

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (NATIONAL CONSULTANT)

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 Promoting Renewable Energy in Mae Hong Son Province (PIMS #3908)'.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Promoting Renewable Energy in Mae Hong Son Province			
GEF Project ID:	3908		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00059287 (UNDP output ID)	GEF financing:	2,712,700.00	
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government :		
Focal Area:	Energy	Other (UNDP):		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	UNDP Thailand	Total Project Cost:	2,712,700.00	
Other Partners involved:	Office of the Governor, MHS Province Provincial Energy Office , MHS Province Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency (DEDE), MHS Province	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		23 December 2010
		Operational Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 December 2017	Actual:

PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

The Project Objective is “to overcome barriers to the provision of Renewable Energy (RE) services in integrated provincial renewable energy programmes in Thailand”. This will contribute to the broader Goal of reducing GHG emissions in Thailand. Importantly, it will also contribute to the Goal of Thailand’s GEF strategy, which is to mobilize GEF resources in support of the implementation of Sufficiency Economy principles, as enshrined in the 10th National Economic and Social Development Plan.

Following a Mid-Term-Review (MTR) in Q3 of 2013, significant changes were made to the project framework and the implementation modality. In the second phase of the project the focus is more on off-grid renewable energy applications and the project implementation modality is Direct Implementation (DIM).

The second phase of the project aims at facilitating an integrated RE planning process at provincial and local level, in order to translate targets set at national level to local level and into real action. The four components of the project focus on (a) institutional capacity development for planning and implementing RE programmes; (b) access to financing; (c) technical training and education and (d) policies for up-scaling and replication.

In order to realize the project objective, the project was designed to comprise of four components, each of which addressing a specific category of barriers to renewable energy development in MHS. The project components and outputs for the remaining period of the project are:

Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional, organizational and social capacity results in planning, management and implementation of integrated RE programmes in MHS	
Output 1.1	Strengthened capacities, mobilization and co-ordination mechanisms for integrated RE planning in MHS
Outcome 2: Financially sustainable RE systems operational in MHS	
Output 2.1	Awareness raised of all stakeholders involved in RE projects regarding social, economic and environmental costs and benefits of RE systems
Output 2.2	Grid-linked RE systems established consistent with integrated provincial development plans
Output 2.3	Off-grid renewable energy electrical systems to local communities established
Output 2.4	Non-electrical renewable energy promoted
Outcome 3: Technical support is available locally for the development, management and maintenance of RE applications in MHS	
Output 3.1	Completed trainings in maintenance and repair of RE systems
Outcome 4: Policies facilitate up-scaling and replication of RE systems in Thailand	
Output 4.1	Lessons learned documented and disseminated to policy makers and included in national policies
Output 4.2	Centre of learning in MHS promoting RE as part of the Sufficiency Economy established

The RE technology focussed during the second phase of the project has 7 items:

1. Off-grid micro-hydropower
2. On-grid solar farm
3. Solar home system (SHS) rehabilitation and solar lanterns
4. Improved cookstoves (ICS)
5. Provincial integrated RE planning
6. Solar rooftop and Energy Efficiency measures in government buildings
7. Biodigesters

Described in the Addendum of the Project Document that at the end of the second phase of the project, the following are the expected outcomes on the ground:

- 1 on-grid solar farm project approved, installed and operational (500 kW);
- 100 SHS rehabilitated (100*120 Wp);
- 200 solar lanterns sold (200*2.5W);
- 20 additional biodigesters at schools, SMEs and farms installed and operational;
- 2 off-grid hydropower plants approved, installed and operational (2*30 kW);

- 10 solar rooftop systems approved, installed and operational (10*200 W);
- 1 EE project in gov. building approved, implemented and operational (RE capacity 600 W savings);
- 10 villages in which ICS have been tried out and being used in MHS by end of 2016 (50 systems).
- Direct reduction of GHG emissions due to operation of these systems is about 14,216 tonnes CO2.

IN 2016, due to development complexities on the ground, several project results were modified. These included the unattained micro-hydro power (MHP), solar farm and solar rooftop. Below are the new agreed results for the 2017 project extension period endorsed by the Project Board on 25 May 2016, and later by UNDP CO and the regional office on 14 November 2016:

