



Reference:	PIMS 4014/TMEEA
Country:	Turkey
Description of the Assignment:	International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of UNDP GEF Market Transformation of Energy Efficient Appliances in Turkey
Project:	PIMS 4014: Market Transformation of Energy Efficient Appliances in Turkey (EE Appliances) (PIMS 4014)
Period of Assignment/Services:	25 working days over the period from 1 September 2015 – 31 December 2015
Duty Station:	Home based (with 1 mission of 7 working days to Turkey) and 18 home-based days

*Proposal should be submitted by email to ic.proposal@undp.org.tr no later than **10 July 2015**, COB. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.*

1. Background

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 of Energy efficient Appliances in Turkey (EE Appliances)* (PIMS 4014).

For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

2. Scope of Work, Responsibilities and Description of the Proposed Analytical Work

For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

3. Requirements for Experience and Qualifications

Please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

4. Documents to be included when submitting the Proposals

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

- Personal CV, including past experience in similar projects and at least 2 references

- P11 Form
- Financial Proposal (please see Section 5 below and Annex II)

5. Financial Proposal

The interested individual consultants must submit their financial proposals by following the guidance and the standard template provided in Annex II. Any deviation from the standard text may lead to disqualification.

6. Evaluation

The evaluation will be based on cumulative analysis (i.e. technical qualifications and price proposal). The weight of the technical criteria is 70%; the weight of the financial proposal is 30%. Candidates that obtain a minimum of 70 pts out of a maximum 100 pts will be considered for the financial evaluation. Candidates that do not meet the minimum requirements will be disqualified.

Criteria	Maximum Points	Weight	Weighted Score
Technical	100	70%	70
General Qualifications	20	14%	14
General Professional Experience	30	21%	21
Specific Professional Experience	50	35%	35
Financial	100	30%	30

7. Annexes

The following annexes are an integral part of this procurement notice. In case of any conflict between the provisions of the Annex III and the procurement notice and/or Annex I and/or Annex II, the provisions of Annex III are applicable.

- Annex I: Terms of Reference
- Annex II: Price Proposal Guideline and Template
- Annex III: General Conditions of Contract for Individual Consultants

ANNEX I – TERMS OF REFERENCES

1. 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 of Energy efficient Appliances in Turkey (EE Appliances)* (PIMS 4014). The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Market Transformation of Energy Efficient Appliances in Turkey (EE Appliances)			
GEF Project ID:	4014		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00071137	GEF financing:	2,710,000	2,710,000
Country:	Turkey	IA/EA own:	20,000	20,000
Region:	RBEC	Government:	2,926,600	2,926,600
Focal Area:	CCM	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CC-SP1	Total co-financing:	2,946,600	2,946,600
Executing Agency:	DG for Renewable Energy under the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources	Total Project Cost:	5,656,600	5,656,600
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology; Turkish White Goods Manufacturers' Association; Arçelik A.Ş.	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		March 2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2015	Actual: December 2015

2. Objective and Scope

The objective of the project is to reduce the household electricity consumption and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of Turkey by accelerating the market transformation of less energy consuming building appliances.

This will be facilitated by a) strengthening the local institutional capacity to develop, adopt and implement effective appliance EE policies; b) developing and implementing a structured compliance

checking and enforcement program for appliance energy performance labels and standards; c) increasing consumer and the supply chain awareness and capacity to purchase / deliver energy efficient appliances in the Turkish market; and d) analysing and reporting the results of the project for further learning, adaptive management and, as applicable, replication in other countries.

Working together with its partners, the project has been 'implemented to achieve the following four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Enhanced institutional capacities in Turkey to develop and implement effective appliance EE policies;

Outcome 2: A structured enforcement and verification program with adequately trained staff and other resources;

Outcome 3: Raised awareness of the end-users and the supply chain and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers to develop and implement specific promotional activities to enhance the sale of energy efficient appliances;

Outcome 4: Institutionalization of the support provided by the project, including monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation.

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.

3. Evaluation approach and method

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

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

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

required to conduct one field mission to Ankara and Istanbul for a minimum of 7 full working days (not including travel days) to meet as many as possible of the project partners and stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, DG for Renewable Energy (Executing Agency),
- Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) – General Directorate of Industry and General Directorate of Safety and Inspection of Industrial Products Turkish White Goods Manufacturers’ Association (TURKBESD),
- Arçelik A.Ş.
- UNDP Turkey Country Office
- UNDP Project Manager and Project Team
- Project Managers of other UNDP GEF EE projects in Turkey,
- UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre – Regional Technical Advisor on Climate Change
- Turkish Standards Institute (TSE),
- Turkish Accreditation Agency (TURKAK)
- Universities (Ankara University, Bogazici University, Istanbul Aydin University, Kadir Has University, Ozyegin University)
- Ministry of Development
- Ministry of Finance
- Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (GEF OFP) Selected manufacturers of EE appliances in Turkey

In the event that a second 1-2 day mission to Ankara is required at the end of the assignment to present the final findings and report, the additional cost of this mission will be covered by the UNDP CO in case it is required.

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 final lessons learned study 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.

4. 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:	

5. 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	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

6. 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.

7. 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 as measured through the achievement of significant greenhouse gas emission reductions, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

8. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

9. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Turkey with the advice and support of the UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre. 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.

10. Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 working days (of which a minimum of 7 working days will take place in Turkey) according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Estimated Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	<i>September 2015</i>
Evaluation Mission	7 days	<i>September-October 2015</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	13 days	<i>November 2015</i>
Final Report	2 days	<i>December 2015</i>

11. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

Mission to Turkey	Travel to Turkey for meetings with all project stakeholders	September-October 2015	UNDP CO to arrange travel and accommodation for the Evaluator
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 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.

12. Place of Work

Place of work for the assignment is home-based with various travels in Turkey depending on the project needs and the duties and responsibilities of the consultant. It is estimated that one mission of up to seven working days will be needed to Ankara and/or Istanbul. The seven working days in Ankara and/or Istanbul do not include travel days which should be outside of the 7 FULL working days to be spent in Ankara and/or Istanbul. The timing and duration of all missions are subject to the pre-approval of UNDP.

The travel and accommodation costs of all missions will be borne by UNDP. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
- Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item is subject to the following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
- covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

13. QUALIFICATIONS and SKILLS

The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects either for UNDP or for other international organizations. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage but is not a requirement. The International Evaluator will be responsible for finalizing the report following comments from UNDP and other stakeholders. The International Evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation of the project and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- At least a first degree in science or engineering with minimum six years of relevant energy related M&E professional experience or related field
- Demonstrated technical knowledge in energy efficiency, in particular of household appliances and experience working on technical assistance projects related to energy efficiency
- Previous experience in evaluating technical assistance projects for international organizations, including GEF projects
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
- Have exemplary written and oral communication skills in English, be fully IT literate
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on energy efficiency;
- Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures is an asset.
- Fluent in English both written and spoken.

14. Evaluator Ethics

The International Evaluation Consultant 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 [UNEP 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#).

15. Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
20%	Approval of Inception Report by UNDP Turkey
50%	Approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
30%	Approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective of the project: Reduction of household electricity consumption and related greenhouse gas emissions of Turkey by accelerating and ensuring the market transformation towards more energy efficient appliances.	The estimated stock and annual sale of different energy classes of the appliances selected for monitoring	Depending on the product category, an estimated 17% reduction or 89% increase of the average UEC by 2013 compared to the 2007 level	Depending on the product category, 2-28% reduction of the average UEC by 2013 compared to the estimated baseline development ³	The market monitoring system and reports produced in the frame of the project	Adequate data will be available from the market
	Household electricity consumption trend	Continuing increase of the total electricity consumption of the targeted appliances	Stabilizing or reducing the total electricity consumption of the targeted appliances	Calculations on the basis of the available market data and assumed baseline development	See above
	Amount of reduced CO ₂ emissions compared to the projected baseline	Zero	Estimated min. 1.7 tons of incremental reduction of CO ₂ (with a causality factor of 60%) by the appliances sold during the project	Official energy statistics	See above
Outcome 1: <i>Enhanced</i>	<i>The content and status of new policies and</i>	<i>Insufficient implementation of</i>	<i>New legal and regulatory provisions and supporting</i>	Official publications	Continuing commitment of

³ See section IV, part V for further details

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<i>institutional capacities in Turkey to develop and implement effective appliance EE policies.</i>	<i>programs supporting their implementation</i>	<i>policies and programs to support enhancement of appliance energy efficiency</i>	<i>compliance checking, enforcement and outreach programs adopted that reflect international "best practices"</i>	and project's midterm and final evaluations	the key public authorities and government entities to develop and implement effective appliance S&L policies.
Output 1.1 Enhanced capacity of public authorities to implement and monitor the impact of the adopted S&L related laws and regulations, and assess the impact, applicability and required implementation support of possible new regulations and policies.	The status and type of capacity building provided	Insufficient awareness and supporting studies to assess the applicability and required implementation support of new regulations and policies, and monitor and assess the impact of the existing ones	<p>Trained staff and supporting studies to assess the applicability and required implementation support of new regulations and policies, and to monitor and assess the impact of the existing ones.</p> <p>Specific sub-targets include, among others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an assessment report combining a GHG emission reduction and cost benefit analysis; - review of the existing EE appliance program; - review of the new regulations proposed under the EU Ecodesign Directive and acceleration of their transposition in Turkey, including new S&L requirements for TV sets not subject to any S&L 	Project progress report	Willingness of the targeted public authorities to benefit from the training and the supporting studies.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			<p>schemes yet in Turkey;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - finalized training curricula and modules/ materials; - delivered training on adopted policies (At least 5 trainings for 20 participants per training); - delivered training on eco-design (at least 5 trainings for 20 participants per training); - participation in international and national workshops, meetings and study tours (at least 10 technical persons per year). 		
Output 1.2 A structured market monitoring system	Availability of required data	No accurate market information available for public use.	Regularly updated data on annual sale of different appliances per energy classes available for public use (with finalized market monitoring methodology and established system with Association of Manufacturers)	Project progress reports	Concluded agreements with the manufacturers and the retail chain to submit the required data
Output 1.3 Agreements with the private sector on the implementation of voluntary agreements and/or specific promotional	Status of complementary promotional measures	No specific promotional campaigns or incentive schemes to accelerate the phase out of old or otherwise inefficient appliances.	At least 2 consultation workshops and concluded agreements for specific promotional campaigns and/or incentive schemes for at least two appliances.	Project progress reports	Willingness of the key stakeholders to support the proposed measures, incl. the availability of adequate financial

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
campaigns and incentives schemes, for instance, for the accelerated replacement of old inefficient appliances.					resources.
Outcome 2: A structured enforcement and verification program with adequately trained staff and other resources	<i>The rate of compliance checked by random samples taken from the market and random visits to the retail stores</i>	<i>An inadequate verification and enforcement scheme in place to ensure compliance.</i>	<i>Over 90% compliance of the random product samples and visits to the retail stores.</i>	Specific market surveillance reports	Continued commitment of the key public authorities to implement such program.
Output 2.1 A finalized proposal for a strengthened compliance checking and enforcement scheme both for products and the retailers.	Status of the proposal	A need to develop a well elaborated and comprehensive proposal for a strengthened compliance checking and enforcement program.	Finalized proposal for a strengthened compliance checking and enforcement scheme both for products and the retailers (addressing also the required legal amendments to effectively follow-up non-compliance)	Project progress report	See above
Output 2.2 Agreed and upgraded procedures and organizational arrangements for testing of products	Status of the agreement	No agreed procedures and organizational arrangements at the national level for testing of products	Agreed and upgraded procedures and organizational arrangements for testing of products	Project progress report	See above

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 2.3 <i>Testing the agreed compliance checking and enforcement schemes for all targeted (6) appliances in selected locations.</i>	Status of the pilot project	The agreed programs, procedures and organizational arrangements not tested before their adoption	The agreed programs, procedures and organizational arrangements tested for all targeted (6) appliances before their broader adoption	Project progress report and a separate evaluation report of the pilot(s)	See above
Output 2.4 <i>Trained staff of both the selected testing laboratories and MoIT's branch offices to implement the compliance checking program.</i>	The amount and type of training provided	No training available	Specific training courses and/or on-the-job training delivered as per the annual work plans, including training the state inspectors on compliance (estimated 10 trainings for 20 participants per training event) and training on testing of products (estimated 2 trainings for 30 participants per training event).	Project progress reports	Willingness of the targeted stakeholders to benefit from the training.
Outcome 3: <i>Raised awareness of the end-users and the supply chain and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers to develop and</i>	<i>The priority of different criteria used by the targeted clients in their purchasing decisions</i>	<i>Less emphasis among the consumers and sales personnel on energy efficiency aspects and life cycle costs when purchasing and marketing new</i>	<i>Beside the initial purchasing price, energy efficiency and life-cycle costs have become a key criteria for purchasing decisions.</i>	Consumer surveys	Pay-back of the higher EE appliances attractive enough for the consumers or supported by other product characteristics

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<i>implement specific promotional activities to enhance the sale of energy efficient appliances.</i>		<i>appliances.</i>			such as higher overall quality, more attractive design etc.
Output 3.1 Completed surveys to assess the level of awareness and key “drivers” of the consumers for the purchase of different products in prior and after the campaign	Status of surveys	Insufficient information on the level of awareness and preferences of the consumers in their purchasing decisions (as it relates to EE aspects) for effectively designing and monitoring the impact of the marketing campaigns	Completed consumer surveys with at least 1500 questionnaires per survey.	Project progress reports	
Output 3.2 Joint marketing campaigns with the manufacturers and retail chain (with related material for advertising and in-store use) highlighting the energy efficiency aspects and the life-cycle costs approach.	Delivery and availability of the marketing material	Insufficient focus and material on energy efficiency aspects in marketing	Delivery of joint marketing campaigns with the manufacturers and retail chain highlighting the EE aspects and the life-cycle costs approach, including, as applicable, booklets, billboards, newspaper advertisements, TV spots, flyers, internet etc.	Project progress reports	Continuing interest of the manufacturers and retail chain to co-operate with and cost-share such marketing campaigns

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 3.3 A web site to support consumer's choice with test results and other product information, pricing, easy to use calculation tools etc. with an emphasis on energy efficiency	Impact of the content of the website in consumers purchasing decisions	No website with regularly updated content on product information and its comparison available	Over 20% of the interviewed consumers in stores considering the purchase of a new appliance are aware of and have found the content of the website useful.	Project progress reports In-store surveys	Interest of the manufacturers and retail chain to co-operate in the development and assessment of the impact of the website.
Output 3.4 Trained sales staff in the retail chain (complemented, as applicable, by specific incentives such as premiums for the sales personnel for the sale of EE products) to market the products on the basis of their energy performance and related life-cycle costs beside other characteristics.	Emphasis on EE aspects in the marketing strategy of the retail chain. As applicable, disbursement rate of the incentives for the sales personnel to market EE products.	Relatively low emphasis on energy efficiency aspects in the marketing strategy of the retail chain.	Energy efficiency and life-cycle cost reduction aspects highlighted in the marketing strategy of the retail chain	Review of the in-store marketing material Test visits in the retail stores	Interest of the managers and sales staff of the retail chain to benefit from the training.
Output 3.5 Specific promotional campaigns to expedite phase-out	Status and the delivery rate of the campaigns	No specific promotional campaigns to expedite phase-out of old inefficient	Reaching at least 50% of the stated target of the campaigns, as measured by the delivery rate of the promotional measure	Monitoring reports and final evaluation of the impact	Interest of the Gov't, manufacturers and retail chain to co-

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
of old inefficient appliances, including, as applicable, specific financial incentives and/or utility (DSM) driven delivery and financing models.		appliances	used.	of the campaigns initiated.	operate in the development, organization and financing of the campaign.
OUTCOME 4: Institutionalization of the support provided by the project, including monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation.	<i>The status of recommendations contributing to institutional sustainability.</i> <i>The level of information available for adaptive management and for measuring the impact of the project.</i>	<i>Insufficient institutional mechanisms in place to ensure sustainability of project results.</i> <i>Insufficient information for adaptive management and for measuring the impact of the project.</i>	<i>Project recommendations to ensure institutional sustainability adopted and implemented.</i> <i>Adequate information available for adaptive management and measuring the impact.</i>	Project final evaluation Annual project reports	Successful completion of the prior project activities
Output 4.1 An updated baseline study, against which the impact of the project can be measured.	Status of the report.	Insufficient or outdated baseline information.	An updated baseline study finalized.	Project reports	Adequate data will be available from the market
Output 4.2 Energy	The level of inclusion of appliance energy	Appliance energy efficiency aspects	Appliance energy efficiency aspects increasingly included	Project reports and final	Interest of the

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
efficiency aspects increasingly included into the curricula of relevant educational institutions.	efficiency aspects into the curricula of relevant educational institutions.	insufficiently covered by the current curricula	into the curricula of the relevant educational institutions, with a specific course on appliance energy efficiency in at least one university. Research studies related to the topic of the project started and completed in Turkish universities	evaluation	identified educational institutions to co-operate with the project.
Output 4.3 Further elaboration of the possible financial support mechanisms to accelerate the market shift towards more energy efficient appliances, including, as applicable, carbon financing	The type of financing available for covering the incremental investment costs of energy efficient appliances	No particular financing mechanisms available to reduce the eventual incremental investment cost barrier in purchasing energy efficient appliances.	Identified or established financial support mechanisms continue to promote the purchase of energy efficient appliances at and after the end of the project. Organized stakeholder meetings to discuss the possible financial instruments and mechanisms (at least 5 meetings with banks and other financial institutions).	Final evaluation	Interest of the identified key stakeholders on financing to co-operate and invest in the promotion of energy efficient appliances.
Output 4.4 Final project report consolidating the results and lesson learnt from the implementation of the different project components and	Status of the final report	No consolidation of the results and lessons learnt.	Final project report consolidating the results and lesson learnt from the implementation of the project.	Project progress reports and final evaluation	Ongoing monitoring and recording of the impact of the project and barriers faced.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
recommendations for the required next steps.					
Output 4.5 Project mid-term and final evaluations and other required reviews.	Status of the mid-term and final evaluation	Inadequate information for adaptive management.	Finalized mid-term and final evaluations	Project progress reports	Adequate monitoring, reporting and filing of the key documents during implementation to facilitate external reviews and evaluations.

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

Project Documents

- Project document and its annexes;
- Midterm evaluation (MTE) and other relevant evaluations and assessments;
- Annual work plans endorsed by Steering Committee;
- Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs – CDR;
- Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR);
- Minutes of Steering Committee Meetings;
- Project consultant reports;
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Steering Committee, and other partners to be consulted;
- Project informative materials, knowledge products and technical reports all available on project website;
- Other upon request.

UNDP Documents

- Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF Documents

- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
Does the project's objective fit within the priorities of the local government and local communities? Does the project's objective fit within Turkey's national biodiversity conservation priorities? Does the project's objective fit GEF strategic priorities and operational principles? Does the project's objective support implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity? Other MEAs?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Is the project objective likely to be met? To what extent and in what timeframe? What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement? Is adaptive management being applied to ensure effectiveness? Is monitoring and evaluation used to ensure effective decision-making?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Is the project cost-effective? Are expenditures in line with international standards and norms for development projects? Are management and implementation arrangements efficient in delivering the outputs necessary to achieve outcomes? Was the project implementation delayed? If so, did that affect cost-effectiveness? What is the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation? To what extent is the project leveraging additional resources?			

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends?			
Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained?			
Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained?			
To what extent are the project results dependent on socio-political factors?			
To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?			
Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

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.

- 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
 - Relevant final stage GEF Tracking Tool
 - 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 Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____



ANNEX II – PRICE PROPOSAL GUIDELINE and TEMPLATE

The prospective Consultants should take the following explanations into account during submission of his/her price proposal.

- The lump sum price proposal should be indicated in US Dollars (USD).
- The price proposal should be indicated in gross terms and hence should be inclusive of costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa (if needed) etc.
- Assignment related travel and accommodation costs will be borne by the UNDP and should not be included within the price proposal.
- The cost and terms of reimbursement of all travel authorized by UNDP for Individual Contractors must be negotiated prior to travel.
- The cost of travels of the consultant may either be;
 - Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
 - Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following **constraints/conditions** provided in below table;
 - covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

- UNDP will not make any further clarification on costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa etc. It is the applicants' responsibility to make necessary inquiries on these matters.
- Please (a) copy the below text into a word processor, (b) indicate your price proposal as explained above, (c) do not change any part of the standard text (changing the standard text may lead to disqualification), (d) sign the document, (e) scan the signed version of the price proposal, and (f) send it as an attachment back to UNDP.



Price Proposal Submission Form

To: United Nations Development Programme

Ref: International Terminal Evaluation Consultant

Dear Sir / Madam,

I, the undersigned, offer to provide Professional Consulting Services as an Individual Contractor, to carry out the duties spelled out in the attached Terms of Reference for the lump sum of US\$ for 25 working days, of which I understand that the minimum number of working days to be spent in Turkey during the assignment is 7 full working days with a daily consultancy rate of..... US\$. Having examined, understood and agreed to the Procurement Notice and its annexes, the receipt of which are hereby duly acknowledged, I, the undersigned, offer to deliver professional services, in conformity with Annex I (Terms of Reference) of the Procurement Notice.

My ***lump sum price proposal*** for the Assignment is: USD

I confirm that my financial proposal will remain unchanged. I also confirm that the price that I quote is **gross**, and is inclusive of all legal expenses, including but not limited to social security, income tax, pension, visa etc., which shall be required applicable laws.

I agree that my proposal shall remain binding upon me for 60 days.

I understand that you are not bound to accept any proposal you may receive.

[Signature]

Date:

Name:

Address:

Telephone/Fax:

Email: