

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Duty Station: UNDP Country Office, Pretoria
Category: Energy Efficiency, Standards and Labelling, Appliances
Type of Contract: Individual Contract (International Consultant)
Language Required: English
Application Deadline: 21 March 2019
Starting Date: 15 April – 01 July 2019
Expected Duration of Assignment: 25 days

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the: *'Market Transformation Through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labelling of Appliances in South Africa'* (PIMS 3277). The 5-year project commenced in November 2011 and was awarded two extension rounds until 31 March 2019. The project is implemented by the Department of Energy, through a project management unit.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Market Transformation Through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labelling of Appliances in South Africa			
GEF Project ID:	2692		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 3277	GEF financing:	4 375 000	4 375 000
Country:	South Africa	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Africa	Government:	4 766 408	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other SECO:	4 000 000	0
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	See below	Total co-financing:	4 766 408	
Executing Agency:	Department of Energy	Total Project Cost:	13 141 408	
Other Partners involved:	Department of Trade & Industry	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		1 November 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 October 2016	Actual: 31 March 2019

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project (*Market Transformation Through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labelling of Appliances in South Africa*) was designed to support the implementation of South Africa's Energy Efficiency Strategy, which set an overall energy intensity reduction target of 12% by 2015 and a 10% reduction in the residential sector. The Strategy identified a residential appliance Standards and Labelling (S&L) project as a major contributor towards the target. The project aims to address the policy, information, technology and financial barriers that were preventing the widespread introduction and uptake of efficient appliances.

The goal of the project is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions caused by household appliances' electricity consumption by facilitating a comprehensive market transformation for the South African market towards the use of energy efficient electrical appliances. This is to be achieved through the introduction of two regulations applicable to 12 residential electrical appliances, namely minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) and information labels. It has been estimated, that once in effect, the regulations could yield up to 388 GWh of electricity savings per annum, which is equivalent to 4.6Mt of CO₂. The objective of the GEF funding is to remove the most significant barriers impeding the uptake of energy efficiency appliances, and in so doing contribute materially towards the Strategy's targeted 10% reduction in residential energy consumption. The project had five outcomes:

1. Policy and regulatory framework for the S&L project
2. Define labelling specifications and MEPS thresholds for the 12 products considered for regulation
3. Strengthen the capacity of institutions and individuals involved in the S&L project
4. Awareness raising campaign
5. Implementation of Market Surveillance and Compliance regime to ensure performance standards are met
6. Development of Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity are met

The TE is limited to the GEF component of the project

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects². A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see [Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical

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

² <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf>

Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to South Africa, to visit the project sites jointly identified with the project manager. Interviews will be held with the following organizations at a minimum including: UNDP Country Office, Department Of Energy, Department of Trade and Industry, South African Bureau of Standards, National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications, Eskom, independent test laboratories, Consumer Goods Council, manufacturers and retailers.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								

Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.³

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in South Africa. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	<i>05 May 2019</i>
Evaluation Mission	13 days	<i>15 June 2019</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	<i>25 June 2019</i>
Final Report	2 days	<i>01 July 2019</i>

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

³ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will just be composed of 1 international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF processes and procedures;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
- A Master's degree in environmental sciences, climate change mitigation, energy engineering or other closely related field; PhD will be considered as an advantage

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
30%	Following submission of the preliminary report
40%	Following submission and receipt of the final draft report
20%	Following approval of the final draft report which has considered and incorporated comments

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online procurement.za@undp.org by **21 March 2019**. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete CV in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

UNDP-GEF TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

Note: The following is a template for the TE Team (the Consultant) to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS #)

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

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following UNDP Country Program Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Strength national capacities to achieve the goal of 10 % reduction of energy demand in the residential sector as stated in the National Energy Efficiency Strategy.					
Country Program Outcome Indicators: Progress reports on energy demand and CO2 emissions reduction.					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: To reduce South African's energy-related CO ₂					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: A strategic Market Transformation. 4.59 MtCO ₂ abated over the lifetime of the appliances					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Cumulative amount of GHG reduced in kilotons of CO ₂					
Strategy	Indicators	Baseline (Year 0)	Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Project Objective: Reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions caused by the electricity consumption of household appliances in South Africa by facilitating a comprehensive transformation of the home appliance market through the introduction of a combination of two regulatory tools – Minimum Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KWh of electricity demand reduction in the residential sector by year 5 of project implementation • Tons of CO₂ emissions reduction by year 5 of the project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average efficiency of most appliances sold in SA is lower than the previous European class G. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase awareness of energy efficiency • Increase market share of high efficient appliances • Reduce electricity demand by 4.41 TWh over the project time. • Reduce CO₂ emissions by 4.54 MtCo₂ over the project time and by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metering campaign • Consumers/retailers questionnaire surveys. • Sales data collection before and after the implementation of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong involvement of national agencies in the project • The objectives of the project remain in line with the South African Government objectives • In case these assumptions do not hold appropriate RBM approaches will be used to modify project activities as needed

Performance Standards and Information Labels (S&L) – and a series of associated awareness-building and monitoring activities.					
OUTCOME 1: Policy and regulatory framework for the S&L program: Strengthen structures and mechanisms for appliance energy efficiency standards and labels (S&L)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of applicable S&L implementing regulations gazetted and enacted • Evidence that relevant regulations are disseminated to key industry stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient policy/regulatory framework to implement S&L program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy/ institutional/ regulatory framework on energy efficient appliances is gazetted and enacted into law under the National Energy Act by end of 2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey of major stakeholders • S&L regulations to be circulated for public comment and then gazetted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major stakeholders (public and private) support the project objectives and adhere to the timeline for enactment of the regulations • This assumption will be ensured through formation of the stakeholder committee and regular consultations.
Output 1.1: Review of existing policies and regulations. Provide feedback and advice for any corrective or new action to be taken to reduce project risks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of stakeholders engaged in consultations • Ensure any other program (energy or environmental) is identified to avoid confusion amongst consumers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S&L Action plan developed by DoE & DTI • DoE to introduce law to allow for MEPS • DTI plans to develop enforcement regulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of stakeholders review S&L implementation regulations & approve final proposal of energy classes and MEPS thresholds. • S&L program extended to new set of products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder consultation reports • The new action plan that includes next set of products to be regulated under S&L programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders actively participate in the review of S&L implementation regulations • Appropriate consultative mechanisms will be put in place if this not hold
Output 1.2: Evaluation of financial incentives such as the rebate program operated by the Eskom DSM for purchasing efficient appliances. Development of new	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of existing rebate programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Eskom rebate program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase market share of efficient appliances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of efficient appliances sold due to the rebate program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentive programs are approved and effective • If these are not approved the MEPS will still be in place.

financial incentives if needed.					
OUTCOME 2: Define labeling specifications and MEPS thresholds for the 12 products considered by the DoE & DTI for S&L regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Energy classes and MEPS thresholds for the 12 products included in DoE & DTI action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labeling specifications and MEPS are unknown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By 2012, reach an agreement with stakeholders on energy classes and MEPS requirements for the 12 products included in DoE & DTI action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders consultation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders actively participate in providing market data and the review of the engineering /cost benefits analysis. Appropriate management responses will be devised if this assumption does not hold.
Output 2.1: Conduct market and engineering analysis for the products selected for S&L regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost benefits analysis conducted for the 12 products selected for S&L regulation Number of Market research and industry studies conducted. Market transformation benefits demonstrated to stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose energy classes and MEPS thresholds applicable for the South African market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering analysis reports Stakeholders consultation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High quality of market data International expertise available to train local experts on the analysis Appropriate management responses will be devised if this assumption does not hold.
Output 2.2: Adopt labeling specifications and MEPS thresholds for the 12 products selected for S&L regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labeling energy classes and MEPS adopted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of energy classes and MEPS thresholds Agreement with stakeholders on schedule to phase out inefficient appliances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders consultation reports Label affixed on products sold in SA Impact assessment analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders involved in the process Necessary legislation is drafted and enacted In case these assumptions do not hold appropriate RBM approaches will be used to modify project activities as needed
OUTCOME 3:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of institutions audited and capacities upgraded Number of staff trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation of testing facilities (public & private) and enforcement institution Adaptation of International/EU test procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit reports Trainings & workshops organized Validation of the conversion factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public sector funding to is made available to upgrade test facilities

Strengthen the capacity of institutions and individuals involved in the S&L program.			to the South African climatic and usage conditions when needed	proposed for the adaptation of test procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If not, private sector test lab engagement will be sought
Output 3.1: Strengthen institutions (testing facilities, enforcement institution...)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of testing facilities audited Number of testing facilities upgraded Number of testing facilities accredited Accreditation of enforcement institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade the existing facilities Ensure test facilities are operational, sufficient & available for compliance checking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National testing and enforcement institutions accredited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders involved in testing, compliance and enforcement procedures cooperate in the project
Output 3.2: Strengthen employee skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Necessary intergovernmental forums established to ensure coordinate effort Number of employees trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train the required number of people based on sales & number of units to be tested per year. Train all staff involved on testing and enforcement on accreditation requirements & constraints Adoption of conversion factors for testing considering the South African conditions Train the required number of inspectors for trade inspections and compliance checking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of staff trained on testing Number of staff trained on accreditation requirements South African test procedures updated with the conversion factors Stakeholders consultation reports Number of inspectors trained on MSC procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong cooperation between private and public institution on trainings and sharing experiences and lessons learnt Involvement of stakeholders on test procedures adaptation
OUTCOME 4:					
Awareness raising campaign for standards and labels, targeting manufacturers, distributors, retailers and end-users.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consumers and retailers become more aware of appliance energy efficiency standards and labels and retailers via sampling and surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 50% of consumers and retailers contacted (within the sample group) become more aware of appliance energy efficiency standards and labels and retailers provide evidence of marketing efforts to support the scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consumers and retailers survey Project implementation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retailers and consumers of appliances support the project objectives

Output 4.1. Test and adopt Label design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of dissemination activities offered to consumers and retailers • Number of consumers (particularly low incomes) and retailers covered by dissemination activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 50% of consumers and retailers contacted (within the sample group) are able to understand the meaning of the label and its benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumers survey results • Number of consumers responding to the questionnaire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer NGOs, retailers and research institutes involved in the program • Retail staff understand label & can explain it to consumers
Output 4.2. Develop communication campaign towards manufacturers, importers, distributors, retailers and consumers about appliances' energy efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of dissemination activities offered to each category • Number of people covered by dissemination activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statistically relevant sample of households will be drawn on to determine the market penetration & effectiveness of the project • Ensure consumers distinguish between MEPS & extra financial benefits of exceeding MEPS voluntarily. • At minimum the staff of top 10 manufacturers, distributors are aware about S&L programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer, manufacturers, distributors and retailers surveys. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication materials developed are of high-quality and appropriate for the given audiences targeted
Output 4.3. Develop and deliver training programs for distributors and retailers staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of trainings delivered. • Numbers of trainers involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retailers and distributors able to deliver S&L message to end-users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact assessment studies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong involvement of retailers and distributors
OUTCOME 5: Implementation of S&L Market Surveillance & Compliance (MSC) regime to ensure energy performance standards is met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSC procedures adopted and implemented • Number of models/product excluded from the S&L program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum number of products sold in the market (ratio TBD for each appliance type) which don't comply with the S&L requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of MSC activities will be covered by levies to be charged by NRCS on regulated products.
Output 5.1. Development of MSC procedures for regulated products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSC procedures adopted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of MSC procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders consultation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment from manufacturers side

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train NRCS staff on MSC activities and compliance procedures 		
Output 5.2. Integration of product energy performance compliance checking with local manufacturers and country pre-import inspections.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSC procedures implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop database of S&L products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of models/products excluded from the S&L program / year Number of site visits by inspectors / year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manufacturer / retailer contributions to database. Ensure database has integrity and that fields collected are relevant
OUTCOME 6: Development of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skilled South African professionals trained on M&E of energy projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All those skilled South African professionals trained demonstrate appropriate level of knowledge via 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project implementation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment of resources
Output 6.1. Replication of S&L program for new set of products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work plan to replicate the S&L for new set of products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend S&L program for other appliances and equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project implementation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experts adequately review the implementation of the program for the 1st set of products and suggest improvements
Output 6.2: Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation methodology for S&L programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of staff trained on M&E of S&L programs Launching of metering campaigns and data collection studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eskom has developed expertise on metering campaigns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make M&E activities part of the whole process Record lessons learnt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on end-use sales and energy use of appliances published 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consumers and retailers are willing to cooperate in data collection and questionnaire surveys

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

1. GEF project document (prodoc), CEO Endorsement letter, no-cost project extension letter
2. Mid-term evaluation
3. Project progress reports
4. Annual Work Plans
5. Relevant national standards and legislation for 12 appliances
6. Selected reports and studies undertaken during the duration of the project. PM to supply
7. GEF Tracking Tools at TE

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This list will be further detailed with specific questions by Country Office and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser, based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Has the project contributed to the wider understanding of adoption of EE appliances in public, private and residential facilities in South Africa			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Have mandatory MEPS been adopted?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Has a mandatory label been developed?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Is there physical evidence that manufacturers / retails shops are complying with the regulations?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Has public awareness around EE appliances increased in South Africa?			

• Is there evidence to suggest that the project has strengthened EE national EE policy and regulatory framework?			
• Is the project supported by a compliance mechanism? Is it effective?			
• Were the funds administered cost effectively and in accordance with UNDP and national guidelines			
• Has the sponsor (DoE) and the project partners actively supported the project?			
• To what extent will the responsible public institutions continue to have the political will, capacity and resources to implement MEPS			
• How secure is the long-term financial sustainability of the MEPS programme			
• Has there been increased awareness of MEPS among government institutions			
• Has there been increased awareness of MEPS among consumers			

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁴

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁶)
- 1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁷)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

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

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____