RE Technology	New Outputs/Results
Solar farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify to solar PV system; • Install the solar PV system to 1-2 off-grid school(s) and 1-2 local/ district hospital(s); • Number of the target schools and capacity of the system to be installed will depend on the needs, technical requirements and the remaining budget of the solar farm (around THB 1.5 million).
SHS rehabilitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support 60 systems of SHS rehabilitation in remote/ border communities to be implemented by the Army's RE Operation Unit of the 17th Infantry Regiment Task Force in MHS (in addition to the achieved result of 103 systems) with provision of operation and maintenance trainings to village technicians/ house owners.
Solar PV rooftops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install a grid-connected solar PV system to 1-2 local/ district hospitals with EE measures & other RETs (i.e. solar water boiler), if needed, using budget from the remaining budget of the solar farm activity; • Install & revitalize solar PV system to additional 2-3 off-grid schools (in addition to the modified ones from solar farm activity); • Support 50% start-up investment fund of solar PV rooftop installation cost to individual SME/ hotel (8-11 kWp); other RETs can be considered, if appropriate; • Support & facilitate the installation by reusing abandoned solar PV panels to at least 1 government building (1-3 kWp); • Increase 20-50 kWp generation capacity to the current 4.5 kWp at the provincial hospital system, depending on the project budget.
ICS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support additional 200 units of ICS to 5 ethnic & watershed communities in an exchange to a community reforestation activity (in addition to the achieved result of 130 units).
Biodigesters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support additional 6 units to individual farms, with the same operational model, trainings & start-up investment fund, follow-up/ after sales service (in addition to the achieved result of 30 systems).
Other RETs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore & install other RETs such as solar water boiler & chiller in government building with technologically suited to local needs.
RE financial support model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch crowdsourcing on solar lanterns, solar PV system for hospitals, ICS.

The total project budget is USD. US\$ 2,712,700.

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 projects 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 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 expected to conduct a field mission to Thailand including the project sites in Mae Hong Son (MHS) province.

At the project sites, key stakeholders include MHS Provincial Office, MHS Provincial Energy Office, the local governments, schools and communities should be interviewed.

Interviews will be held with the following personnel and organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Representative of Responsible Parties, including:

- Governor of MHS
- Chief of MHS Provincial Office
- Chief of MHS Provincial Energy Office
- Members of the Project Board
- Chiefs of Tambon (sub-district) Administrative Organizations (local governments)
- Directors of school, hospitals
- Representatives from target communities
- Representative from the key service provider of the project

Project Team

- Project Manager
- Project Field Officer
- Project Assistant

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

UNDP Country Office in Bangkok in-charge of this project. UNDP:

- BRH Regional Technical Specialist,
- IGSD/ UNDP Thailand Programme Manager

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. The full scope methods used in the evaluation are at the discretion of the evaluator(s), but a mixed method of document review, interviews, and direct observations should be employed, at a minimum. The TE inception report and TE report should explain all the evaluation methods used in detail.

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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA & EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
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	Planned	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 environment, governance, 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.²

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 Thailand. 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

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](#)

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 19 days over a time period from 1 September to 30 November 2017 according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Tentative Period
Preparation	4 working days	<i>11-14 September 2017</i>
Evaluation Mission	7 working days (Monday-Friday); per diem will be paid on working days and over the weekends.	<i>9-13 October 2017 and 16-17 October 2017; Note: 17 October 2017 (debriefing at UNDP CO)</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	5 working days	<i>23-27 October 2017</i>
Final Report	3 working days	<i>20-22 November 2017</i>

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: <i>15 September 2017</i>	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: <i>17 October 2017</i>	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 1 week after the evaluation mission: <i>30 October 2017</i>	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: <i>23 November 2017</i>	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. See [Annex H](#) for an audit trail template.

DUTY STATION

Home-based with travel to Bangkok and Mae Hong Son, Thailand

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *an international and a national evaluator*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. 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 team members must present the following qualifications:

A. INTERNATIONAL LEAD CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-Graduate in energy, environmental studies, engineering, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (15%)
- Minimum of 8 years accumulated and recognized experience in the field of energy policy, rural energy development planning, sustainable development (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)
- Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of Promoting Renewable Energy in Mae Hong Son Project is an advantage (5%).
- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported renewable energy, sustainable realization and utilisation of RE technologies (10%)
- Comprehensive knowledge of international best practices in renewable energy, poverty reduction and sustainable development (15%)
- Excellent written English (15%)

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review
- Leading the TE Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Terminal Evaluation Report

B. NATIONAL CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-graduate in energy, environmental studies, engineering, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (15%)
- Minimum of 5 years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)

- Eight (8) years of project development and implementation (15%)
- Some project management experience in energy, environment, and sustainable development (10%) would be an advantage.
- Multilateral and bilateral funded project development and implementation (10%)
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects (20%)
- Excellent in written and spoken English (10%)

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

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

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of inception report
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template³ provided by UNDP;
- b) CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form⁴);
- c) Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the

³ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psd/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by CoB 25 April 2017. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (REVISED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX DURING 2016 PIR)

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions
Overall Goal: The reduction of GHG emissions in Thailand					
Project Objective: To overcome barriers to the provision of Renewable Energy (RE) services in integrated provincial renewable energy programmes in Thailand					
Project Objective 1:	Increase of power generation capacity and usage from RE systems in MHS both on-grid and off-grid	RE power generation capacity in MHS amounts to 29,220 MW (on grid) and 255 kW (off-grid).	By the end of the project RE power generation capacity in MHS amounts to 29,720 MW (on grid) and more than 315 kW (off- grid). Additional RE power generation capacity of 500 kW (solar farm) and 60 kW (off grid hydro) and several solar applications realized.	Project Reports, DEDE statistics	Economic growth in the country will continue
Project Objective 2:	Models for RE generation & application which can be replicated in other areas demonstrated.	No new models for RE generation & application.	At least 3 new models for RE generation & application developed and operational. Models ready to be replicated in other areas (hydro, solar and biodigesters)	Project Reports, DEDE statistics	Government support for RE development and utilization will not change
Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional, organizational and social capacity results in planning, management and implementation of integrated RE programmes in MHS	1) No. of RE projects proposed by government agencies in line with provincial plan	0	At least 2 RE projects proposed by government agencies in line with provincial plan	Project reports, meeting reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued government support for RE - Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects
	2) No. of working RE management models established	0	At least 3 management models established (off-grid hydro, biodigesters, solar)		
Outcome 2: Financially sustainable RE systems operational in MHS	3) No. of on-grid solar farm projects approved, installed and operational in MHS by end of 2016	3 (total 2,880 kW – June 2014)	1 additional on-grid solar farm project approved, installed and operational in MHS by end of 2016 (capacity 500 kW)	Project reports, approval documents, surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued government support and support from communities for RE

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions
					- Capacity of government and communities does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and implementation of RE projects
	4) No. of SHS rehabilitated in MHS by end of 2016	0	100 SHS rehabilitated in MHS by end of 2016 (100*120 Wp)		
	5) No. of solar lanterns sold in MHS by end of 2016	0	200 solar lanterns sold in MHS by end of 2016 (200*2.5W)		
	6) No. of biodigesters installed at schools, SMEs and farms in MHS by end of 2016 with support from project	33 (at SMEs/hh – June 2014)	20 additional biodigesters at schools, SMEs and farms installed and operational in MHS by end of 2016 with support from project (average size 8 m3)		
	7) No. of off-grid micro-hydropower projects approved, installed and operational in MHS by end of 2016	9 (255 kW – June 2014)	2 off-grid hydropower plants approved, installed and operational in MHS by end of 2016 (2*30 kW)		
	8) No. of solar rooftop installations approved, installed and operational in MHS by end of 2016	0	10 solar rooftop systems approved, installed and operational in MHS by end of 2016 (with support from the project) (10*200 W)		
	9) No. of EE projects in gov. buildings approved, implemented and operational in MHS by end of 2016	0	1 EE project in gov. building approved, implemented and operational in MHS by end of 2016 (RE capacity 600 W savings)		
	10) No. of villages in which ICS have been tried out	0	10 villages in which ICS have been tried out and being used in MHS by end of 2016 (50 systems)		

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions
	and are being used in MHS by end of 2016				
Outcome 3: Technical support is available locally for the development, management and maintenance of RE applications in MHS	11) No. of village technicians trained to operate and maintain off-grid hydropower plants	0	4 village technicians trained to operate and maintain off-grid hydropower plant by end of 2016	Project reports, training evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued government support for RE - Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects
	12) No. of village technicians trained to maintain rehabilitated SHS	No knowledge (center) or experts easily available	10 village technicians trained to maintain rehabilitated SHS by end of 2016		
	13) No. of technicians trained on EE measures and solar rooftop installation	0	2 government technicians trained on EE measures and solar rooftop installation		
	14) No. of users trained in the operation and maintenance of biodigesters	0	20 users of biodigesters trained to operate and maintain the systems		
	15) An improved design of an ICS suitable for situation in MHS	0	Improved design for ICS suitable for MHS finalized		
Outcome 4: Policies facilitate up-scaling and replication of RE systems in Thailand	16) Documented and published experiences/lessons learned from all technologies implemented by end of 2016	0	By end of 2016 all lessons learned documented and published	Project reports, Centre of learning reports and lessons learned report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient annual replenishment of RE development and investment funds - Capacity of government does

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions
	17) Center of learning approved and operational in MHS by end of 2016	0	Center of learning approved and operational by end of 2016		not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects
	18) Guidelines published No. of lessons learned included in policy making at central level	0	At least 2 guidelines for replication published e.g. a) on management models for off-grid applications b) incentive schemes/financial model for RE		
	19) Lessons learned documented	0	At least 2 important lessons learned included in policy making at central level		

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

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)

Project Implementation Plan

Implementing/Executing partner arrangements

List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted

Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

Mid Term Review (MTR) Report

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports

Project budget and financial data

Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points

UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

For the sample evaluation criteria matrix, please refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

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"> • Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project relevant the GEF climate change focal area? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project relevant to Thailand’s environment and sustainable development objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project internally coherent in its design? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? 		•	•

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?	•	•	•
• Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	•	•	•
• How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?	•	•	•
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	•	•	•
• What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?	•	•	•
• Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed? 	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? 	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</p> <p>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>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 Form⁵

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: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- 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 Manual⁷)
- 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 rated⁸)
- 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
 - Project Finance

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ See Annex D for rating scales.

- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- 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
- Report Clearance Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool

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: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator 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 *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