	MINEM
A.3	Create a user friendly URL alias to facilitate access to the Project Website by technicians, manufacturers, resellers and final users of domestic appliances. Also, generate an adequate dissemination of the web page as well as Project information and its progress.	MINEM
B	Outcome 2: Market transformation implemented with public and private sector involvement base on consolidated information and on the market structure	
B.1	Key recommendation: The design of the market transformation strategy is another critical activity which depends on the completion of other pending undertakings. An effort should be made to facilitate the communication with the companies which would be in charge of the implementation of those pending undertakings in order to accelerate the availability of information and data that is needed to finalize the design of the market transformation strategy. In that regard, it is important that the proposed prioritizes the private sector participation and commitment both in terms of the manufacturers, importers and distributors of the equipment that will be subjected to the mandatory labeling system as well as retail chains in order to emphasize the relevance of training their sales forces who will be in direct contact with the final users.	MINEM
B.2	Increase the participation in international seminars and promote the information exchange with staff in charge of S&L programs in the region with the intent of generating synergies, benefit from lessons learned and attain a high level of harmonization among the S&L programs already in operation in the region.	MINEM Project Team
C	Outcome 3: Strengthened legal framework for mandatory S&L and endorsed final technical regulations	
C.1	Key recommendation: Due to the complexities associated with obtaining MEF approval of the Technical Regulations, evaluate the possibility of moving forward with the approval of the Technical Regulations by appliance category and thus avoid that potential issues with technical regulations for a given equipment category may end up delaying and / or blocking the approval of the rest of the technical regulations.	MINEM MEF

C.2	Evaluate the possibility that the MEPS could be approved directly by MINEM, in its role of competent authority, without the intervention of MEF or other government units	MINEM
C.3	Several manufacturers have questioned the validity of testing the appliance noise level. Technical experts should evaluate the reasonableness of this comment, as well as, the rest of the comments and act accordingly.	MINEM
D	Outcome 4: Increased consumer awareness and acceptance of S&L programs	
D.1	Key recommendation: Move forward with the implementation of the awareness raising campaign on the characteristics of the energy efficiency labels and .the benefits of selecting high energy efficient appliances, as soon as possible.	MINEM
D.2	Begin the training workshops for sales personnel soonest, so they can learn the different types of energy efficiency labels and information that will be used for each of the 9 categories of equipment subjected to the mandatory labeling system sufficiently in advance	MINEM
E	Outcome 5: Information and knowledge on S&L generated and shared	
E.1	Key recommendation: Seek more experience exchanges with other S&L projects in the region and in particular with the S&L program which is being implemented in Colombia.	MINEM, INDECOPI, SUNAT, MINAM,PRODUCE MEF, INACAL, MINCETUR
F	Project implementation and adaptive management	
F.1	Key recommendation: Design a detailed “critical path” to be used as a management tool, in order to monitor progress of the pending activities and be able to detect delays, risks, or other circumstances which may endangered the timely implementation of the energy efficiency labeling system The frequency of PSC meetings should be increased from now until the end of the Project in order to have at least quarterly meetings while seeking higher participation of the different PSC members	MINEM
F.2	To avoid additional delays, consider engaging specialized advisors based on the needs that may be arising from now onwards. In particular, there is an immediate need to identify and engage outside advisors to assist with the evaluation of the four studies which are about to be awarded and which will be critical for completing the implementation of the Project.	MINEM
G	Sustainability	

G.1	Key recommendation: Estimate investment needs in equipment and infrastructure and in technical and administrative staff which would be required to guarantee the sustainability of the Project both in DGGE as well as in other organizations and agencies which will be involved in the certification, validation and inspection processes and make the necessary funding provisions.	MINEM, INDECOPI , SUNAT, MINAM, PRODUCE, MEF, INACAL, MINCETUR
G.2	Evaluate the possibility of implementing a “Plan B” which would consider the implementation of the S&L program in stages in order to guarantee that Peru will have an S&L program in operation by the end of the Project even if it is partially implemented	MINEM UNDP
G.3	Since next year there will be Presidential elections in Peru, MINEM’s commitment, as well as, the commitment of the rest of the government agencies to the Project should be strengthened in order to guarantee the availability of all of the technical and institutional support which will be needed to ensure that the S&L program is duly approved before the change of government takes place, even as part of a progressive implementation scheme.	MINEM UNDP

Introduction

In July 2015, United Nations Development Program (UNDP) of Peru contracted Alfredo Caprile as an Independent Consultant to perform the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTR) of the Project named “Energy Efficiency Standards and Labels in Peru (PIMS (4128)”. The Project started in June, 19 of 2012 and is currently in its third year of execution.

The Project aims at removing key barriers to the widespread commercialization of energy efficient domestic appliances such as refrigerators, freezers, water heaters and air conditioners lighting products, as well as, electric motors and industrial boilers. The Project will support the implementation of the energy efficiency standards and labeling program by the Peruvian Ministry of Energy and Mines (MINEM), carrying out activities to: (i) strengthen the implementation structure of a mandatory standards and labeling program, (ii) provide technical assistance to the testing institutions and (iii) promote the demand for such domestic appliances by, inter alia, the development of an awareness rising campaign directed to consumers in cooperation with the private sector including importers, distributors and retail chains.

1.1 Evaluation objective

In accordance with the policies and procedures for Monitoring and Evaluation of UNDP and the Global Environmental Fund (GEF), MTRs are a mandatory requirement for all full size UNDP supported and GEF finance by GEF projects

This report presents the findings of the MTR of the “Energy Efficiency Standards and Labels in Peru” and has the following objective:

- Analyze the relevance of the Project strategy
- Evaluate the progress made in the achievement of the objectives and the results of the Project in accordance with what has been established in the Logical Framework
- Examine the management arrangements
- Identify possible risks towards the sustainability of the Project
- Generate constructive recommendations to guarantee the success of the Project

1.2 Scope and Evaluation Methodology

The MTR has been implemented in accordance with the Terms of Reference (see Annex I) and UNDP/GEF policies and procedures for monitoring and evaluation included in the “Guidance for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UND Supported GEF-Financed Projects⁴”. The evaluation is based on the five criteria defined in such guide which are:

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Results
- Sustainability

Annex II presents the Glossary of Terms included in such Guide.

⁴See

http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20SP_2014.pdf

The following instruments have been used to gather project information and its progress and results:

- **Gathering of Project information and documentation**

Prior to the start of the mission to Lima the following Project documentation was gathered and reviewed:

- o Project Identification Form (PIF)
- o Project Document (PRODOC)
- o Project Progress reports
- o Project operating manual
- o Project Annual Progress Reports 2012-2014
- o Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) 2012 – 2014
- o Budget revisions
- o Minutes of meetings of the Steering Committee
- o Quarterly reports

During the mission to Lima the following documents have been gathered:

- o Law N° 27345 Promotion of the Efficient Use of Energy and its regulation
- o Reference Plan for the Efficient Use of Energy 2009-2018
- o National Energy Policy for Peru 2010-2040
- o Budget revisions for 2014 and 2015
- o Legal norms and regulations
- o Use of GEF and co-financing funds
- o Legal framework report
- o Technical regulations report
- o Market analysis report
- o PRODOC for the Energy Efficiency Standards and Labels for Colombia
- o PRODOC for the Market transformation of the lighting market for Peru
- **MTR Evaluation Matrix** with a list of the evaluation criteria, questions, success indicators, data sources, and methods and instruments that have been used for data gathering
- **Mission to Lima (19 - 25 de July 2015)**⁵

The mission to Lima allowed for the conduct of a formal kick off meeting of the MTR, meetings with members of the Project team and representatives of UNDP in charge of the Project, as well as, face to face meetings with the key Project actors, beneficiaries and other interests parties. Annexes IV, V and VI present an example of the questionnaire used for data gathering, the MTR rating scales, and the details of the activities that took place during the mission, respectively.

Information analysis

The documents gathered before and during the mission were analysed and compared together with the information that was obtained during the meetings with UNDP, the Project team and the key actors, beneficiaries and other interested parties in order to verify its consistency and /or the opinion of the interviewed parties with regard to the quality of the gathered information.

⁵ Prior to the start of the mission a virtual kick-off was arranged via Skype with the presence of Jorge Alvarez Lam and Victoria Alegre from UNDP to agree on the work plan and adjust the schedule of interviews

The progress of the Project in achieving its objective and each of the outputs were valued in accordance with the following scale

- Highly Satisfactory (HS)
- Satisfactory (S)
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
- Unsatisfactory (U)
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

The principal limitation of the evaluation is related to the short duration of the mission. Even so, based on his experience, the Evaluator considers that the level of detail contained in the gathered information and of the opinions of the interviewees have been sufficient to undertake the MTR in accordance with the guidelines established by UNDP and GEF.

1.3 Structure of the MTR report

The MTR report is structured in accordance with UNDP and GEF requirements. The summary of the key sections is presented below:

- **Executive Summary** with a brief description of the MTR objectives and an overview of the key findings and recommendations
- **Section 1 – Introduction.** In this section the objectives and scope of the MTR are described together with the methodology which have been used to undertake the MTR.
- **Section 2. Context and Project Description** including the description of the background context and the key barriers which are faced for the market transformation. In turn, the Project scope and strategy as well as the mechanisms that have been used plus the Project time line and the key stakeholders are presented.
- **Section 3 – Findings.** In first place, the findings of the MTR are presented starting with an analysis of the Project strategy and followed by an analysis of the logic framework and an evaluation of the progress towards results. Next aspects related to Project implementation and adaptive management are discussed as well as its sustainability.
- **Section 4 .Conclusions.** In this section the key conclusions are presented.
- **Section 4. Recommendations** detailing the evaluator’s principal recommendations

2 Project description and background context

2.1 Development context

The sustained growth experienced by the Peruvian economy in the last years has resulted in an increase in the use of basic domestic appliances such as modern lighting, refrigerators, air conditioners and washing machines.

Since 1973, Peru has been developing a number of energy efficiency programs and it was not until year 2000 that Law N° 27.345 – Promotion of Efficient Use of Energy – was passed declaring of national interest the promotion of the Efficient Use of Energy which under Article 3 rules the use of labels with energy consumption information in relation to energy performance standards for all those equipment and appliances that required power supply. The regulations of this law were approved in year 2007 and in 2008 the Supreme Decree (DS) N° 034-2008-EM was promulgated mandating public sector organizations that had to replace lighting equipment to utilize energy efficient equipment. Furthermore, such energy efficient equipment had to have the corresponding energy efficiency labels in accordance with the Energy Efficiency Labels Guide which would be approved to such effect.

In 2009, MINEM issued the Reference Plan for the Efficient Use of Energy with the objective of achieving energy savings in the order of 15% when compared to business as usual (BAU) demand. A savings of 54TJ was estimated for year 2018 of which about 11% would corresponds to savings of electric energy.

In 2010, based on the guidelines of the Strategic Plan for the National Development – Peru 2021 Plan, prepared by the National Center for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN), the National Energy Policy of Peru 2010 – 2040 was approved by DS N° 064-2010-EM. To have more efficiency in the productive chain and in the use of energy were among the objectives of such policy, specifically mentioning the need to reach high levels of energy efficiency compatible with international standards and to promote the creation certification entities.

Subsequently, in 2014 Law N° 30.224 is passed creating National System for Quality and National Quality Institute (INACAL) as the highest technical regulatory authority, under the umbrella of the Ministry of Production (PRODUCE), in relation to normalization, accreditation and metrology matters.

2.2 Key barriers for market transformation

Some of the key barriers which are preventing the transformation of the domestic appliances market in Peru are:

- Lack of reliable information with regard to the import, inventory and sales of the different domestic appliances and their energy consumption in accordance with the various types of labels that are envisioned.
- Absence of an accreditation, certification and verification system for applying the regulations of energy efficiency labels.
- Need to strengthen testing laboratories, companies and institutions that would choose to participate in the accreditation, certification and/ or verification processes.
- Definition of a strategy to determine the manner in which energy efficiency labels and standards will be put in place as well as the definition of the Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS) for each of the categories of the domestic appliances and the manner in which they would become mandatory.

- Lack of awareness both at the consumer level, as well as, of the importers, manufacturers, suppliers, distributors and traders with regard to the benefits of having a mandatory energy efficiency labels and standards system in place.
- Need to harmonize the proposed energy efficiency standards and labels (S&L) system with those in place at the region and internationally.

2.3 Project Description and Background Context

The Energy Efficiency S&L project in Peru (PMS 4128) was designed to assist in the removal of key barriers which are impeding the implementation of market transformation strategy based on an Energy Efficiency S&L mandatory system for domestic appliances and electrical motors in harmony with similar systems that are already in place in the region and the world.

The Project Document (PRODOC) mentions the following Outcomes as progress indicators:

Table 4 Project Outcomes

Component	Expected Outcome
Capacity development of key public and private	Enhanced capacities of key public and private agencies to design, implement and enforce compliance of a S&L program
Market transformation strategy formulation and implementation	Market transformation strategy implemented with the participation of the public and privates sectors and based on consolidated information of the market structure
Strengthened legal and regulatory framework	Strengthened legal framework for the mandatory S&L and endorsed final Technical Regulations
Consumer awareness and industry outreach	Increase in consumer awareness and acceptance of the S&L program
Monitoring, evaluation (M&E) and knowledge management	Information and knowledge on S&L carried out

With regard to its global environmental impact the objective of the Project is to reduce the emissions of CO₂ via the implementation of the EE S&L program

2.4 Project implementation arrangements

The Project is being implemented under UNDP's National Execution Modality (NEX) with MINEM as the Local Implementing Partner who has in turn delegated such authority in the Energy Efficiency General Directorate (DGEE). The Project Management Unit (PMU) is comprised of the National Coordinator who is supported by one technical and one administrative specialist. There is also a Project Steering Committee (PSC) comprised of representatives from the following institutions:

- UNDP
- MINEM
- Ministry of Production (PRODUCE)
- Ministry of Environment (MINAM)
- Ministry of International Commerce and Tourism (MINCETUR)

- Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF)
- National Institute for the Defense of the Competition and Protection of Intellectual Property (INDECOPI)
- National Superintendence of Tributary Administration (SUNAT)
- National Quality Institute (INACAL)⁶

2.5 Project timing and milestones

The PRODOC was approved in June 2012, however Project activities did not start until March 2013, when the first National Project Coordinator and the Project Administrator were designated while the Technical Specialist was recruited in May 2013. After the resignation of the first National Project Coordinator in April 2014, the current National Project Coordinator was hired. The end date⁷ of the Project is scheduled for June 2016 but a request to extend the end date to December 2016 has already been requested.

2.6 Key Stakeholders

Among the key institutions and organizations involved and / or interested in the subject of energy efficiency of domestic appliances are:

- MINEM
- CENERGIA
- INACAL
- PRODUCE
- MINAM
- MINCETUR
- MEF
- National Institute for the Defence of the Competition and Protection of Intellectual Property (INDECOPI)
- SUNAT
- National Society of Industries (SNI)
- National Confederation of Private Enterprises (CONFIEP)
- Peruvian Association of Consumers and Users (ASPEC)
- Chamber of Commerce of Lima

In addition, importers, manufacturers, distributors and sellers of domestic appliances should be added to the list, as well as, final users.

3 Findings

This section presents the findings of the MTR. In the first place, the Project strategy is examined followed by a critical analysis of the logical framework and an evaluation of the progress towards results. Finally, aspects related to Project execution and adaptive management and the sustainability of the Project are examined.

⁶ The addition of INACAL was proposed in the last meeting of the Directive Committee on June 17th, 2105

⁷ According to the PRODOC the initial Project end date was scheduled for May 2015 but given the delay in the signing of the PRODOC the Project end date is scheduled for June 2016, albeit an extension to December 2016 has been requested in July 2015

3.1 Project Strategy

The Project strategy is based on capacity building and technical assistance to key stakeholders in the public and private sectors with the objective of implementing a mandatory energy efficiency labeling system for 9 categories of domestic appliances and their corresponding MEPS. To date important progress has been made in capacity development of public sector entities and agencies and in engaging those stakeholders involved in the import, manufacturing and distribution of domestic appliances on the design of the Technical Regulations and the legal and regulatory framework proposals. However, there has not been sufficient progress on the development and implementation of consumer campaigns to increase the sale of energy efficient appliances, the design of a strategy for the phase out of inefficient appliances and most importantly to raise consumer awareness on the characteristics of the energy efficiency labels and the importance of taking into account the life cycle cost of the appliance at the time of deciding the purchase of domestic appliances.

Project Design

In general terms, the Evaluator considers that the design that has been adopted by the Project to achieve the transformation of the electro domestic appliances market in Peru is adequate. The characterization of the current situation and expected results, as well as the identification and definition of the different barriers which would need to be removed are conceptually well defined.

The decision to differentiate the Technical Energy Efficiency Regulations from the MEPS has been a sound one since this would facilitate the approval of the mandatory Labeling Program; leaving for a second phase the implementation of the MEPS which are more restricted and hence delays and / or resistances may be generated before final approval is granted.

To allow consumers to decide their purchase of electro domestic appliances in accordance with their preferences and budget and based on specific information of their energy consumption is a relevant strategy to achieve the intended results with respect to the transformation of the market.

The Project concept is aligned with the country development priorities and in particular with those included in the Reference Plan for the Efficient Use of Energy which was officially introduced in October 2009, as well as, with the priorities which have been included in energy efficiency legislation passed since then (see Section 2.1).

During the design of the Project and its implementation the perspective of the key stakeholders – both public and private – that would be effected by the Project have been taken into consideration.

The PSC was originally comprised of representatives from UNSP, MINEM, INDECOPI, MINAN and PRODUCE. As Project implementation progressed, other stakeholders were invited to be part of the PSC such as SUNT, MINCETU and INACAL, which shows the high degree of national ownership of the Project.

At the same time, key manufactures and sellers of domestic appliances⁸ have participated actively on the revision of the Energy Efficiency Technical Regulations providing a high number

⁸ INDURAMA, B/H/S, SOLE among others from the private sector

of valuable comments, in addition to those that came from NGOs, professional associations and other members of the civil society.

The Project activities and expected results do not have a particular approach with regard to the subject of gender equality and /or human rights, as is the case of other projects that look more closely into these issues under the UNDP priority themes⁹. Even so, as part of the awareness raising campaigns the influence that women would have in the decision making of a large part of the electro domestic appliances will be taken into consideration.

3.1.2 Logical Framework

The PRODOC and the logical framework are based on the first project concept as presented in the PIF which was approved in March 2009, whereas the PRODOC was approved in June 2012 and the Project activities did not begin until June 2012.

The design of the logical framework is based on the elimination of institutional, information and awareness rising barriers as mentioned in section 2.2. In general terms, the outputs and activities are well described and both the PRODOC design and the logical framework meet the SMART¹⁰ criteria requiring that indicators ought to be:

- Specific,
- Measurable,
- Achievable,
- Relevant and
- Time-bound

However, it should be noted that:

- Due to the delays experienced in the implementation of the Project, the proposed targets which would be used to evaluate the Project results in terms of reduction Unit Energy Consumption (UEC), percentage of appliances that would comply with the energy efficiency regulations and the reduction of GHG to be achieved at Project end should be revised.
- The proposed targets for strengthening the standardization of institutions and entities in charge of undertaking the testing and the amount of professionals to be trained are too ambitious. The target of having 5 accredited laboratories at Project end will be too difficult to achieve. In lieu it is suggested to have at least one accredited laboratory for each of the 9 equipment categories which are subjected to the mandatory labeling system by the Project end date.
- There is also uncertainty with regard to the feasibility of having entities that would be ready to undertake the certification of appliances which would threaten the feasibility of achieving the target of having a mandatory EE labeling program in place at Project end. At least there should be one agreement in place with internationally accredited certification companies for each of the 9 equipment categories by Project end date.
- The amount of staff to be trained also appears as a difficult target to be achieved depending on the meaning that would be applied to the definition of “staff trained”.

⁹ UNDP priority areas are: 1) poverty reduction, 2) democratic governances, 3) HIV / AIDS, 4) crisis prevention and recovery, 5) energy and environment, 6) women empowerment y 6) capacity building

¹⁰ SMART: *specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound*

Therefore, the level of capacity building that would be achievable under each of the activities should be specified in more detail.

In general terms, during the execution of the Project the results framework has been fulfilled as intended with no need to introduce major changes.

Progress Towards Results

One of the key objectives of the MTR is to evaluate progress towards results based on the information included in the different Project documents and tracking tools and the results verified during the course of the MTR. This section provides an analysis of the progress towards results for the Project objective and each of the outcomes with their corresponding ratings in accordance with the rating scales that have been established for the MTR.

3.2.1 Progress towards results analysis

At the beginning the Project suffered important delays which negatively impacted in the achievement of the mid-term targets. The PRODOC was approved in June 2012 and therefore the start of activities was delayed until March 2013 when the first National Project Coordinator and the Project Administrator were hired and the Technical Specialist while the Technical Specialist assumed his post in May 2013. Upon the resignation of the first National Project Coordinator in April 2014, the current National Project Coordinator was hired and thus the configuration of the current Project Technical team was rounded off.

The setup of the PSC occurred in June 2013 and the first PSC meeting did not took place until December 2014 with the participation of the current National Project Coordinator. Since then another 3 PSC meetings were held in August and December of 2014 and in June of 2015.

At the same time, since the start of the Project the head of the DGEE of MINEM has changed three times, which has also negatively impacted on the progress of the Project activities.

In addition, the Project has suffered additional delays due to the cancellation of the contract of the international consultant which was originally selected to prepare the Energy Efficiency Technical Regulations and which have to be replaced by a local consultant after an arduous search.

Consequently, the Project has reached a low level of implementation which has resulted in the yearly rescheduling of the budget.

During the last meeting of the PSC, the budget has been rescheduled one more time and a 6 month extension of the Project end date which had lately been set for June 2016 has been requested.

Table 5 presents the ratings in the progress towards results for each Component and activity at the time of undertaking the MTR based on the rating scale and the color code required by GEF for the evaluation of the indicators as indicated below:

Table 5 MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.

4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – <i>management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications</i> – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Table 6 Progress towards results matrix

Indicator assessment code

Green= Awarded	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------------	---	--

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
Project Objective¹¹ To reduce CO2 emissions through the implementation of a (mandatory) energy efficiency standards and labels program	A) Change in annual sales towards average higher efficiency appliances (lower unit energy consumption, UEC)	See UEC table	Reduction in average UEC of domestic appliances		MS	Due to delays in the Project implementation it is unlikely that the Project will be able to reach the established targets in the PRODOC in terms of reduction in average UEC, percentage of domestic appliances compliance and reduction in GHG emissions. In particular, the proposed calculations to estimate GHG emission reductions should be revised based on the actual Project situation and the percentage of domestic appliances which are capable of meeting the requirements of the proposed S&L program.
	B) Share of non-compliant products	There is no mandatory S&L	50% should be compliant by the end of the project.			
	C) GHG emission trends	Annual electricity demand will grow to 1000 TJ by 2018 and corresponding GHG emissions	Estimate of direct and indirect emissions (1,217 ktCO ₂ over the period 2011-2018 in accordance with the Referential Plan's projections.			
	D) Amount of CO ₂ emissions avoided directly and indirectly	N/A	Direct emission reduction (due to project's intervention 2011-2015): 301 ktCO ₂ ; Indirect emission reduction (post-project)			

¹¹ Objective (Atlas output) and outcomes are monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
			impact, 2016-2025): 2,192 ktCO ₂			
Outcome 1 Enhanced capacities of key public and private agencies to design, implement and enforce a mandatory S&L program	E) Status of programs in key public agencies to implement effective mandatory S&L	Insufficient implementation of S&L program	New policy provisions and compliance checking, enforcement and outreach programs adopted that reflect international "best practices"	Completed Activities Initial Workshop (August 2013) generated interest from the public and private sector as well as from consumer associations with the participation of 38 attendees	MS	Even if the request to extend the Project end date to December 2016 presented in July 2015 is granted, it is unlikely that the following targets will be met: Having 5 accredited laboratories is a difficult target to be met. In lieu it is suggested to have at least one moderately accredited laboratory for each of the 9 equipment categories which will be subjected to the mandatory labeling system by Project end date. There is also uncertainty regarding the feasibility of being able to have accredited certification companies in Peru in the short term. At least there should be one agreement in place with internationally accredited certification companies for each of the 9 equipment categories by Project end date. Consideration should be placed on aiming at a progressive implementation based on the availability of accredited labs, certification companies and other elements that will be necessary to
Output indicators:	1) Status and type of TA and capacity building activities (output 1.1)	Programs, procedures and organizational arrangements are not sufficient for mandatory implementation of S&L	About 100 staff trained over a 4-yrs period at 4 workshops and training events	In June 2013, INDECOPI and Project staff participated in the Energy Efficiency Labels for LAC region in Petropolis, Brazil		
	2) Impact of project's website on government officials private sector and consumers (in their purchasing decision) (output 1.1, output 4.1, output 4.2)	Some info on S&L on MINEM website	A dedicated web site with 50% of interviewees find website useful)	Capacity building event to 10 staff with an expert from INMETRO Brazil, /2013 Participation in the 7th EEDAL International conference "EE in domestic appliances and lighting" September 2013, in Coimbra, Portugal Capacity building to 50 staff		
	3) Status and functioning of database (output 1.2)	No such a database exists	One database established by yr1 at MINEM	Data base implemented with data on energy consumption and end use of technologies		
	4) Strengthened standardization institutes and testing bodies (output 1.3)	Testing capacity available at selected institutes but insufficient	At least 5 accredited laboratories and internationally recognized Number of agreements recognizing accreditation bodies in other countries	Ongoing Activities: Tendering of two key consultancies under evaluation to decide their award: Laboratory diagnosis Development of a compliance system for the S&L program and MEPS 4 training workshops under development for specialists of public and private agencies in charge of the		

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
			About 150 staff trained over at 6 workshops and training events per year	design, implementation, verification and compliance of the mandatory S&L system and MEPS to meet the proposed target		have in place for the startup of a mandatory S&L program
	5) Status of verification and enforcement of S&L (output 1.4)	Current verification and enforcement scheme are inadequate	Accepted verification and enforcement plans About 150 staff trained at 6 workshops events per year The appliances selected are tested on compliance	An international technical visit is being planned for entities involved in the S&L program with the objective of learning details on the operation of labs and conformity evaluation schemes for EE labels Expenditures to date The amount of funds incurred under Activity 1 as of June 30, 2015 amounted to US\$ 154,530 of the total budget for this Activity of USD 517,256		At the same time, consideration should be given to having a progressive implementation in terms of the requirements that each of the categories of domestic appliances will have to meet in order to speed up the implementation of the mandatory S&L program and eventually the same approach should be followed with the compliance with the MEPS. Finally, it is important to note the particular interest and commitment of the manufacturers in relation to the proposed mandatory labeling system evidence among others by the valuable contribution of comments to the Technical Regulations draft based primarily on their experience with similar labeling systems of other countries in which they are involved.
Outcome 2 Market transformation strategy implemented with public and private sector involvement, based on consolidated information on the market structure	F) Level of info available to define energy consumption in label categories and for measuring project impact	Data available in MINEM's database, but needs to be updated and expanded	Regularly updated data on annual sale and energy consumption and technology Market monitoring methodology finalized	Completed Activities Study on the structure and the evolution of energy appliances market, Design of data base for energy consumption and end use of appliances and measuring impact of S&L program		The development of the implementation strategy for the mandatory labeling and the MEPS is overdue
	G) Status of recommendations contributing to	S&L system in place is voluntary, but has limited impact so far	Market transformation strategy in with	Proposal on guidelines for introduction of the Technical Regulations prepare as		Due to the need of data on the state of the labs and to ensure that the MEPS are designed within reason in

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
	institutional sustainability (transformation strategy)		implementation plan and budget	part of the development of the Technical Regulations	MS	the short term, the definition of the MEPS has been postponed to 2016
Output indicators:	6) Availability of required market and technical data (output 2.1)	Insufficient data Insufficient information on consumers preferences No real info exchange or integration of info systems with other countries in the region	Regularly updated data base) Completed consumer surveys with at least 1500 questionnaires per survey 14 workshops on data gathering	Partial progress with the preparation of the market transformation strategy including procedures and administrative arrangements for the implementation of the S&L program ToR for the definition of MEPS have been drafted and awaiting results of diagnosis of labs and evaluation of the conformity evaluation scheme to initiate the bidding process which has been postponed until 2016		It is very likely that the implementation of the S&L program and MEPS will have to be done in stages based on the availability of accredited labs and certification companies
	7) Level of info available for definition of energy consumption levels for labels and MEPS	Format for MEPS and labels formulated, but quantification is needed based on solid data	Proposal for levels of MEPS for the 5 appliances About 16 meetings per appliance on S&L energy level definition	Ongoing Activities Tender for the design, recollection and disposition and/or recycling of outdated appliances that would be voluntary disposed by owners or as part of an exchange programs to promote more efficient appliances		
	8) Status of strategy on mandatory S&L implementation	Non existing	Strategy in place 14 workshops with stakeholders on strategy including participation in 4 regional meetings	Organizations of workshops to broadcast the results of the market study, baseline, and impact already done Publishing of case studies and experiences related to accreditation processes, laboratories, implementation of certification entities or S&L in other countries Organization of workshops to spread the results of sustainability proposals and to		

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
				continue with the development of Project activities Participation of a member of the Project team in international seminars related to S&L systems and MEPS Expenditures to date The amount of funds incurred under Activity 2 as of June 30, 2015 amounted to US\$ 271,691 of the total budget for this Activity of USD 684,124.		
Outcome 3 Strengthened legal framework for mandatory S&L and endorsed final Technical Regulations	H) Status of decision-making regarding introduction of mandatory EE S&L	Mandatory MEPS exist for CFLs; voluntary labels and MEPS for ballasts, cloth washers, fluorescent lamps, refrigerators and freezers, air conditioners and electric water heaters	Signed decree on Technical regulations making labels (and/or MEPS) mandatory in the refrigerators, freezers, water heaters, washing machines and electric motors	Completed Activities Support to INDECOPI for the drafting of the S&L based on the requirements of the Use of Energy Efficiency Promotion Law and the drafting of the Technical Regulations previously prepared by MINEM	MS	The cancellation of the contract of the international consultant which was originally selected to prepare the Technical Regulations has generated an significant delay in the publication of the Technical Regulations
<i>Output indicators:</i>	9) Awareness level of decision-makers to develop and implement effective S&L policy and regulations (output 3.1)	Insufficient awareness and info to adopt S&L laws and regulations	3 events per year; including participation in international events and study tour for key decision-makers	Official publication by decree of the General guidelines of the Energy Efficiency Labels		The scarcity of local experts on regulation and verification of energy efficiency labels has impacted negatively in the achievement of this result
	10) Status of Technical Regulations (output 3.2)	S&L on voluntary basis	Decree by Government and/or President making S&L mandatory	Technical meetings with representatives of private sector companies and the National Society of Industries to discuss the details of the Technical Regulations Meetings with technical normalization committees to present and discuss the Technical Regulations drafts Legal and regulatory framework analysis		To date there is uncertainty with regard to the amount of time that would be required to obtain MEF approval of the DS drafts which is contingent to the presentation of the REITs. The contract for the preparation of the REITs is about to be awarded.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
				Publication of 9 Technical Regulations for public consultation during 90 days (in El Peruano official gazette March 16, 2015) Presentation of the Technical Regulations in 5 cities of Peru Workshop in Lima to inform that the Technical Regulations do not represent an obstacle to free trade At the closing of the public consultation process, 600 consultations have been received, evidence of the degree of awareness raising achieved to date. Ongoing Activities Analysis and consolidation of the received consultations in order to seek Technical Regulations approval Elaboration of social, technical, economic political and environmental impact of the Technical Regulations to seek MEF approval (RIAs)¹² Organization of workshops to present the Technical Regulations to the civil society Organization of workshops to present the legal and regulatory framework proposals		Even though a workshop has been done to show that the Technical Regulations do not represent and obstacle to free trade, it appears that in certain circles there are people who think differently and insist that more attention should be given to this issue. In fact, there are many countries in the region and in the rest of the world that already have mandatory S&L systems in operation including MEPS. Evaluate the benefits of preparing a summary of best practices at the international level to demonstrate that more so than being an obstacle to free trade, the S&L programs and MEPS are an efficient tool to protect consumers from domestic appliance manufacturers and sellers that pretend to offer domestic appliances with a lower initial cost but with a much higher life cycle cost aside from the negative externalities that this may generate for the country. The implementation of this recommendation is included as part of the ToR of the REITs.

¹² RIA Regulatory Impact Analysis

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
				Forum on EE labeling and free commerce Presentation of Project objectives at 7 public schools with delivery of printed material Meetings with technical normalization committees for the different categories of equipment in order to disseminate information on the Project and discuss details of the Technical Regulations Technical meetings representatives of manufacturing companies and members of the National Industry Society to discuss details of the Technical Regulations Update and dissemination of the Web page with more than 2000 visits Ongoing Activities Workshops with specialized agents of the industrial and commercial sectors to disseminate and persuade of the importance of the EE labeling Development of an awareness raising campaign to the general public with written press, radio and/ or TV on the importance of EE labeling Development of strategy to communicate the benefits of the EE labeling		

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Midterm Level and Assessment	Achievement Ratings	Justification for Ratings
				Expenditures to date The amount of funds incurred under Activity 4 as of June 30, 2015 amounted to US\$ 66,368 of the total budget for this Activity of USD 359,849.		
Outcome 5: Information and knowledge on S&L program generated and started	J) The level of information available for monitoring and evaluation and adaptive management	n.a.	Adequate information available for adaptive management and measuring the impact	Completed Activities: PSC meetings Progress review reports including quarterly and annual reviews PIRs for 2013 and 2014 Reprogramming of 2014 and 2015 budgets in order to match project progress with actual results Ongoing Activities: Gathering and description of lessons learned Expenditures to date The amount of funds incurred under Activity 5 as of June 30, 2015 amounted to US\$ 1,874 of the total budget for this Activity of USD 60,000.	S	Since the designation of the current National Project Coordinator, the Project progress reports and budget rescheduling have been prepared with a high degree of detail which has facilitated the evaluation of the Project progress Due to the delays that occurred at the beginning of the Project and the impact that this has generated in the progress of various activities it is necessary to increase the frequency of the PSC meetings which have proven to be effective in making adaptive management decisions.

3.2.2 *Remaining barriers to achieve Project objectives*

The key remaining barriers to attain the Project objectives are:

- **Lack of a legal framework to implement and regulate a mandatory S&L program as well as the introduction of MEPS.** Even though progress has been made towards the definition of the Technical Regulations and the analysis of the legal and regulatory framework, at this stage is critical to obtain MEF approval of the DS draft of the proposed Technical Regulations to be sent to the Ministers Council for approval by the President of the country. To that effect the presentation of a Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIAs) for each appliance category has to be submitted with the objective of demonstrating the principles of necessity, proportion, cost/ benefit, transparency and consistency together with the medium term benefits. The ToR for the RIAs have been drafted and a second call for bids is under way.
- **Lack of public and private laboratories capable of conducting energy efficiency tests and / or energy consumption tests for domestic appliances under the NTP/ISO/IEC-17025 norm.** Offers of interested companies to undertake a diagnosis of the existing laboratories are currently under evaluation¹³.
- **Insufficient technical capacity to implement a mandatory S&L program.** In spite of the technical capacity improvements that have been achieved during the last two years, there is still a need to have access to technical specialists with hand on experience in the implementation and operation of a mandatory S&L system. The Project plans to continue having capacity building workshops for staff which is directly involved in this matter.
- **No market transformation strategy in place:** Substantial progress has been made in analyzing the market structure and the development of a data base. However, the design of a strategy to boost the sale of efficient appliances is still pending. In this regard, there is currently a tender in process to hire a consultant to recommend the disposal and / or recycling of outdated energy inefficient appliances which would be disposed as a result of incentive programs to trade in obsolete appliances for energy efficient ones. At any rate there is still a need to define other elements of the market transformation strategy in terms of general procedures and administrative arrangements.
- **Lack of consumer awareness regarding the benefits of energy efficient household appliances.** The engagement of a specialized group to develop a massive public media campaign with print, radio and/or television press is currently under negotiation. At the same time, there are provisions to train manufacturers, traders, importers and sales teams of large retail chains with the objective of demonstrating the benefits of assessing domestic appliances based on their life cycle cost which is already implicit in the proposed rating of the energy efficiency labels.
- **Need to harmonize the proposed S&L program with the rest of the S&L programs in the region,** so it will not end up acting as a market barrier blocking access to domestic appliances (either manufactured locally or abroad) which might be considered energy efficient under international best practices but may not meet all the requirements of the S&L system that is being proposed for Peru. Even though the Technical Regulations have been developed taking into account international standards such as IEC, ISO etc. it is important to guarantee that the requirements of the S&L system that would be

¹³ On Friday August 21, CENERGIA was awarded a contract to perform a Laboratory Diagnosis

implemented are consistent with what is being required under other S&L systems in the region.

3.3 Project Implementation and adaptive management

The Project is being implemented under UNDP's National Implementation modality and the local Implementing Partner responsible for day to day implementation of the Project and the advances towards meeting the specified objectives is MINEM.

Throughout its implementation the Project has been forced to turn to adaptive management techniques as a result of different problems and contingencies that have appeared such as:

- In 2013, due to the delay in establishing the conformation of the PSC, the Vice Minister of Energy had to intervene to speed up the appointment of the representatives of PRODUCE, MINAN and INDECOP.
- The resignation of the National Project Coordinator in February 2014 caused certain delays but a new National Project Coordinator was hired in short time (i.e., April 2014).
- The cancelation of the contract of the international expert that was selected to prepare the Technical Regulations, due to extended delays in the submission of deliverables, was resolved through the selection of a local expert in due time.
- The difficulties experienced by CENERGIA in having access to private sector information due to lack of trust and guarantees that the information would not be mishandled were solved with written and personal communications from the Project team members.
- During the tendering of the consultancy to strengthen the legal and regulatory framework, it was necessary to work closely with law firms which were not familiarized with the scope of services that was requested and as a result had no interest in responding to the tender.

3.3.1 Management arrangements

The Project is being implemented under UNDP's National implementation modality and as such the government of Peru has assumed the implementation responsibility which has been delegated to DGGE within MINEM.

The current National Project Coordinator with the support of a technical expert and an administrative officer is performing an effective role as Project Manager. The Project Team has a thorough knowledge of the logic framework structure including and clear understanding of the scope of the activities, indicators and intended results as well as of the risks and assumptions.

The PSC has only been able to meet four times since the start of the Project activities (i.e., December 2013, August and December 2014 and June 2015). Given the delays experienced by the Project it would be highly beneficial to increase the frequency of the PSC meetings to have one meeting per quarter from now until the end of the Project.

Even so, it should be noted that the members of the PSC have demonstrated a major commitment y in the recent times there has been a particular support from SUNAT in looking for the best option to standardize the import tariff heading and their descriptions to be able to duly control the enforcement of the energy efficiency norms.

On the other hand, UNDP monitoring and evaluation has been adequate and the same applies to technical assistance and administrative support that UNDP has been providing to the Project. Also, due to the limited size of the Project Team, UNDP has been asked to take on the

implementation of several tendering processes, some of which have taken longer than expected since several tenders were declared void due to lack of interest (see below)

3.3.2 Work planning

Beside the delays that resulted from changes in the head of DGEE, the National Project Coordinator and the cancellation of the contract of the international consultant that was originally selected to develop the Technical Regulations, the Project has suffered additional delays related to the cancellation of tender processes, as it has been the case recently with the tender of the consultancy to recommend the handling, treatment and disposal of solid and gaseous waste which is a key activity for the pursuit of the market transformation strategy.

In addition to this tender, the following tenders are currently in process which are also key for the implementation of the Project:

- Evaluation of the conformity system for the S&L program
- Diagnostic of the laboratories

3.3.3 Finance and co-finance

With regard to financing, the total amount of GEF funds that have been assigned to the Project is US\$ 2 million.

Primarily due to the delays that occurred at Project start, as of 2014 only US\$ 639,354, representing 32% of the total GEF funds, have been executed. The level of GEF fund execution as of June 2015 was US\$ 743,695, equivalent to 37%, while the amount of GEF funds already committed at the end of the second quarter were US\$ 475,805. Taking into consideration the amount of GEF funds executed plus those that have been committed this amount represents 61% of the total GEF funds.

The following table presents the breakdown of the expenses incurred through June 30 2015 for each of the Project activities

Table 7 Breakdown of expenses incurred through June30, 2015

Activity	Budget (US\$)	Expenses through June 30, 2015 (US\$)	Balance (US\$)
Activity 1	517,256	154,531	362,725
Activity 2	684,124	271,691	412,433
Activity 3	198,771	120,254	78,517
Activity 4	359,849	66,368	293,481
Activity 5	60,000	1,874	58,126
Activity 6	180,000	128,976	51,024
Total	2,000,000	743,695	1,256,306.

The budget for 2015 has been set at US\$ 1,249,786 and thus there is still an important amount of funds to be executed.

In 2015, UNDP conducted a financial audit of the Project without making any major observation with regard to use of Project funds.

In terms of co-financing the Peruvian government has committed an additional US\$ 4.8 million (in kind) of which MINEM will contribute US\$4.3 million and the remaining US\$ 500,000 will be contributed by MINAM.

As presented in Table 8, as of June 2015 the in-kind contributions of MINEM and MINAM have been valued at US\$ 2.4 million and US\$ 275,000, respectively

Table 8 Co-financing table

Co-financing entity	Type of co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at Stage of Midterm (US\$)	Actual Percentage of Expected Amount
MINEM	In-kin	4,300,000	2,400,000	56.00 %
MINAM	In-kind	500 ,000	27, 000	55.50 %
Total		4,800 ,000		

In accordance with the co-financing agreement signed between the Project and MINEM, the in-kind contribution that MINEM has been delivering to the Project include the following projects, studies and campaigns:

- Lighting Market Transformation project
- Improved cooking stoves in Peru at the national level
- Logistic support during COP 20
- Energy efficiency campaign directed at teachers from January through December across the nation
- Distribution of energy efficiency and labeling publications at the national level

In addition, it is worth mentioning that operating expenses that the DGEE has been incurring in relation to actions related to energy efficiency and reduction of CO2 emissions that has been delivering to the Project in accordance with the functions that have been assigned to the DGEE.

In relation to MINAM co-financing commitment, the following projects and campaigns are being executed:

- Studies on Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)
- Capacity development for the
- “*Voces para el Clima*” campaign
- Solar energy campaign
- Study of the atmospheric load of Sulphur dioxide
- Development of the CO2 emissions inventory
- Technical support in relation to environmental issues

In addition, operating expenses of the Climate Change General Directorate and Environmental Quality General Directorate and other units are being considered as in kind co financing in accordance with the functions that have been assigned to MINAM under the co-financing commitment.

3.3.4 Project level monitoring and evaluation systems

The key Project monitoring and evaluation activities and systems that are being used for adaptive decision making based on changes in the Project environment are:

- PSC meetings, and
- Periodic review reports and ad-hoc meeting with UNDP and other entities including
 - Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) for years 2013 and 2014
 - Annual Progress Reports (APRs) for the years 2013 and 2014
 - Quarterly progress reports from the 3rd quarter of 2013 through 2nd quarter 2015
 - Administrative and budget rescheduling reports

With regard to the PIRs, the Evaluator notes that Project progress has been reported by outcome and output in accordance with the PRODOC logic framework and with an adequate level of detail. However, as it has been mentioned before, some of the indicators included in the logic framework have not been clearly quantified and / or defined, as is the case with those indicators that referred to the amount of staff to be trained without specifying the exact meaning of the word “trained”. In general terms, the quality of the logic framework could be improved by including more precise indicators.

The APR and the quarterly reports, as well as, the administrative and budget rescheduling reports have been prepared with an adequate level of detail and with sufficient information to allow for the monitoring of the Project activities

3.3.5 Stakeholder engagement

The Project has openly sought to engage stakeholders from the public and private sector. as well as from the civil society. This is reflected in the diversity of entities which are part of the PSC and in the fact that as new needs for advice in different fronts began to emerge the number of members of the PSC was increased to gain access to new perspectives. Nevertheless, due to the delays in the implementation of the Project, the frequency of the PSC meetings should be increased so that everyone is aware of the state of progress to results and the evaluations and recommendations of UNPD officers and UNDP/GEF regional technical advisor.

At the same time it is critical that that the PIRs and APRs are shared among the PSC members so every member is aware of the Project progress and of the evaluations and recommendations made by UNDP and the technical advisor of the UNDP / GEF regional office.

Developing additional workshops and /or training seminars in addition to those that are already scheduled should act as an incentive mechanism to strengthen the integration among stakeholders and thus benefit the medium and long term sustainability of the Project.

After the publication of the Technical Regulations draft a series of workshops¹⁴ has been organized as part of the national consultation process. The receipt of more than 600 inquiries

¹⁴ Following the publication of the Technical Regulations draft five workshops were organized in Lima, Arequipa, Huancayo, Piura and Pucallpa as part of the national consultation process. An additional

and comments, which are currently being processed, is a compelling proof of the high degree of interest and commitment that the Project has been able to generate among interested parties.

The selection of a specialized media company to implement an aware raising campaign on the benefits of having a mandatory energy efficiency labeling system is under negotiation.

3.3.6 Reporting

The following table summarizes the key reporting mechanisms that have been used by the Project Team to inform progress towards results and adaptive management changes to the PSC and key stakeholders

Table 9 Reporting Mechanisms

Document
Quarterly progress reports
Annual work plans
Annual budgets and budget reviews
Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
Annual Progress Reports
PSC Minutes of meetings

3.3.7 Communications

There is a good internal Project communication with key stakeholders on a regular basis and at the same time a number of workshops have been conducted together with the development of the Project web page in order to communicate the Project objectives and key achievements as detail below

- Inception workshop – Lima August 2013
- Project Web page 2014
- Workshops to present the draft of the Technical Regulations
 - Lima
 - Arequipa
 - Huancayo
 - Piura
 - Pucallpa
- Workshop to show that the Technical Regulations do not represent an obstacle to commerce

3.4 Sustainability

The evaluation of the sustainability of the Project consists on determining the extent to which the Project benefits will continue once the financing support of GEF is over and in evaluating those risks that might jeopardized the continuation of the Project outcomes. The key Project risks have been duly identified and evaluated in the various Project documents including PRODOC, APR, PIR and the Risk Management module under ATLAS).

The risks that are examined in those documents and which are still relevant plus others that have been identified by the Evaluator are presented in the first column of the following table.

workshop was conducted in Lima to demonstrate that the Technical Regulations do not represent an obstacle to free trade

The second column presents the comments of the Evaluator for the four GEF categories of sustainability (financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance, and environmental).

Table 10 Sustainability and Risks

Risk	Comment
<i>Financial risks</i>	
Lack of financial resources to keep the necessary level of technical capacity within the DGEE and the rest of the public sector entities in charge of guaranteeing the operation of the mandatory S&L program in the medium to long term	The wages of the Project Team are currently being paid out of GEF funds and therefore, MINEM should make provisions to fund a team of professionals directly in charge of guaranteeing the implementation of the S&L program beyond the end of the Project. Also, over the passage of time other categories of domestic appliances or other energy equipment may have to be included in the S&L program plus the need to conduct periodic updates of the Technical Regulations based on changes in the market conditions will require additional technical capacities. Consequently, provisions should be made to have a team of professionals throughout the different public entities responsible for guaranteeing that the S&L program stays operational. At the same time, there is a need to obtain additional funding to pay for the cost of adding additional manpower and equipment in the different public sector entities in charge of guaranteeing the control, verification, and compliance of the S&L program and the implementation of MEPS in the medium to long term
<i>Socio economic risks</i>	
Consumers lack of interest to purchase efficient appliances	There is a need to speed up the implementation of awareness raising campaigns and the design of promotional campaigns to increase the sale of efficient household appliances, including the availability of financial loans for the purchase of efficient equipment and / or rebates for the trade-in of old energy inefficient appliances which will have to be disposed properly. It is important to note that persuading the various stakeholders and in particular end users of the importance of opting for energy efficient domestic appliances requires of a cultural change that takes a long time.
<i>Institutional framework and governance risks</i>	
Verification and control mechanisms do not filter out all inefficient appliances	An international public tender is in place for the Development of a Conformity System for the S&L program and the enforcement of the MEPS. Since a great portion of the domestic appliances which are commercialized in Peru are imported, Customs will have an important role in the enforcement of the S&L program by blocking the import of energy inefficient appliances. The Project team is actively working with SUNAT on this issue.

Risk	Comment
Delays in implementing mandatory EE labeling and MEPS	The Technical Regulations have been published for public consultation and once approved they will become mandatory. However, there is uncertainty regarding how long it would take to get MEF approval for the MEPS, since they may represent a potential barrier to free trade. Legal / regulatory experts should analyze the feasibility that the responsibility for MEPS approval would be in the hands of MINEM as competent authority. In other words, evaluate the possibility that the MEPS approval be considered as part of a revision to the energy efficiency labeling system without having to go back over the process that was needed to obtain the approval of the mandatory energy efficiency label system in the first place. The Evaluator does not have sufficient knowledge of the extent of the existing legislation and regulations but the logic says that once the mandatory energy efficiency label system is approved, MINEM, as competent authority, ought to be in a position to make future revisions without having to start the approval process all over.
Change of Ministers and loss of political support	Even though the energy efficiency labeling is already part of the Energy Efficiency National Plan already approved by the current government, the upcoming change of government and change of the Minister of Energy and Mines could jeopardized the support already given to the proposed S&L program and end up delaying its mandatory approval.
Delays in obtaining the certification of laboratories and / or accreditation of certification companies in the short to medium term for not being technically capable or lack of interest under the conditions imposed by the energy efficiency labeling system	The results and recommendations of the laboratory diagnosis study, the evaluation of the conformity of the energy efficiency labeling system and the solid and gaseous waste disposal assessment are needed to examine this risk in more detail. The design of an alternative plan which would consider a progressive implementation of the energy efficiency labeling system before the end of the Project based on the existing lab capacities and / or companies that might be capable / interested in participating should be taken into consideration as a risk mitigation measure. Also, to speed up the process of making the S&L program mandatory, certain requirements may have to be reduced initially until there are signals that it is possible to increase such requirements up to the levels specified in the Technical Regulations. In other words, the progressiveness of the mandatory requirements of the energy efficiency labeling system may have to be defined based on market conditions in terms of the existing or achievable capacities by the different stakeholders in order to guarantee that the

Risk	Comment
	certification, validation and compliance of the S&L program is implemented in the short term
<i>Environmental risks</i>	
Poor management in the handling and final disposal of solid and gaseous waste from energy appliances	The Project plans to engage a consultant to determine the best practices of the management, handling and final disposal of solid and gaseous waste from energy appliances. Particular attention should be placed in examining sound mechanisms to ensure that the disposal of energy inefficient appliances that would be traded in as part of rebates to promote the sale of high energy efficient appliances will be done in accordance with best international practices.

4. Conclusions

- The implementation of the planned activities included in the PRODOC that had to be completed by midterm are critically delayed, principally due to the impacts of: (i) delays in the start of Project activities, (ii) resignation of the first National Project Coordinator, and (iii) drawbacks from the cancellation of the contract of the international consultant which was selected to develop the Technical Regulations.
- These delays are directly reflected in the low level of GEF fund execution, which as of June 2015 was at 39% only. This is in spite of the fact that 3 years have already passed since the start of Project activities.
- Under this context there is a low probability that all of the proposed activities in the PRODOC could be completed before the end of the Project (i.e., June 2016) which justifies the request to extend the Project end date to December 2016.
- There are still six critical activities, which if they are not completed before the end of the Project, would put at risk the possibility of having a mandatory energy efficiency program in place, even under a partial implementation scheme as discussed below.
- The six pending activities which are more critical are:
 - **MEF endorsement of the DS** to approve the Technical Regulations for the 9 categories of appliances for which there is still pending the preparation of the RIAs which are required by MEF to approve the draft DS and send it to the Ministers Council Presidency for its approval by the President.
 - **Availability of accredited laboratories** to perform the various test required to grant the energy efficiency certification to the various categories of appliances, in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the Technical Regulations.
 - **Design and implementation of the conformity system** for the certification of the energy efficiency labeling system and eventually for the compliance with the MEPS which have not yet been defined.
 - **Identification of entities interested in participating in the certification, validation and conformity** of the proposed S&L program.
 - **Implementation of a consumer awareness raising campaign** on the characteristics of the energy efficiency labels and the benefits of selecting energy efficient domestic appliances.
 - **Development of a strategy to guarantee the sustainability** of the mandatory energy efficiency labeling program.
- It is important to note that due to technical reasons the design and implementation strategy for the MEPS have been postponed for 2016 and as a result there is a certain risk that the mandatory compliance of the MEPS may not be implemented before the end of the Project.

5. Recommendations

The resulting recommendations from the MTR are presented in Table 11 below.

Table 11 Recommendations

Rec #	Recommendation	Responsible Entity
A	Outcome 1 Enhanced capacities of key public and private agencies to design, implement and enforce a mandatory S&L program	
A.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i> The Project has had important delays and the early completion of the compliance system study for the certification of the energy efficiency labeling system and enforcement of the MPS which is key in order to have a mandatory S&L program in place before the end of the Project. The results of this study will provide crucial information for the completion of a number of pending activities (i.e., strengthening of laboratories, identification and strengthening of companies which may participate in the certification and / or verification processes, capacity building in public sector agencies, etc.). The tendering process for the selection of the company which might be selected to perform such study is being handled by UNDP. With the intent of avoiding any delays and ensuring that the data / information / conclusions from the conformity evaluation needed to complete the other pending activities becomes available ASAP, a high priority should be given to finalizing the selection process and monitoring of the development of the study very closely.	MINEN /UNDP
A.2	The proposed targets for strengthening the standardization of institutions and entities in charge of undertaking the testing and the amount of professionals to be trained are too ambitious. The target of having 5 accredited laboratories at Project end will be too difficult to achieve. In lieu, it is recommended to have at least one accredited laboratory for each of the 9 equipment categories which are subjected to the mandatory labeling system by the Project end date. There is also uncertainty with regard to the feasibility of having entities that would be ready to undertake the certification of appliances which would threaten the feasibility of achieving the target of having a mandatory EE labeling program in place at Project end. At least there should be one agreement in place with internationally accredited certification companies for each of the 9 equipment categories by Project end date.	MINEM
A.3	The design of the Project Web page is adequate. However, the URL name that has been selected is too complex	

	(http://pad.minem.gob.pe/EEE/index.aspx?cport=1) and a more user friendly URL alias should be created such as www.etiquetaenergetica.gob.pe, similarly to the ones that are being used by other countries in the region (i.e., Colombia http://www.etiquetaenergetica.gov.co/). This will facilitate access to the Website information by technicians, manufacturers, resellers and end users.	MINEM
B	Outcome 2: Market transformation implemented with public and private sector involvement base on consolidated information and on the market structure	
B.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i> The design of the market transformation strategy is another key activity which should be given high priority in order to guarantee the sustainability of the Project. Given the dependence of this activity with the development of the laboratory, certification and accreditation procedures (which are part of the evaluation of the conformity system for the certification of the energy efficiency labeling system and enforcement of the MEPS), measures should be taken to facilitate the communication between the companies that will be preparing both studies in order to speed up the availability of data / information that will be needed to complete the market transformation study.	MINEM
B.2	Even though members of the Project team have participated in two international seminars, their participation in international events should be increased. In addition information exchanges with other S&L programs in the region should be promoted with the objective of generating synergies and benefiting from the lessons learned, as well as, seeking a high degree of harmonization between the proposed S&L program for Peru and those in other countries throughout the region. A high degree of harmonization is key to improve the supply of energy efficient appliances from local manufacturers and importers in terms of technology standards and costs. A wide dispersion on the requirements of the S&L programs is likely to generate an inefficient and / or more costly supply.	MINEM Project Team
C	Outcome 3: Strengthened legal framework for mandatory S&L and endorsed final technical regulations	
C.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i> To obtain MEF approval of the Technical Regulations the development of the RIAs has to be completed, in order to demonstrate the principles of necessity, proportionality, cost/benefit ratio, transparency and consistency together with the medium term benefits of the proposed S&L program. Since there are 9 categories of domestic appliances involved, the feasibility of	MINEM MEF

	seeking the approval of the Technical Regulations by appliance category should be evaluated and thus avoid that discrepancies of specific aspects of the Technical Regulation of a given appliance category may end up blocking the approval of the Technical Regulations as a whole. At the end, it would be preferable to obtain approval of a given number of Technical Regulations rather than none.	
C.2	Evaluate the possibility that the MEPS could be approved directly by MINEM, in its role of competent authority with power to modify the Technical Regulations which will be initially approved by DS. The experts on legal and regulatory issues should examine whether this would be possible.	
C.3	Domestic appliance manufactures, resellers, and importers have made comments and submitted suggestions with regard to the viability of the Technical Regulations which will have to be analyzed. In particular, several manufacturers have question the validity of “noise level test” on the basis that it does not appear to have a direct relationship with energy efficiency, it appears not to be a simple test to perform and may end up generating controversies. The technical experts should evaluate the reasonableness of this particular comment, as well as, the other comments and suggestions and take the necessary actions.	MINEM
D	Outcome 4: Increased consumer awareness and acceptance of S&L programs	
D.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i> Move forward with the implementation of the awareness raising campaign on the characteristics of the energy efficiency labels and the benefits of selecting high energy efficient appliances as soon as possible.	MINEM
D.2	Training of sales personnel on how to provide the best information on the energy performance of the different categories of domestic appliances and promote the most efficient equipment is a key pending activity to guarantee the success of the S&L program. Consequently, it is recommended that these training workshops are started ASAP, so sales personnel can become familiar with the different types of energy efficiency labels and the information that would be included in each of the 9 categories of domestic appliances that would be part of the S&L program.	MINEM
E	Outcome 5: Information and knowledge on S&L generated and shared	
E.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>	MINEM INDECOPI

	Increase the exchange of experiences with other S&L programs in the region and in particular with the S&L program in Colombia which is more advance in its implementation and from which there would be lessons to be learned from and /or potential to generate important synergies. (https://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=3930)	SUNAT MINAM PRODUCE MEF INACAL MINCETUR
F	Information and knowledge on S&L generated and shared	
F.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i> Due to the delays that have occurred in the implementation of the Project, from now onwards it is indispensable to concentrate efforts in continuously monitor the progress of the pending activities and the state of the identified risks in order to achieve the Project objectives before the end date. In addition, a detailed “critical path” should be prepared to be used as a management tool to control the progress of the pending activities, and to identify delays, risks or other circumstances which may threaten the implementation of the mandatory labeling system.	MINEM UNDP
F.2	The Energy Efficiency Director General was designated in May 2015 and is highly committed to the Project as are all of the Project team members. However, considering the amount and diversity of the pending activities, the engagement of specialized advisors based on the specific needs that may arise from now onwards should be considered. In particular there is an immediate need to identify and engage external consultants to evaluate the results of the four studies which are being tendered and which will be critical for completing the Project Regulatory Impact Analysis of the energy efficiency labeling system (see below) Diagnostic of laboratories Conformity system for the energy efficiency labeling	MINEM
G	Sustainability	
G.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i> Estimate investment needs in equipment and infrastructure and in technical and administrative staff which would be required to guarantee the sustainability of the Project both at DGGE as well as in other organizations and agencies which will be involved in the certification, validation and inspection processes and make the necessary funding provisions	MINEM INDECOPI SUNAT MINAM PRODUCE MEF INACAL MINCETUR

G.2	The delays in Project implementation could threaten the implementation of the mandatory S&L program as it has been proposed in the PRODOC before the end of the Project. Consequently, the possibility of implementing a “Plan B” which would consider the implementation of the S&L program in phases in order to guarantee that Peru will have an S&L program in operation by the end of the Project even if it is partially implemented should be evaluated	MINEM INDECOPI SUNAT MINAM PRODUCE MEF INACAL
G.3	The Project is totally aligned with the energy policies and development priorities of Peru. However, since next year there will be Presidential elections in Peru, the Project commitment of MINEM and of the rest of the government agencies which are involved in the Project should be strengthened in order to guarantee the availability of all the technical and institutional support which will be needed to ensure that the S&L program is duly approved before the change of government takes place even as part of a progressive implementation. The objective is to avoid the delays usually occurred as a result of a change in the administration.	MINEM INDECOPI SUNAT MINAM PRODUCE MEF INACAL

Annex I

MTR Terms of Reference

Normas y Etiquetado de Eficiencia Energética Perú

Términos de Referencia Revisión de Medio Término

Consultoría: Examen de Mitad de Periodo del Proyecto Normas y Etiquetado de Eficiencia Energética
Lugar de destino: Lima, Perú
Plazo: 90 días
Dedicación: Parcial
Supervisor: Oficial de Programa Medio Ambiente y Energía y la Especialista en monitoreo y evaluación del componente de Medio Ambiente y Energía

1. INTRODUCCIÓN

Estos son los Términos de Referencia (ToR) del Examen de Medio Término (MTR por sus siglas en inglés) del PNUD-GEF para el proyecto denominado Normas y Etiquetado de Eficiencia Energética en Perú (N°4128), implementado a través de PNUD que se ejecuta en el periodo 2012-2016. El proyecto se inició el 19 de junio de 2012 y actualmente se encuentra en su tercer año de ejecución. En consonancia con la Guía para MTR de PNUD-GEF, este proceso de examen de mitad de periodo dio comienzo antes de la presentación del Segundo Informe de Ejecución del Proyecto (PIR). En los presentes ToR se fijan las expectativas para el actual MTR. El proceso del MTR debe seguir las directrices marcadas en el documento *Guía para la Realización del Examen de Mitad de Periodo en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUO y Financiados por el GEF* ([insertar enlace](#)).

2. ANTECEDENTES E INFORMACIÓN DEL PROYECTO

El Proyecto se diseñó con el objetivo de reducir las emisiones de CO₂ a través de la implementación del programa de normas de eficiencia energética y etiquetado. El proyecto apoyará la implementación de programas de estándares de eficiencia energética y eco etiquetado del Ministerio de Energía y Minas (MINEM) del Perú, realizando actividades para fortalecer la estructura de implementación de los estándares obligatorios y programa de etiquetado.

Los resultados previstos son:

Resultado 1.- Aumento de las capacidades de gerencia y organización de las agencias gubernamentales (MINEM, PRODUCE, MINAM, INDECOPI, MINCETUR, MEF y la SUNAT, gobiernos locales), a través de un análisis de capacidad institucional realizado y el entrenamiento de autoridades, facilitando el acceso a éstas a información internacional sobre las mejores prácticas en el cumplimiento de las normas de aplicación de los estándares de etiquetado de eficiencia energética. Asimismo, productos esperados de este resultado son la creación de una base de datos sobre consumo de energía y uso final de tecnologías y el fortalecimiento de la estandarización de laboratorios y pruebas (a través del fortalecimiento de capacidades).

Resultado 2.- Estrategia de transformación de mercado implementada con participación del sector público y privado, basada en información consolidada de la estructura de mercado. Este resultado se enfocará en: i) consolidación de información sobre estructura de mercado, ii) análisis técnico-económico conducido para priorizar tecnologías y medidas a tomar y iii) estrategia de transformación de mercado para S&L obligatorio diseñada e implementada.

Resultado 3.- Marco Legal de S&L fortalecido y regulaciones técnicas finales endosadas. Este resultado se enfoca en i) incremento de conciencia entre los tomadores de decisiones en el gobierno y sector privado para beneficiar las regulaciones y de normas de etiquetas de eficiencia energética, ii) resoluciones finales sobre Normas y Etiquetado emitidas por entidades tomadoras de decisiones.

Resultado 4.- Aumento en la conciencia del consumidor y aceptación del programa de S&L. Este resultado se enfoca en i) participación efectiva de la industria (importadores y proveedores, distribuidores y cadenas de venta al detalle) en la creación de conciencia del consumidor, ii) implementación de campañas para el consumidor con el objeto de incrementar sus niveles de conciencia.

Resultado 5.- Monitoreo, evaluación y gestión del conocimiento. Enfocado en el monitoreo y evaluación del proyecto, la realización de evaluaciones de medio término y final y auditorías y el recojo de lecciones aprendidas y las publicaciones del proyecto.

En cuanto a los arreglos institucionales, el Proyecto es cofinanciado por el Fondo Mundial para el Medio Ambiente (FMAM) y el Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD) como agencia implementadora del FMAM que está a cargo de la administración financiera y de obtener los resultados esperados del Proyecto.

La implementación del proyecto es bajo la modalidad de Ejecución Nacional del PNUD, siendo el Socio Ejecutor local el Ministerio de Energía y Minas (MINEM), responsable de la implementación del proyecto y los avances para el cumplimiento de los objetivos especificados. Dentro del MINEM, la responsabilidad es delegada a la Dirección General de Eficiencia Energética (DGEE).

3. OBJETIVOS DE LA REVISIÓN DE MEDIO TÉRMINO (MTR)

El propósito general de la evaluación es verificar el logro de los objetivos y resultados del proyecto recogidos en el Documento del Proyecto (PRODOC), analizando las primeras señales de éxito o fracaso con el propósito de identificar cualquier cambio que sea necesario para retomar el rumbo del proyecto y conseguir los resultados deseados.

El MTR revisará también la estrategia del proyecto y sus riesgos a la sostenibilidad y servirá como un agente de cambio y juega un papel fundamental en el apoyo a la rendición de cuentas. Sus principales objetivos son:

- a) Fortalecer las funciones de supervisión del proyecto;
- b) Garantizar la rendición de cuentas para el logro del objetivo del PNUD/FMAM y fomentar la responsabilidad en la utilización de recursos;

- c) Mejorar el aprendizaje organizacional y el desarrollo (documentar, retroalimentar y difundir las lecciones aprendidas)
- d) Permitir la toma de decisiones informadas;

Asimismo, evaluará el funcionamiento general del proyecto sobre la base de los datos de referencia establecidos desde el inicio del proyecto.

4. ENFOQUE Y METODOLOGÍA DEL MTR

Los datos aportados por el MTR deberán estar basados en información creíble, confiable y útil. El consultor del MTR examinará todas las fuentes de información relevantes, incluidos los documentos elaborados durante la fase de preparación (por ej Project Identification Form (PIF), Plan de Iniciación del PNUD, Política de Protección Medioambiental y Social del PNUD, Documento del Proyecto, informes de proyecto como el Examen Anual/Project Intermediate Report (PIR), revisiones del presupuesto del proyecto, informes de las lecciones aprendidas, documentos legales y de estrategia nacional, y cualquier otro material que el consultor considere útil para este examen basado en datos objetivos}. El consultor del MTR analizará la Herramienta de Seguimiento del área de actuación del GEF al inicio del proyecto enviada a este organismo con la aprobación del CEO, y la Herramienta de Seguimiento a mitad de ciclo, la cual debe ser completada antes de iniciarse la misión de campo del MTR.

Se espera que el consultor que lleve a cabo el MTR, siga un enfoque colaborativo y participativo que garantice una relación estrecha con el Equipo de Proyecto, sus homólogos gubernamentales (la persona o entidad designada como responsable o el Coordinador de Operaciones del GEF (Operational Focal Point), la(s) Oficina(s) de País del PNUD, los Asesores Técnicos Regionales (RTA) del PNUD-GEF y otras partes interesadas clave.

La implicación de las partes interesadas resulta vital para el éxito del MTR. Dicha implicación debe incluir entrevistas con aquellos agentes que tengan responsabilidades en el proyecto, entre los que están:

1. La Dirección General de Eficiencia Energética (MINEM)
2. Equipo de ejecución del proyecto
3. PNUD
4. Consultores del proyecto y
5. El comité Directivo del Proyecto

Asimismo, está previsto que el/la Consultor/a del MTR realice entrevistas y al menos un taller a llevarse a cabo en la ciudad de Lima. La organización, difusión de invitaciones y materiales (logística y costos de materiales) serán asumidas por el consultor. Los costos relacionados a coffee break y sala para el taller serán asumidos por el Proyecto.

El informe final del MTR deberá contener una descripción completa del enfoque seguido y las razones de su adopción, señalando explícitamente las hipótesis utilizadas y los retos, puntos fuertes y débiles de los métodos y el enfoque seguido para el examen.

5. ÁMBITO DETALLADO DEL MTR

El/la consultor/a del MTR evaluará las siguientes cuatro categorías de progreso del proyecto. Para unas descripciones más amplias véase la Guía para la Realización del Examen de Mitad de Periodo en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y Financiados por el GEF- Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, (link de la publicación <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef>).

i. Estrategia del proyecto

Diseño del proyecto:

Analizar el problema abordado por el proyecto y las hipótesis aplicadas. Examinar el efecto de cualquier hipótesis incorrecta o de cambios en el contexto sobre el logro de los resultados del proyecto recogidos en el Documento del Proyecto.

Analizar la relevancia de la estrategia del proyecto y determinar si ésta ofrece el camino más eficaz para alcanzar los resultados deseados/buscados. ¿Se incorporaron adecuadamente al diseño del proyecto las lecciones aprendidas en otros proyectos relevantes?

Analizar cómo quedan recogidas en el proyecto las prioridades del país. Comprobar la propiedad nacional del proyecto. ¿Estuvo el concepto del proyecto alineado con las prioridades de desarrollo del sector nacional y los planes para el país?

Analizar los procesos de toma de decisiones. ¿Se tuvo en cuenta durante los procesos de diseño del proyecto la perspectiva de quienes se verían afectados por las decisiones relacionadas con el proyecto, de quienes podrían influir sobre sus resultados y de quienes podrían aportar información u otros recursos durante los procesos de diseño del proyecto?

Analizar hasta qué punto se tocaron las cuestiones de género relevantes en el diseño del proyecto. Para un mayor detalle de las directrices seguidas véase Guía para la Realización del Examen de Mitad de Periodo en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y Financiados por el GEF.

Si existen áreas importantes que requieren atención, recomendar aspectos para su mejora.

Marco de resultados/marco lógico:

Acometer un análisis crítico de los indicadores y metas del marco lógico del proyecto, evaluar hasta qué punto las metas de mitad y final de periodo del proyecto cumplen los criterio "SMART"(abreviatura en inglés de Específicos, Cuantificables, Consequibles, Relevantes y Sujetos a plazos) y sugerir modificaciones/revisiones específicas de dichas metas e indicadores en la medida que sea necesario.

¿Son los objetivos y resultados del proyecto o sus componentes claros, prácticos y factibles de realizar durante el tiempo estipulado para su ejecución?

Analizar si el progreso hasta el momento ha generado efectos de desarrollo beneficiosos o podría catalizarlos en el futuro (por ejemplo, en términos de generación de ingresos, igualdad de género y empoderamiento de la mujer mejoras en la gobernabilidad, etc.) de manera que deberían incluirse en el marco de resultados del proyecto y monitorizarse de forma anual.

Asegurar un seguimiento efectivo de los aspectos más amplios de desarrollo y de género del proyecto. Desarrollar y recomendar los indicadores de "desarrollo" SMART, que deberán incluir indicadores desagregados en función del género y otros que capturen los beneficios de desarrollo.

ii. Progreso en el logro de resultados

Análisis del progreso en el logro de resultados:

Revisar los indicadores del marco lógico y compararlos con el progreso realizado en el logro de las metas establecidas para fin de proyecto mediante la Matriz de progreso en el logro de resultados y en función de lo establecido en la Guía para la Realización del Examen de Mitad de Periodo en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y Financiados por el GEF; reflejar los avances siguiendo el sistema de colores "tipo semáforo" basado en el nivel de progreso alcanzado; asignar una valoración del progreso obtenido a cada resultado; efectuar recomendaciones desde las áreas marcadas como "No lleva camino de lograrse" (rojo).

Tabla 1. Matriz de progreso en el logro de resultados (resultados obtenidos en comparación con las metas para el final del proyecto)

Estrategia del Proyecto	Indicador	Nivel Inicial de referencia	Nivel en el 1er PIR (Auto reportado)	Meta a Mitad del Proyecto	Nivel y evaluación a Mitad de Periodo ⁴⁵	Valoración de los logros conseguidos	Justificación de la valoración
Objetivo: Reducir las emisiones de CO₂ mediante la implementación de un programa de normas estándares (obligatorios)	Cambio en las ventas anuales hacia aparatos más eficientes Cantidad de productos que no cumplen Tendencia de emisión de GEI Cantidad de emisiones evitadas directamente e indirectamente	Ver tabla UEC N/A Incremento a 1000TJ en 2018 N/A					
Resultado 1: Capacidades mejoradas en las agencias públicas y privadas para diseñar y hacer cumplir un programa obligatorio de Normas y Etiquetado	Estado de los programas en agencias clave de gobierno para implementar efectivamente S&L Estado y tipo de TA y actividades de desarrollo de capacidades Impacto del sitio Web del proyecto en los oficiales del gobierno, sector privado y consumidores (en la decisión de compra) Estado y funcionamiento de la base de datos Fortalecer la estandarización de institutos y entidades que realizan pruebas Estado de verificación y aplicación de S&L	Implementación insuficiente Programas, procedimientos no suficiente Alguna información en el sitio Web del MINEM No existe Base de Datos No existe Base de Datos Capacidad de pruebas disponible en institutos seleccionados					
Resultado 2: Estrategia de transformación de Mercado implementada con participación del sector público y privado basada en información consolidada del estructura de mercado	Nivel de información disponible para definir el consumo de energía en categoría de etiquetas y para medir el impacto del proyecto Estado de las recomendaciones que contribuyen a las sustentabilidad institucional Indicadores de Producto Disponibilidad de datos de mercado y técnicos Nivel de información para la definición de niveles de energía para etiquetas y MEPS Estado de la Estrategia para la implementación de S&L obligatorio	Datos disponibles en la Base de Datos del MINEM pero se requieren actualizar El sistema de Standards and Labeling (S&L) establecido es voluntario, pero con impacto limitado					

Resultado 3: Marco Legal de S&L fortalecido y regulaciones técnicas finales endosadas	Estado de la forma de decisiones con relación a la introducción de S&L obligatorios en eficiencia energética	MFPS obligatorio existentes para CFLs, etiquetado (voluntario) y MIFPS para lámparas, refrigeradores y congeladores -aires acondicionados, calentadores de agua eléctricos y gas balastos, motores eléctricos y calderas industriales					
	Niveles de conciencia de los Tomadores de decisiones para desarrollar e implementar efectivamente las políticas y regulaciones de S&L Estado de las regulaciones técnicas						
Resultados 4: Aumento en la conciencia del consumidor y aceptación del programa de S&L	Prioridad de diferentes criterios utilizados por los consumidores al tomar la decisión de la compra y del sector privado al almacenar los productos	No énfasis en los consumidores (y personal de ventas) en los aspectos de eficiencia energética y ciclo de vida al comprar o mercadear nuevos aparatos					
	Campanas conjuntas de mercadeo de los fabricantes y cadenas de ventas al detal Énfasis en los aspectos de EE en la estrategia de Mercado de la cadena de ventas al detal Estado y entrega de campañas específicas e incentivos						
Resultado 5: Información y conocimientos generados y compartidos sobre el programa de S&L	El nivel de información disponible para el monitoreo y evaluación de un manejo adaptable Estado del progreso, evaluación e informes del	No hay consolidado de lecciones aprendidas y resultados del proyecto					

Código para la Evaluación de los Indicadores

Verde= Logrado	Amarillo= Camino de lograrse
----------------	------------------------------

Además del análisis de progreso en la consecución de resultados:

Comparar y analizar la Herramienta de Seguimiento del GEF al nivel inicial de referencia con la completada inmediatamente antes del Examen de Mitad de Periodo. Identificar las restantes barreras al logro de los objetivos del proyecto en lo que resta hasta su finalización. Una vez examinados los aspectos del proyecto que han tenido éxito, identificar fórmulas para que el proyecto pueda ampliar los beneficios conseguidos.

iii. Ejecución del proyecto y gestión adaptativa

Mecanismos de gestión:

Analizar la eficacia general en la gestión del proyecto tal y como se recoge en el Documento del Proyecto. ¿Se han realizado cambios? ¿Son efectivos? ¿Están claras las responsabilidades y la cadena de mando? ¿Se toman las decisiones de forma transparente y en el momento adecuado? Recomendar áreas de mejora.

Analizar la calidad de la ejecución por parte del Organismo ejecutor/Socio(s) en la Ejecución y áreas de mejora recomendadas.

Analizar la calidad del apoyo proporcionado por el Organismo Asociado del GEF (PNUD) y recomendar áreas de mejora.

Analizar la eficacia de la participación de las entidades que integran el Comité Directivo

Planificación del trabajo:

Analizar cualquier demora en la puesta en marcha e implementación del proyecto, identificar sus causas y examinar si ya se han resuelto.

¿Están los procesos de planificación del trabajo basados en los resultados? Si no es así, ¿se pueden sugerir maneras de reorientar la planificación del trabajo para enfocarse en los resultados?

Examinar el uso del marco de resultados/marco lógico del proyecto como herramienta de gestión y revisar cualquier cambio producido desde el inicio del proyecto.

Financiación y cofinanciación:

Evaluar la gestión financiera del proyecto, con especial referencia a la rentabilidad de las intervenciones.

Analizar los cambios producidos en las asignaciones de fondos como resultado de revisiones presupuestarias y determinar si dichas revisiones han sido apropiadas y relevantes.

¿Cuenta el proyecto con controles financieros adecuados, incluyendo una apropiada información y planificación, que permitan a la Dirección tomar decisiones informadas relativas al presupuesto y que faciliten un flujo de fondos en tiempo y plazos adecuados?

A partir de la información contenida en la tabla de seguimiento de la cofinanciación que hay que rellenar, ofrecer comentarios sobre la cofinanciación. ¿Se utiliza la cofinanciación estratégicamente para ayudar a los objetivos del proyecto? ¿Se reúne el Equipo del Proyecto regularmente con todos los socios en la cofinanciación a fin de alinear las prioridades financieras y los planes de trabajo anuales?

Sistemas de seguimiento y evaluación a nivel de proyecto:

Analizar las herramientas de seguimiento usadas actualmente. ¿Ofrecen la información necesaria?

¿Involucran a socios clave? ¿Están alineadas con los sistemas nacionales o incorporados a ellos?

¿Usan la información existente? ¿Son eficientes? ¿Son rentables? ¿Se requieren herramientas adicionales?

¿Cómo pueden hacerse más participativas e inclusivas?

Analizar la gestión financiera del presupuesto para el seguimiento y evaluación del proyecto. ¿Se asignan recursos suficientes para el seguimiento y evaluación? ¿Se usan estos recursos con eficacia?

Implicación de las partes interesadas:

Gestión del proyecto: ¿Ha desarrollado y forjado el proyecto las alianzas adecuadas, tanto con las partes interesadas directas como con otros agentes tangenciales?

Participación y procesos impulsados desde el país: ¿Apoyan los gobiernos locales y nacionales los objetivos del proyecto? ¿Siguen teniendo un papel activo en la toma de decisiones del proyecto que contribuya a una ejecución eficiente y efectiva del mismo?

Participación y sensibilización pública: ¿Hasta qué punto ha contribuido la implicación y la sensibilización pública en el progreso realizado hacia el logro de los objetivos del proyecto?

Información:

Analizar los mecanismos empleados por la Dirección del proyecto para informar de los cambios en la gestión adaptativa y comunicarlos al Comité Directivo del Proyecto.

Evaluar hasta qué punto el Equipo de Proyecto y sus socios llevan a cabo y cumplen con todos los requisitos de información del GEF (p.ej: ¿qué medidas se han tomado para abordar los PIR con valoraciones bajas, cuando sea aplicable)?

Evaluar cómo se han documentado y compartido las lecciones derivadas del proceso de gestión adaptativa con los socios clave y cómo han sido internalizadas por éstos.

Comunicación:

Examinar la comunicación interna del proyecto con las partes interesadas: ¿Existe una comunicación regular y efectiva? ¿Hay partes interesadas importantes que se quedan fuera de los canales de comunicación? ¿Existen mecanismos de retroalimentación cuando se recibe la comunicación?

¿Contribuye la comunicación con las partes interesadas a que estas últimas tengan una mayor concienciación respecto a los resultados y actividades del proyecto, y a un mayor compromiso en la sostenibilidad a largo plazo de los resultados del mismo?

Examinar la comunicación externa del proyecto: ¿Se han establecido canales de comunicación adecuados –o se están estableciendo– para expresar el progreso del proyecto y el impacto público deseado (por ejemplo, ¿hay presencia en la Web?); ¿Llevó a cabo el proyecto campañas de comunicación y sensibilización pública adecuadas?).

A efectos informativos, redactar un párrafo de media página que resuma el progreso del proyecto hacia los resultados en términos de su contribución a la generación de beneficios relacionados con el desarrollo sostenible y el medio ambiente global.

iv. Sostenibilidad

Validar si los riesgos identificados en el Documento del Proyecto, el Examen Anual del Proyecto/PIR y el Módulo de Gestión de Riesgos del Sistema ERP del PNUD denominado ATLAS son los más importantes y si las valoraciones de riesgo aplicados son adecuadas y están actualizadas. En caso contrario, explicar por qué.

Asimismo, evaluar los siguientes riesgos a la sostenibilidad:

Riesgos financieros para la sostenibilidad:

¿Cuál es la probabilidad de que se reduzca o cese la disponibilidad de recursos económicos una vez que concluya la ayuda del GEF {teniendo en cuenta que los recursos potenciales pueden provenir de múltiples fuentes, como los sectores público y privado, actividades generadoras de ingresos y otros recursos que serán adecuados para sostener los resultados del proyecto)?

Riesgos sociales o políticos para la sostenibilidad:

¿Existen riesgos sociales o políticos que puedan poner en peligro la sostenibilidad de los resultados del proyecto? ¿Cuál es el riesgo de que el nivel de propiedad e implicación de las partes interesadas (incluyendo el de los gobiernos y otras partes interesadas) sea insuficiente para sostener los resultados/beneficios del proyecto? ¿Son conscientes las diversas partes interesadas clave de que les interesa que los beneficios del proyecto sigan fluyendo? ¿Tienen el público y/o las partes interesadas un nivel de concienciación suficiente para apoyar los objetivos a largo plazo del proyecto? ¿Documenta el Equipo del Proyecto las lecciones aprendidas de manera continuada? ¿Se comparten/transfieren a los agentes adecuados que estén en posición de aplicarlas y, potencialmente, reproducirlas y/o expandirlas en el futuro?

Riesgos para la sostenibilidad relacionados con el marco institucional y la gobernabilidad:

- ¿Presentan los marcos legales, las políticas, las estructuras y los procesos de gobernabilidad riesgos que puedan poner en peligro la continuidad de los beneficios del proyecto? Al evaluar este parámetro, es preciso tener en cuenta también si están instalados los sistemas /mecanismos requeridos para la rendición de cuentas, la transparencia y los conocimientos técnicos.

Riesgos medioambientales a la sostenibilidad:

- ¿Hay algún riesgo medioambiental que pueda poner en peligro la continuidad de los resultados del proyecto?

Conclusiones y Recomendaciones

El/la consultor/a del MTR incluirá una sección en el informe donde se recojan las conclusiones obtenidas a partir de todos los datos recabados y pruebas realizadas.

Las recomendaciones deberán ser sugerencias sucintas para intervenciones críticas que deberán ser específicas, cuantificables, conseguibles y relevantes. Se debería incluir una tabla de recomendaciones dentro del informe ejecutivo del informe. Para más información sobre la tabla de recomendaciones, véase la Guía para la Realización del Examen de Mitad de Periodo en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y Financiados por el GEF.

Las recomendaciones del consultor del MTR deberán limitarse a 15 como máximo.

Valoración

El/la consultor/a del MTR incluirá sus valoraciones de los resultados del proyecto y breves descripciones de los logros asociados en una Tabla Resumen de Valoraciones y Logros en el Resumen Ejecutivo del Informe del MTR. Véase el Anexo E para comprobar las escalas de valoración. No es necesario hacer una valoración de la Estrategia del Proyecto ni una valoración general del mismo.

Tabla. Resumen de valoraciones y logros del MTR Proyecto Normas y Etiquetado de Eficiencia Energética

Parámetro	Valoración MTR	Descripción del logro
Estrategia del proyecto	N/A	
Progreso en el logro de resultados	Valoración del grado de logro del objetivo. Valoración del grado de logro del resultado 1 (Calificar según escala de 6 pt.)	
	Valoración del grado de logro del objetivo. Valoración del grado de logro del resultado 2 (Calificar según escala de 6 pt.)	
	Valoración del grado de logro del objetivo. Valoración del grado de logro del resultado 3 (Calificar según escala de 6 pt.)	
	Valoración del grado de logro del objetivo. Valoración del grado de logro del resultado 4 (Calificar según escala de 6 pt.)	
Ejecución del proyecto y gestión adaptativa	Calificar según escala de 6 pt.	
	Calificar según escala de 4 pt.	

CRONOGRAMA DE EJECUCION

La duración total del MTR será de 90 días calendario, contados a partir del día siguiente de la firma del contrato. El cronograma provisional del MTR es el siguiente:

PERIODO DE EJECUCIÓN	ACTIVIDAD
03 de junio de 2015	Cierre de solicitudes
10 de junio de 2015	Comunicación de resultados
12 de junio de 2015	Firma del contrato
15 de junio de 2015	Preparación del consultor del MTR (entrega de los Documentos del Proyecto)
15-22 de junio de 2015	Revisión de los Documentos y elaboración-presentación del Informe de Iniciación del MTR
22-25 de junio de 2015	Finalización y validación del Informe de Iniciación del MTR: fecha más tardía para el inicio de la misión del MTR.
06 al 17 de julio de 2015	Misión del MTR: reuniones con las partes involucradas, entrevistas.
20 de julio de 2015	Reunión para el cierre de la misión en Lima y presentación de las primeras conclusiones: fecha más temprana para la finalización de la misión del MTR.
03 de agosto de 2015	Presentación del borrador del informe
10-12 de agosto de 2015	Incorporación del <i>rastro de auditoría</i> ¹ a partir de los datos ofrecidos en el borrador del informe/Finalización del informe del MTR.
21 de agosto de 2015	Preparación y comunicación de la respuesta de la Dirección.
27 de agosto de 2015	Taller de conclusión con las partes interesadas (el consultor deberá considerar en su propuesta que su participación en dicho taller será en forma virtual).
31 de agosto de 2015	Fecha prevista para la finalización definitiva del MTR

El Informe de Iniciación deberá presentar opciones para llevar a cabo visitas de campo o entrevistas.

6. PRODUCTOS DEL EXAMEN DE MITAD DE PERIODO

La relación de productos requeridos es como sigue:

No.	Producto	Descripción	Plazo	Responsabilidades
1	Informe de Iniciación del MTR	El consultor del MTR clarifica los objetivos y métodos del Examen de mitad de Periodo	Como mínimo 2 semanas antes de iniciarse la misión del MTR: 22 de junio 2015	El Consultor del MTR lo presenta al PNUD y a la Dirección del Proyecto
2	Presentación	Conclusiones Iniciales	Final de la misión del MTR: 17 de julio	El Consultor del MTR las presenta ante la Dirección del proyecto y la Unidad de Gestión y PNUD
3	Borrador de Informe final	Informe completo (usar las directrices sobre un contenido recogidas en el Anexo B de la Guía de Mitad de Periodo del GEF)	Antes de transcurridos 3 semanas desde la misión del MTR: 03 de agosto de 2015	Enviado al PNUD, examinado por el RTA Unidad de Coordinación de Proyectos OFP del GEF
4	Informe Final	Informe revisado con prueba de auditoría donde se detalla cómo se han abordado (o no) en el informe final del MTR todos los comentarios recibidos	Antes de transcurrida 1 semana desde la recepción de los comentarios del PNUD sobre el borrador: 12 de agosto	Enviado al PNUD

*El Informe Final del MTR debe estar en inglés. Siempre que sea aplicable el PNUD podrá decidir traducir el informe a otro idioma.

6.1 Mecanismos del MTR

El consultor del MTR tendrá la responsabilidad de comunicarse con el Equipo del Proyecto para proporcionarle todos los documentos pertinentes, fijar entrevistas con las partes interesadas y organizar visitas de campo.

¹ Listado de todos los comentarios recibidos y la manera en que han sido abordados (o no) en el informe final del Examen de Mitad de Periodo (formato proporcionado en la Guía de Examen de Mitad de Periodo).

7. PERFIL DEL CONSULTOR

El Consultor no podrá haber participado en la preparación, formulación y/o ejecución del proyecto (incluyendo la redacción del Documento del Proyecto) y no deberá tener un conflicto de intereses con las actividades relacionadas con el mismo.

El consultor deberá contar con experiencia y participación o gestión de proyectos y evaluaciones en otras regiones a nivel mundial.

Profesional especialista en medio ambiente, ciencias, ingeniería u otro campo estrechamente relacionado. Experiencia de al menos dos servicios de trabajo con el GEF y/o con evaluaciones realizadas por este organismo (o en el marco de proyectos apoyados por el GEF); Experiencia en la evaluación de al menos tres proyectos referidos al sector energía y/o eficiencia energética. Deseable experiencia en la identificación, formulación, monitoreo y/o implementación de proyectos o programas relacionados al sector energía, eficiencia energética y/o electrificación. Deseable experiencia en evaluaciones y análisis sensibles al género.

8. MODALIDADES Y ESPECIFICACIONES DE PAGO

Los pagos se realizarán dentro de los 15 días calendarios siguientes a la presentación de los productos abajo mencionados, previa conformidad emitida por el área usuaria. En caso de existir observaciones a los informes presentados, el plazo se contabilizará a partir del levantamiento de las mismas:

- 10% del pago a la aprobación definitiva del Informe de Iniciación del MTR
- 30% a la presentación del borrador del informe del MTR
- 60% a la finalización del informe del MTR

9. PROCESO DE POSTULACIÓN

La relación de documentos a ser presentados es como sigue:

a) **Carta de Confirmación de Interés y Disponibilidad** mediante la plantilla proporcionada por el PNUD;

b) **CV o el Formulario P11 de Historia Personal**

c) **Breve descripción del enfoque del trabajo/propuesta técnica** de por qué el postulante cree que es la persona más adecuada para el proyecto, y una metodología propuesta sobre cómo piensa enfocar y completar el trabajo (máximo 1 página), según formato adjunto.

d) **Propuesta financiera**, que indique el precio total (a suma alzada), utilizando la plantilla adjunta al modelo de Carta de Confirmación de Interés. Si un postulante es contratado por una organización/compañía/institución y tiene previsto que su empleador cargue una tasa de gestión por su cesión al PNUD en concepto de Acuerdo de Préstamo Reembolsable (RLA), el solicitante debe indicarlo en este momento y asegurarse de que esos costos estén debidamente incluidos en la propuesta financiera que se envíe al PNUD.

e) **Formato de Vendor** debidamente llenado.

Todos los materiales de la solicitud deberían remitirse por vía electrónica haciendo referencia al número y título del proceso PNUD/IC-134/2015 "Examen de Mitad de Periodo del Proyecto Normas y Etiquetado de Eficiencia Energética" a la siguiente dirección electrónica: adquisiciones.pe@undp.org hasta el 03 de junio de 2015.

Las solicitudes incompletas quedarán excluidas del proceso (los documentos que se reciban fuera del plazo indicado por cualquier razón, no se considerarán a efectos de la evaluación). En caso de que la propuesta sea enviada vía correo electrónico verificar que ésta se encuentre firmada y sea remitida en formato PDF, libre de cualquier archivo dañado, con un peso máximo de 4MB por envío

Criterios para la evaluación de la propuesta:

Sólo se evaluarán aquellas solicitudes que cumplan con todos los requisitos. Las ofertas se evaluarán conforme al método de Puntuación Combinada (*Combined Scoring*) según el cual la formación académica, la experiencia en proyectos similares y la propuesta técnica tendrán un valor de 70 puntos, mientras que la propuesta económica tendrá un valor de 30 puntos. El postulante que reciba la puntuación combinada más alta y que acepte los Términos y Condiciones Generales del PNUD será el que reciba el contrato.

Annex II

Glossary of Terms

This glossary of terms is drawn from UNDP, GEF and UNEG source materials, as well as from the OECD-DAC.

Term	Definition
Activities	Actions taken through which the project inputs are mobilized to produce
Adaptive Management	The project's ability to adapt to changes to the project design (project objective, outcomes, or outputs) during implementation, resulting from (a) original objectives that were not sufficiently articulated; (b) exogenous conditions that changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed; (c) the project's restructuring because the original objectives were overambitious; or (d) the project's restructuring because of a lack of progress.
Conclusions	Point out the factors of success and failure of the evaluated intervention, with special attention paid to the intended and unintended results and impacts, and more generally to any other strength or weakness. A conclusion draws on data collection and analyses undertaken, through a transparent chain of arguments.
Co-financing	Includes Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6 and GEF/C.46/09.
Cost Effectiveness	Assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept.
Country Ownership	Relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable
Environmental risks to sustainability	Environmental factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes (i.e. biodiversity-related project gains or water quality-related project gains that may be at risk due to frequent severe storms)
Evaluation	Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer term outcomes. Projects can be evaluated during the time of implementation, at the end of implementation (Terminal Evaluation), or after a period of time after the project has ended (ex-post evaluation).
Executing Agency	An entity or agency that receives GEF Funding from a GEF Partner Agency in order to execute a GEF project, or parts of a GEF project, under the supervision of a GEF Partner Agency. May also be referred to as "project executing agency." See "Implementing Partner" for equivalent UNDP terminology.
Financial Planning	Includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing

Financial risks to sustainability	Financial factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes. Factors to be considered are: whether financial and economic resources are likely to be available after GEF grant assistance ends, or if macroeconomic conditions in the country/region are likely to affect future funding.
GEF Agency	GEF Agencies are the 10 institutions that are entitled to receive GEF Trust Fund resources directly from the GEF Trustee for the design, implementation, and supervision of GEF Projects as of November 2010. They include the following organizations: AfDB, ADB, EBRD, FAO, IADB, IBRD, IFAD, UNDP, UNEP, and UNIDO.
GEF Partner Agencies	Those agencies eligible to request and receive GEF resources directly for the design, implementation, and supervision of GEF Projects. This category includes both GEF Agencies and GEF Project Agencies. It does not include agencies designated by countries that request resources from the GEF Secretariat for the execution of activities under GEF direct access modalities (implemented by the GEF Secretariat), including for Convention reports and National Portfolio Formulation Exercises.
GEF Project Agencies	Any of the institutions that the GEF has accredited to receive GEF resources to design, implement and supervise GEF-financed projects apart from the ten GEF Agencies.
Inputs	Financial, human and material resources used for the project
Implementing Partner	UNDP terminology for the entity to which the UNDP Administrator has entrusted the implementation of UNDP assistance specified in a signed document along with the assumption of full responsibility and accountability for the effective use of UNDP resources and the delivery of outputs, as set forth in such document. By signing a Project Document, an implementing partner enters into an agreement with UNDP to manage the project and achieve the results defined in the relevant documents. UNDP may select an implementing partner for a project from one of five different types of partner organizations. These categories are: 1. Government entities. The use of a government entity is referred to as national implementation. Eligible government entities include: (a) A ministry of the government; (b) A department within a ministry; (c) A governmental institution of a semi-autonomous nature, such as, the central bank, a university, a regional or local authority or a municipality. 2. United Nations agencies that have signed the Implementing Partner Agreement. 3. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). 4. UNDP This is referred to as direct implementation. 5. Approved inter-governmental organizations that are not part of the UN system
Implementation Approach	Includes an analysis of the project's work-planning, finance, stakeholder engagement, communication strategy, partnerships in implementation arrangements, and overall project management
Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability	Legal, policy, and governance factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes. Factors to be considered are whether systems of accountability, transparency, and technical know-how are in place.
Jointly-conducted Midterm Review	A Midterm Review in which different donor agencies and/or partners participate

Monitoring	The periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected
Outputs	Products and services that result from the project
Outcomes	The likely or achieved short- 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.
Quality Assurance/Review	Quality assurance encompasses any activity that is concerned with assessing and improving the merit or the worth of an intervention or its compliance with given standards. For the purposes of this Guide, it especially refers to the assessment of the quality of Midterm Reviews carried out for UNDP/GEF projects.
Replication	In the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects
Results	The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.
Socio-economic risks to sustainability	Social risks to economic changes and/or political and cultural factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes. Factors to be considered are: level of stakeholder ownership (over project planning, resources, project benefits, etc.) and stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives.
Stakeholder	Agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the intervention or its evaluation
Stakeholder Engagement	The process by which a project involves people who may be affected by the decisions it makes or can influence the implementation of its decisions
Sustainability	The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion
Terms of Reference	Written document presenting the purpose and scope of the MTR, the methods to be used, the standard against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and reporting requirements.

Source: Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP Supported, GEF Financed Projects

Annex III

MTR Evaluation Matrix

Matriz de Evaluación del MTR¹⁵

Criterios de evaluación	Preguntas de la evaluación	Indicadores de éxito	Fuente de datos	Método e instrumentos de recolección de datos
Relevancia: ¿En qué medida la iniciativa, sus productos y efectos son coherentes con las políticas y prioridades del GEF, del PNUD, las prioridades nacionales ambientales y las necesidades de los beneficiarios? ¿Ha sido idónea la forma de operación del Proyecto en relación al contexto nacional?				
Prioridades del GEF	¿Es el Proyecto relevante al área de interés sobre cambio climático del GEF?	• Prioridades y áreas de trabajo incorporados en el diseño del Proyecto	• Documentos de Proyecto • Sitios web de PNUD y GEF, asociados e interesados • Políticas y estrategias nacionales • Asociados claves del Proyecto	• Análisis de los documentos y otra información • Entrevistas con PNUD, el equipo de Proyecto y otros actores asociados
Prioridades del PNUD	¿En qué medida el Proyecto se corresponde con el Plan de Acción del Programa del País (CPAP por sus siglas en inglés)	• Prioridades y áreas de trabajo incorporados		
Prioridades nacionales ambientales	¿Cómo el Proyecto apoya las prioridades ambientales y de desarrollo del Perú?	• Apreciación y reconocimiento de los interesados nacionales con respecto a la adecuación del Proyecto • Grado de participación de los interesados en el diseño del Proyecto		
Necesidades de los beneficiarios (género y DH)	¿El Proyecto toma en consideración las realidades nacionales ambientales (marco institucional y de políticas) y de la población (desigualdades e inequidades) tanto en la etapa de diseño como en su implementación?			

¹⁵ Criterios de evaluación con las preguntas, indicadores, fuentes de datos y metodología clave

Idoneidad	¿Existen vínculos lógicos entre el problema que se desea resolver, los resultados esperados del Proyecto y el diseño del Proyecto (en términos capacidad nacional, componentes del proyecto, elección de socios, estructura, mecanismos de implementación, alcance, presupuesto, uso de recursos, etc.)?	• Solidez del marco lógico; • Coherencia entre resultados logrados y resultados planeados		
-----------	--	--	--	--

Criterios de evaluación	Preguntas de la evaluación	Indicadores de éxito	Fuente de datos	Método e instrumentos de recolección de datos
Efectividad: ¿En qué medida se han logrado o se lograrán resultados y objetivos del Proyecto? ¿Qué factores internos y externos explican los resultados alcanzados a la fecha o la ausencia de resultados?				
Objetivos, resultados y productos	¿Ha sido efectivo el Proyecto para alcanzar los resultados y objetivos previstos “Fortalecimiento de las capacidades nacionales para insertar temas de ambiente y uso eficiente de energía dentro de los planes de desarrollo nacionales y sistemas de implementación”? ¿Qué obstáculos restan para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, o qué medidas aún tienen que tomar los interesados para alcanzar impactos continuos y beneficios para el medio ambiente?	• Avance y resultados según los indicadores del marco lógico (documento de proyecto, PIRs); ejemplos de impactos • Estado (tipo, fortaleza) de las barreras al final del Proyecto en comparación con la situación al inicio	• Documento del Proyecto • Informes de avance y productos técnicos • PNUD y demás integrantes del Comité Directivo del Proyecto) • Beneficiarios de las medidas de EE implementadas – (programa de normas y estándares de EE, estrategia para la transformación del	• Análisis de los documentos y otra información (ej. registro en Atlas) sobre el proyecto y de terceros • Entrevistas con PNUD y el equipo de Proyecto • Entrevistas con otras asociados e interesados
Necesidades de los beneficiarios (género y DH)	¿Consideró el proyecto un enfoque de igualdad de género, derechos humanos con respecto a las actividades y resultados esperados? ¿Fueron asignados recursos (financieros, humanos, de tiempo) para integrar la igualdad de género en el diseño, implementación y monitoreo del proyecto?	• Actividades con indicadores con respecto a género y DH		

Riesgos y supuestos	¿En qué medida se gestionaron adecuadamente los riesgos y suposiciones? ¿Cuáles fueron las principales dificultades, riesgos, oportunidades y desafíos relacionados con la implementación de las actividades y resultados de los diferentes componentes? ¿Cómo se gestionaron; Gestión adaptativa?	• Tipo y nivel de riesgos y medidas tomadas para asegurar sostenibilidad • Calidad del sistema de información sobre riesgos y de las estrategias de mitigación del riesgo	mercado, marco legal de S&L)	
Estrategia	¿Cuál ha sido la calidad de las estrategias desarrolladas? ¿Fueron estas suficientes? ¿Qué métodos tuvieron éxito o no y por qué? ¿Qué cambios podrían haber realizado (de haberlos) al diseño del Proyecto para mejorar el logro de los resultados esperados?	• Calidad de las estrategias desarrolladas • Incidencias de cambio de estrategias del Proyecto		

Criterios de evaluación	Preguntas de la evaluación	Indicadores de éxito	Fuente de datos	Método e instrumentos de recolección de datos
		• Apreciación y reconocimiento de los interesados nacionales con respecto a la adecuación del Proyecto y sus estrategias		
Ejecución IA, EA (foco en resultados, riesgo)	¿Fue el apoyo al Proyecto provisto por el PNUD de forma eficaz y eficiente? ¿Cómo ha sido la calidad de la ejecución por el Asociado en la Implementación?	• Apoyo brindado por PNUD y el EA • Nivel de apreciación de los asociados e interesados		

Alianzas/Participación	¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de participación de las partes interesadas, beneficiarios y socios en el diseño del Proyecto? ¿Cuáles alianzas / vínculos se han facilitado? ¿Cuáles pueden considerarse sostenibles? Qué mecanismos se implementaron para coordinar y articular el trabajo entre los distintos actores involucrados? ¿Fueron efectivos? ¿En qué medida los vínculos entre instituciones y	• Tipo, mecanismos y calidad de la cooperación con asociados; actividades específicas realizadas • Nivel de participación de los interesados y asociados en el diseño e implementación		
Monitoreo (plan, financiamiento, mecanismos , gestión adaptativa)	¿En qué medida el marco lógico, los planes de trabajo, el plan de monitoreo y evaluación orientaron la gestión por resultados del Proyecto y apoyaron la toma de decisiones? ¿Se adaptaron estas herramientas para dotar de flexibilidad necesaria para el logro de los resultados? ¿Se usó o necesitó el manejo adaptativo para asegurar un uso eficiente de los recursos? ¿Los sistemas contables y financieros vigentes fueron adecuados para la gestión del Proyecto? ¿Los fondos de co-financiamiento fueron aprovechados tal como fue planificado?	• Calidad del sistema de información sobre riesgos y de las estrategias de mitigación del riesgo • Disponibilidad y calidad de los informes de avance y de gestión (técnico, financiero) del Proyecto • Calidad de la gestión adaptativa y de seguimiento y evaluación (SyE)		

Crterios de evaluacón	Preguntas de la evaluacón	Indicadores de éxito	Fuente de datos	Método e instrumentos de recoleccón de datos
		• Incidencias de cambio de enfoque del Proyecto (diseño; ejecucón)		
Integración	¿En qué medida el Proyecto ha generado fomentado y respaldado las asociaciones y vínculos entre instituciones y organizaciones?	• Actividades específicas realizadas para respaldar el desarrollo de acuerdos de cooperacón entre partes interesadas		

Apropiación	¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de apropiación de las partes interesadas y socios durante el diseño, la implementación del proyecto y sus resultados?	• Grado de participación de los interesados en el diseño e implementación del Proyecto		
Eficiencia: ¿El proyecto se implementó de manera eficiente en conformidad con las normas y los estándares internacionales y nacionales?				
Oportunidad	¿Se han entregado los productos o servicios oportunamente a los destinatarios?	• Opinión de los destinatarios sobre la entrega de los productos	• Documentos de proyecto • Sitios de página web (disponibilidad) • Informes de avance y datos presupuestales • PNUD	• Análisis de los documentos y datos • Entrevistas con PNUD ; equipo de Proyecto • Entrevistas con otras asociados e interesados
Financiamiento/co-Financiamiento	¿El cofinanciamiento sucedió según lo planeado?	• Fondos planeados y aprovechados (GEF y cofinanciamiento) • Gastos en vista de los resultados alcanzados • Nivel de discrepancia entre gastos planificados y realizados		
Efectividad de la planificación Financiera	¿Fue la ejecución del proyecto tan efectiva como fue propuesta originalmente (planeado vs. actual)?			
Factores costo-efectividad	¿Los recursos financieros fueron usados eficientemente? ¿Han podido usarse con mayor eficiencia? ¿Lograron las adquisiciones realizadas un uso eficiente de los recursos del proyecto? ¿Pudieron usarse con mayor eficiencia? ¿Qué factores del mercado nacional han incidido en la entrega de los productos o servicios?			

Criterios de evaluación	Preguntas de la evaluación	Indicadores de éxito	Fuente de datos	Método e instrumentos de recolección de datos
Sostenibilidad: ¿Existen riesgos financieros, institucionales, socioeconómicos o ambientales para la sostenibilidad de los resultados y efectos del proyecto, en el largo plazo?				
Estrategia	¿Qué acciones se pusieron en marcha para la sostenibilidad de los resultados? ¿Cuáles son los desafíos y riesgos clave para la sostenibilidad de los resultados de las iniciativas del Proyecto que deben abordarse directa y rápidamente? ¿Qué medidas podrían contribuir a la sostenibilidad de los esfuerzos logrados por el Proyecto?	• Ejemplos/calidad de medidas tomadas para asegurar sostenibilidad • Ejemplos de los riesgos claves y medidas para su mitigación	• Documento e informes del Proyecto • PNUD, equipo de proyecto e interesados	• Análisis de los documentos y datos • Entrevistas con PNUD ; equipo de Proyecto y partes interesadas

Sostenibilidad financiera	¿Cómo el Proyecto abordó los temas de sostenibilidad financiera y económica? ¿Son sostenibles los costos recurrentes luego de la finalización del Proyecto?	• Nivel y fuente de respaldo financiero futuro que debe proporcionarse a actividades y sectores relevantes luego de la		
Sostenibilidad institucional	¿Existe evidencia de que los socios del Proyecto darán continuidad a las actividades más allá de la finalización del proyecto? ¿Las organizaciones y sus sistemas y procedimientos internos asimilaron positivamente los resultados de los esfuerzos realizados durante el período de ejecución del Proyecto? ¿Es adecuada la capacidad existente para garantizar la sostenibilidad de los resultados alcanzados hasta la fecha? ¿Están preparadas las instituciones que toman las decisiones para continuar mejorando su estrategia de eficiencia energética? ¿Se desarrollaron las capacidades relacionadas necesarias para la elaboración de leyes y su aplicación?	• El grado en que las instituciones u organismos locales han asumido o planean asumir los resultados y actividades del Proyecto • Prueba del compromiso del gobierno en la promulgación de leyes y asignación de recursos para contar con un marco regulatorio efectivo para S&L		
Sostenibilidad socio-económica y política	¿Cuál es el grado de compromiso político para continuar trabajando sobre los resultados del proyecto? ¿Existen incentivos adecuados para garantizar el sustento de los beneficios económicos y ambientales alcanzados durante el Proyecto?	• Ejemplos de contribuciones y de impactos socioeconómicos • Disponibilidad y accesibilidad a incentivos		

Criterios de evaluación	Preguntas de la evaluación	Indicadores de éxito	Fuente de datos	Método e instrumentos de recolección de datos
Rol Catalítico: ¿En qué medida el proyecto ha demostrado tener un rol catalítico en el país u otras áreas geográficas?				

Escalabilidad y replicabilidad	¿Se repitieron o aplicaron nacionalmente las actividades y los resultados del Proyecto? ¿La experiencia del Proyecto, ha brindado la posibilidad de obtener lecciones relevantes para otros proyectos futuros destinados a objetivos similares? ¿Cómo pueden influir la experiencia y las buenas prácticas del proyecto sobre las estrategias para el uso de mecanismos de eficiencia energética? ¿Cómo puede el país a partir de los éxitos y lecciones del proyecto, mejorar la posibilidad de impacto en iniciativas en curso y futuras?	• Ejemplos de lecciones aprendidas y buenas (o malas) prácticas • Recomendaciones para futuras direcciones e iniciativas	• Los datos e información recolectados en la evaluación • PNUD, equipo del Proyecto y partes interesadas	• Análisis de los datos • Entrevistas
Impacto: ¿En qué medida el proyecto ha logrado impactos o ha avanzado a alcanzar los efectos e impactos previstos? ¿Se han tenido efectos imprevistos o no deseados?				
Contribución al efecto	En qué medida el proyecto ha contribuido a los efectos del CPAP?	• Grado de contribución a los efectos	• Los datos e información recolectados en la evaluación • PNUD, equipo del Proyecto y partes interesadas	• Análisis de los datos • Entrevistas
Impactos	¿Cómo contribuye el Proyecto al impacto esperado: • En el medio ambiente global • En el bienestar económico del país • En otros asuntos socioeconómicos ¿Qué áreas o componentes del Proyecto han contribuido en mayor medida a los efectos de mediano y largo plazo?	• Cualificación y, si posible, cuantificación de los impactos		
Resultados no deseados	¿El Proyecto alcanzó o contribuyó a alcanzar algún resultado imprevisto o no deseado? ¿Cómo se gestionó?	• Ejemplos de resultados no deseados o imprevistos		

Annex IV

Example Questionnaire used for data collection

Modelo de Cuestionario utilizado para la recolección de datos

Relevancia:

1. ¿Es el Proyecto relevante al área de interés sobre cambio climático del GEF?
2. ¿En qué medida el Proyecto se corresponde con el Plan de Acción del Programa del Perú?
3. ¿Cómo apoya el Proyecto las prioridades ambientales y de desarrollo del Perú?
4. ¿El Proyecto toma en consideración las realidades nacionales ambientales (marco institucional y de políticas) y de la población (desigualdades o inequidades) tanto en la etapa de diseño como en su implementación?
5. ¿Existen vínculos lógicos entre el problema que se desea resolver, los resultados esperados del Proyecto y el diseño del Proyecto (en términos capacidad nacional, componentes del proyecto, elección de socios, estructura, mecanismos de implementación, alcance, presupuesto, uso de recursos, etc.)?

Efectividad

6. ¿Ha sido efectivo el Proyecto para alcanzar los resultados y objetivos previstos “Fortalecimiento de las capacidades nacionales para insertar temas de ambiente y uso eficiente de energía dentro de los planes de desarrollo nacionales y sistemas de implementación”?
7. ¿Qué obstáculos restan para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, o qué medidas aún tienen que tomar los interesados para alcanzar impactos continuos y beneficios para el medio ambiente?
8. ¿Consideró el Proyecto un enfoque de igualdad de género, derechos humanos con respecto a las actividades y resultados esperados?
9. ¿Fueron asignados recursos (financieros, humanos, de tiempo) para integrar la igualdad de género en el diseño, implementación y monitoreo del proyecto?
10. ¿En qué medida se gestionaron adecuadamente los riesgos y suposiciones?
11. ¿Cuáles fueron las principales dificultades, riesgos, oportunidades y desafíos relacionados con la implementación de las actividades y resultados de los diferentes componentes?
12. ¿Cómo se gestionaron; Gestión adaptativa?
13. ¿Cuál ha sido la calidad de las estrategias desarrolladas? ¿Fueron estas suficientes? ¿Qué métodos tuvieron éxito o no y por qué?
14. ¿Qué cambios podrían haber realizado (de haberlos) al diseño del Proyecto para mejorar el logro de los resultados esperados?
15. ¿Fue el apoyo al Proyecto provisto por el PNUD de forma eficaz y eficiente?
16. ¿Cómo ha sido la calidad de la ejecución por el Asociado en la Implementación?
17. ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de participación de las partes interesadas, beneficiarios y socios en el diseño del Proyecto?
18. ¿Cuáles alianzas / vínculos se han facilitado? ¿Cuáles pueden considerarse sostenibles?
19. ¿Qué mecanismos se implementaron para coordinar y articular el trabajo entre los distintos actores involucrados? ¿Fueron efectivos?
20. ¿En qué medida el marco lógico, los planes de trabajo, el plan de monitoreo y evaluación orientaron la gestión por resultados del Proyecto y apoyaron la toma de decisiones? ¿Se adaptaron estas herramientas para dotar de flexibilidad necesaria para el logro de los resultados?
21. ¿Se usó o necesitó el manejo adaptativo para asegurar un uso eficiente de los recursos?

22. ¿Los sistemas contables y financieros vigentes fueron adecuados para la gestión del Proyecto?
23. ¿Los fondos de co-financiamiento fueron aprovechados tal como fue planificado?
24. ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de apropiación de las partes interesadas y socios durante el diseño, la implementación del proyecto y sus resultados?

Eficiencia

25. ¿Se han entregado los productos o servicios oportunamente a los destinatarios?
26. ¿El cofinanciamiento sucedió según lo planeado?
27. ¿Fue la ejecución del proyecto tan efectiva como fue propuesta originalmente (planeado vs. actual)?
28. ¿Los recursos financieros fueron usados eficientemente? ¿Han podido usarse con mayor eficiencia?
29. ¿Lograron las adquisiciones realizadas un uso eficiente de los recursos del proyecto? ¿Pudieron usarse con mayor eficiencia? ¿Qué factores del mercado nacional han incidido en la entrega de los productos o servicios?

Sostenibilidad

30. Se repitieron o aplicaron nacionalmente las actividades y los resultados del Proyecto?
31. ¿La experiencia del Proyecto, ha brindado la posibilidad de obtener lecciones relevantes para otros proyectos futuros destinados a objetivos similares?
32. ¿Cómo pueden influir la experiencia y las buenas prácticas del proyecto sobre las estrategias para el uso de mecanismos de eficiencia energética?
33. ¿Cómo puede el país a partir de los éxitos y lecciones del proyecto, mejorar la posibilidad de impacto en iniciativas en curso y futuras?

Impacto

34. En qué medida el proyecto ha contribuido a los efectos del CPAP?
35. ¿Cómo contribuye el Proyecto al impacto esperado:
 - En el medio ambiente global
 - En el bienestar económico del país
 - En otros asuntos socioeconómicos
36. ¿Qué áreas o componentes del Proyecto han contribuido en mayor medida a los efectos de mediano y largo plazo?
37. ¿El Proyecto alcanzó o contribuyó a alcanzar algún resultado imprevisto o no deseado?
38. ¿Cómo se gestionó?

Annex V

MTR Rating Scales

MTR Rating Scales

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Source: Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP Supported, GEF Financed Projects

Annex VI

MTR mission activities

Actividades de la Misión del MTR

1. Itinerario de la Misión

La misión a Lima, Perú tuvo lugar del 19 al 25 de Julio de 2015¹⁶ de acuerdo al siguiente itinerario

Fecha	Lugar / Actividades
Julio 19	Viaje Buenos Aires – Lima
Julio 20 al 24 am	Reuniones en Lima con PNUD, Equipo de Proyecto y principales actores
Julio 24 pm	Reunión de Cierre de Misión del MTR y presentación de las Conclusiones Preliminares
Julio 25	Revisión de la información y datos recabados durante la misión
Julio 26	Viaje Lima – Buenos Aires

La misión a Lima permitió realizar la reunión formal de lanzamiento del MTR, mantener reuniones con los miembros del Equipo de Ejecución del Proyecto y personal a cargo del mismo en la oficina del PNUD de Perú así como realizar entrevistas presenciales con los principales actores, beneficiarios y otras partes interesadas. A su vez, al final de la misión se realizó la reunión de cierre de misión y presentación de las conclusiones preliminares.

2. Actividades realizadas

Tal como fuera previsto en el Programa de Trabajo presentado en el Informe de Iniciación del MTR, durante la misión a Lima tuvieron lugar las siguientes actividades:

- Reunión de lanzamiento formal del Proyecto
- Entrevistas con los principales actores del Proyecto
- Reuniones con el Equipo de Proyecto
- Reunión de Cierre de la Misión y presentación de Conclusiones Preliminares

3. Reunión de lanzamiento formal del MTR

La reunión de lanzamiento formal del MTR se llevó a cabo en las oficinas del PNUD el día 20 de Julio 2015 con los siguientes participantes:

- Sr. Jorge Alvarez Lam – Oficial de Programa de Medio Ambiente del Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD)
- Ing. Juan Olazábal Reyes– Coordinador Nacional del Proyecto - Ministerio de Energías y Minas (MINEM)
- Ing. Walter Carrasco Chacón – Especialista Técnico del Proyecto – MINEM
- Sta. Yudith Arzapolo Victorio – Administradora del Proyecto – MINEM

¹⁶ Previo al inicio de la misión se organizó una reunión virtual de lanzamiento del proyecto vía Skype con Jorge Alvarez Lam y Victoria Alegre del PNUD para acordar el plan de trabajo y ajustar el programa de entrevistas a realizar.

Durante la reunión, el Consultor MTR tomó contacto con el Oficial de Programa del PNUD y el Equipo de Trabajo del Proyecto con el fin de analizar el programa de entrevistas y reuniones previstas durante el transcurso de la misión y realizar los ajustes necesarios para garantizar que se cubrieran el mayor espectro de actores involucrados posible dejando suficiente tiempo para reuniones con el Equipo del Proyecto, así como, para la reunión de Cierre de la misión.

4. Reuniones con el Equipo de Proyecto

A lo largo de la misión el Consultor MTR tuvo oportunidad de mantener varias reuniones prolongadas con el Equipo de Proyecto con el propósito de:

- Explicar el propósito, objetivo y alcance del MTR
- Revisar la documentación del Proyecto a fin de identificar documentación adicional a la ya enviada al Consultor MTR con antelación a la misión que debería ser útil para la preparación del MTR
- Analizar la relevancia de la estrategia del Proyecto
- Examinar el desarrollo de las actividades ejecutadas así como aquellas en ejecución y la programación de actividades a futuro
- Analizar el progreso en el logro de los resultados con respecto a los indicadores de actividades incluidos en el marco lógico del Proyecto
- Evaluar la eficacia de los mecanismos de gestión
- Analizar aspectos relativos a la planificación del Proyecto en lo referente a demoras en la puesta en marcha y sus causas así como cambios propuestos y/o realizados a la programación inicial
- Examinar la gestión financiera del Proyecto y cambios producidos como resultado de revisiones presupuestarias
- Evaluar los sistemas de seguimiento y evaluación a nivel de proyecto
- Analizar los riesgos financieros, sociales o políticos, medioambientales y legales y regulatorios que pudieran afectar la sostenibilidad del Proyecto

5. Entrevistas con los principales actores del Proyecto

Durante el transcurso de la misión el Consultor MTR llevó a cabo una serie de entrevistas presenciales con los principales actores involucrados con el Proyecto. La agenda fue organizada en forma satisfactoria por el equipo del Proyecto conjuntamente con personal de PNUD y todos los entrevistados cumplieron con el cronograma establecido dando prueba de su interés en el Proyecto.

A continuación se detallan las instituciones, organismos y empresas del sector privado que fueron visitados por el Consultor MTR conjuntamente con la lista de personas entrevistadas en cada caso en el orden en el que se sucedieron las entrevistas:

- **Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual (INDECOPI)**
 - Dr. Abelardo Aramayo Baella
Secretario Técnico de la Comisión de la Competencia Desleal y Representante Titular del Comité Directivo del Proyecto
- **MINEM**
 - Msc. Rosa Luisa Ebentreich Aguilar

Directora de General de Eficiencia Energética y Directora Nacional del Proyecto

- **Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo (MINCETUR)**
 - Alejandro Bravo Martínez
Sub-Director de Integración Regional y Miembro Alterno del Comité Directivo del Proyecto
- **Ministerio de la Producción (PRODUCE)**
 - Ing. Graciela Lázaro Ortega
Especialista Ambiental – Dirección General de Asuntos Ambientales y Representante Titular del Comité Directivo del Proyecto
- **Ministerio del Ambiente (MINAM)**
 - José Antonio González Norris
Director – Oficina de Cooperación y Negociaciones Internacionales y Punto Focal GEF de Perú
 - Danilia Rojas Peves
Oficina de Cooperación y Negociaciones Internacionales
 - Giannina Ibarra Vázquez
Especialista en Gestión de Emisiones de GEI Sectoriales – Dirección General de Cambio Climático, Desertificación y Recursos Hídricos y Representante Titular del Comité Directivo del Proyecto
- **Superintendencia Nacional de Administración Tributaria**
 - Wilfredo Madera
 - Miguel Angel Jara Falcón
Representante Alterno del Comité Directivo del Proyecto
- **Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP)**
 - Ing. Raúl del Rosario
Coordinador del Area de Electricidad, Jefe del Laboratorio de Electricidad y consultor técnico del Proyecto para la elaboración de los Reglamentos Técnicos
- **INDURAMA**
 - Santiago León Tamariz
Gerente de Manufactura
 - Leslie Fajardo
- **Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas (MEF)**
 - Franco Maldonado Carlín
Consultor – Dirección General de Asuntos de Economía Internacional, Competencia y Productividad y Miembro Titular del Comité Directivo del Proyecto
- **Centro de Conservación de Energía y del Ambiente (CENERGIA)**
 - Msc. José Meza Segura
Gestión de la Energía – Area Técnica y consultor técnico del Proyecto para la elaboración del estudio de mercado
- **BSH Electrodomésticos S.A.C. (Bosch)**
 - Raúl Coronel
Presidente Ejecutivo y Gerente General Perú
 - Juan Marquina
Jefe de Laboratorio
 - Guillermo Romero
- **MT Industrial (SOLE)**

- o César Ayala
Gerente de Proceso
 - o Theresa Haro Román
Control de Calidad
 - o Katherine Zuñiga Ternero
Jefe Control de Calidad
- **Instituto Nacional de Calidad (INACAL)**
 - o Augusto Mello Romero
Director de Acreditación
 - o Cecilia Minaya

Annex VII

List of Documents Reviewed

Lista de documentos examinados

Para la realización de la evaluación se recopilaron y examinaron los siguientes documentos e información sobre el proyecto y su estado de avance y logros:

- **Recopilación de documentos e información del proyecto**

Previo al inicio de la misión a Lima se recopiló y analizó la siguiente documentación del proyecto:

- o Documento de Formulación del Proyecto (PIF)
- o Documento PRODOC del Proyecto
- o Informes de avance del Proyecto
- o Manual Operativo del Proyecto
- o Plan de Implementación del Proyecto (PIP)
- o Plan Operativo Anual del Proyecto (POA) 2012 al 2014
- o Informe Anual de Ejecución (PIR) 2012 al 2014
- o Revisiones de presupuesto,
- o Actas de reunión
- o Planes / reportes trimestrales

Durante la misión a Lima fue posible adicionar los siguientes documentos:

- o Ley N° 27 345 de Promoción del Uso Eficiente de la Energía y su reglamento
- o Plan Referencial del Uso Eficiente de la Energía 2009 - 2018
- o Política Energética Nacional del Perú 2010 – 2040
- o Reprogramación del presupuesto de 2014 y 2015
- o Normas y regulaciones legales
- o Informe de ejecución de fondos GEF y fondos de co-financiamiento
- o Informe del marco legal
- o Informe de reglamentos técnicos
- o Informe del estudio de mercado
- o PRODOC Proyecto de Nomas y Etiquetado de EE de Colombia
- o PRODOC Proyecto Transformación del mercado de iluminación en Perú

Annex VIII

Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: Alfredo Caprile

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): n.a.

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Buenos Aires, Argentina

on 14th September 2015

Signature:



Annex IX

Signed MTR final report clearance form

Signed MTR final report clearance form

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**Commissioning Unit**

Name:

Signature:

Date:

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name:

Signature:

Date: