

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT)

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 Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	PROMOTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS (PEECB) IN THAILAND			
GEF Project ID:	GEF PIMS#4165		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS#3937 00078576	GEF financing:	3,637,273	
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:	6,500,000	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other Private Sector:	5,767,500	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CC-SP1 Promoting EE technologies and practices in appliances and building	Total co-financing:		
Executing Partner:	Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency (DEDE) under the Ministry of Energy, Thailand	Total Project Cost:	15,904,773	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		14 November 2012
		Operational Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 APRIL 2018	Actual:

2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

The PEECB project has for its goal the reduction in the annual growth rate of GHG emissions from the Thai commercial building sector. The project objective is the promotion and facilitation of the widespread application of building energy efficiency technologies and practices in commercial buildings in Thailand. The realization of this objective will be facilitated through the removal of barriers to the uptake of building energy efficiency technologies, systems, and practices. The project is in line with the GEF-4 Strategic Program No. 1, which is on Promoting energy-efficient buildings and appliances (CC-SP1). It is comprised of activities aimed at improving energy efficiency and promoting the widespread adoption of energy efficient building technologies and practices in the Thai commercial building sector.

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 objective of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid 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 expected to conduct a field mission to Thailand, including the project sites in Bangkok and a nearby province.

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

- Project Director
- Representatives of responsible parties
- Building practitioner professional associations
- Project partners: Bangkok Metropolitan Administration and the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP)
- Stakeholders from both public and private sectors including building owners
- Members of Project Board
- UNDP-GER Regional Technical Advisor
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok in-charge of this project

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.

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

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

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		
5. Impact:		<i>rating</i>			<i>rating</i>
Environmental Status Improvement					
Environmental Status Reduction					
Progress towards status change					
Overall Project Results					

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								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind support 								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, 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 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 liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

10. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to visit the project sites in Bangkok, Thailand.

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days over a period from 6 February to 15 May 2018 according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Tentative Period
Preparation	5 working days	6-12 February 2018
Evaluation Mission	13 working days (Monday-Friday); Per diem will be paid on working days and over the weekends.	14-30 March 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	6 working days	2-6 April 2018
Final Report	6 working days	30 April – 6 May 2018

The tentative timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
7-31 December 2017	Advertisement
31 December 2017	Application closes

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](#)

2– 26 January 2018	Select TE Team/contract issuance process
6-12 February 2018 (5 working days)	Handover of Project Documents Document review, preparing TE Inception Report
13-28 February 2018	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report by CO and UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor
14–29 March 2018 (12 working days)	TE mission: opening session, stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
30 March 2018 (1 working day)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings - End of TE mission
2-6 April 2018 (5 working days)	Preparing draft TE report Submission of draft TE report to UNDP CO /UNDP-GEF RTA
9-20 April 2018	Circulation of draft report for comments
30 April-4 May 2018 (5 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/finalization of TE report
6 May 2018 (1 working day)	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
7 May 2018	Expected date of full TE completion

11. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the followings:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: <i>13 February 2018</i>	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: <i>30 March 2018.</i>	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 1 week after the evaluation mission: <i>6 April 2018</i>	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFFs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: <i>6 May 2018</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.

12. 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 environmental science, engineering, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of 8 years accumulated and recognized experience in the area of Mitigation and Climate Change (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or environmental project 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 Energy Efficiency in the Commercial Buildings” is an advantage (20%).
- Excellent written English (20%)

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 environmental science, environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)
- 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%)
- Knowledge of multilateral and bilateral cooperation project development and implementation (20%)
- Familiarity with Thailand development policy framework, environmental authorities, NGOs and other actors (20%)
- Excellent in written and spoken Thai and English (20%)

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the evaluation 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

13. 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'](#).

14. 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

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template³ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form (P11)**; indicating all past experience from similar projects; as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- 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 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 to UNDP by 31 December 2017. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration. The short listed candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified

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.

Only candidates obtaining a maximum of 70% of the total technical points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

³

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Strategy	Success Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
GOAL: Reduced intensity of GHG emissions from the commercial building sector	• Cumulative CO ₂ emission reduction from the commercial building sector by End-Of-Project (EOP, Year 2015), kton CO ₂ eq	0	230	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBEEC • DEDE's Energy Reports • Annual reports prepared by project partners (Industry/Professional Associations, Commercial Building Managements and Developers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GOT's commitment to commercial building EE remains firm • Current economic growth at least remains constant
	• % reduction in GHG emissions from the commercial buildings sector by EOP	0	1.2%		
OBJECTIVE: Promotion and facilitation of the widespread application of building energy efficiency technologies and practices in commercial buildings in Thailand	• Cumulative energy savings from the commercial building sector by Year 2015, GWh	0	396	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBEEC • DEDE's Energy Reports • Annual reports prepared by project partners (Industry/Professional Associations, Commercial Building Managements and Developers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GOT's commitment to commercial building EE remains firm • Current economic growth at least remains constant
	• % Energy savings by EOP	0	1.2%		
	• % of new buildings that are fully compliant with the new Building Energy Code by EOP	20%	60%		
	• % of new buildings in Thailand that are classified as energy efficient buildings by EOP	10%	40%		
COMPONENT 1: Awareness Enhancement on Building EE Technologies and Practices					
OUTCOME 1: Enhanced awareness of the government, building sector and	• % of overall commercial building stakeholders that agree to greater availability of pertinent information on EE technologies and practices through the PEECB project activities by Year 2015	0	80% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey of and documented feedback from network members and users 	

Strategy	Success Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
banks on EE technologies and practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall commercial building stakeholders that are satisfied with availability and quality of information available from the PEECB project by Year 2015 	0	70% (at least)		
OUTPUT 1.1: Establishment of the Commercial Building EE Information Center (CBEEC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall commercial building stakeholders that are satisfied with availability and quality of CBEEC information services by Year 2015 	0	70% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey of and documented feedback from network members and users 	
OUTPUT 1.2: A system of information exchange and dissemination on EE technologies and practices for commercial building stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall commercial building stakeholders that agree to greater availability of pertinent information on EE technologies and practices through CBEEC as well as promotional and outreach activities by Year 2015 	0	80% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey of and documented feedback from commercial building stakeholders, network members and users 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of users of the information exchange system by EOP 	0	1,500		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of satisfied users of the information exchange system each year Starting Year 2012 	0	70% (at least)		
OUTPUT 1.3: Developed and Promoted Energy Use Simulation Models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of modified BESMs with additional features (e.g. dual language user interface) by Year 2013 	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation on the improved building simulation model 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall no. of trainees that are gainfully employing learned skills on EE building design by Year 2015 	0	70% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post training course evaluation reports 	

Strategy	Success Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
for Commercial Building Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of new buildings that were designed using the modified BESMs by EOP 	0	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A survey report on adoption and utilization among building designers 	
OUTPUT 1.4: Completed training courses on EE technologies and practices, and financial arrangement for commercial buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of completed training courses on EE technologies and practices, and financial arrangement for commercial buildings by EOP 	0	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation on the overall training courses/programs 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall no. of trainees that are gainfully employing learned skills on EE building design, operation and maintenance by Year 2015 	0	70% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post training course evaluation reports 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of trainees that are engaged in EE building project design, implementation and financing by EOP 	0	50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A survey report on adoption and utilization knowledge gained from the training 	
OUTPUT 1.5: Completed training courses on financial assessment of EE application projects in commercial buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of completed training courses on financial assessment of EE application projects in commercial buildings by EOP 	0	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation on the overall training courses/programs 	
OUTPUT 1.6: Established business linkages between suppliers of EE technologies, building owners, banks and building practitioners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of EE investment projects facilitated through business links by EOP 	0	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of EE investments in commercial buildings 	Growth of the commercial building sector is maintained at the same level as the past 5 years.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of banks/FIs that have financed EE investment projects through the business links by EOP 	0	5		
COMPONENT 2: EE Building Policy Frameworks					

Strategy	Success Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
OUTCOME 2: Effective implementation of favorable policies that encourage EE technologies and practices for commercial building in Thailand	• No. of new policy measures for commercial building EE approved and implemented by Year 2015	0	2	• Documentation on policy measures adopted by DEDE	
	• No. of fiscal policies approved by DEDE for implementation by Year 2013	0	1	• DEDE's report and PEECB project report	
	• No. of short and long term action plans for commercial building EE integrated into DEDE's national Energy Conservation Program by EOP	0	1	• Documentation on DEDE's EE policy and action plan	
OUTPUT 2.1: Updated and More Effective Policy Measures on Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings	• No. of new policy measures for commercial building EE approved and implemented by Year 2015	0	2	• Documentation on policy measures adopted by DEDE	
	• No. of existing policy measures for commercial building EE modified and implemented by Year 2015	0	2		
	• No. of recommendations on improved and innovative implementation approaches for EE rating/labeling/certification for commercial buildings in Thailand by Year 2013	0	2	• Recommendation report on policy options to strengthen EE rating/labeling/certification for commercial buildings	
OUTPUT 2.2: Revised and Up-to-date Data and Information to Facilitate Policy Implementation of Commercial Building EE	• % of overall commercial building stakeholders that are satisfied with availability and quality of the energy performance database by Year 2015	0	70% (at least)	• Survey of and documented feedback from network members and users	
	• No. of building energy use profiles established by Year 2014	0	4	• Report on the SEC review and update	
	• No. of commercial building EE project referencing the improved M&V schemes by EOP	0	20	• PEECB project report	
OUTPUT 2.3: Approved and Implemented New	• No. of applicable fiscal policies on commercial building EE identified and formulated by Year 2012	0	3	• DEDE's report and PEECB project report	
	• No. of fiscal policies approved by DEDE for implementation by Year 2013	0	1		

Strategy	Success Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
and Improved Financing Models for Commercial Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of the approved policies that are implemented by EOP 	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
OUTPUT 2.4: Approved energy efficient promotion action plan (short and long term) to supplement DEDE activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of short and long term action plans for commercial building EE integrated into DEDE's national EE policy by EOP 	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation on DEDE's EE policy and action plan 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of activities in the action plan that were considered for inclusion in the National Energy Conservation Program by EOP 	0	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DEDE's report and PEECB project report 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of activities in the approved action plan incorporated in the National Energy Conservation Program that were implemented by EOP 	0	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation on DEDE's EE policy and action plan 	
COMPONENT 3: EE Building Technologies and Applications Demonstrations					
OUTCOME 3.1: Improved confidence in applying EE technologies and practices in commercial buildings in Thailand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of commercial building owners/managers expressing interests and commitments in implementing EE investments by EOP 	10	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports of surveys conducted as parts of information dissemination activities PEECB project reports 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of building EE projects that adopted EE measures and designs being demonstrated and promoted by EOP 	5	10		
OUTPUT 3.1.1: Installed and operational demonstration projects in selected buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of demonstration project implemented and regularly monitored starting Year 2012 	0	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of each demonstration project 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No of completed M&V exercises in accordance with the M&V guideline updated by the PEECB Project 	0	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual M&V report of each demonstration project being implemented 	

Strategy	Success Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
OUTCOME 3.2: Improved local technical and managerial capacity to design, manage and maintain EE technologies and practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall no. of demo building personnel that are gainfully employing learned skills on EE building design, operation and maintenance by Year 2015 	0	70% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post training evaluation report 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of new buildings constructed that are partly or entirely based on the information regarding success of the demonstrations by EOP 	0	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PEECB project report 	
OUTPUT 3.2.1: Documentation of the demonstration projects and available EE technologies in the markets and dissemination of demo project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall no. of building practitioners that are aware of EE technologies/techniques available and applied in demo projects by Year 2015 	0	70% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PEECB project report 	
OUTPUT 3.2.2: Completed training courses for personnel attached to the demo project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of overall no. of demo building personnel that are gainfully employing learned skills on EE building design, operation and maintenance by Year 2015 	0	70% (at least)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post training course evaluation reports 	
OUTCOME 3.3: Replication of demonstration projects within the commercial building sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of new EE building projects designed based on, or influenced by, the results of the demonstration projects by EOP 	0	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of completed replication projects 	

Strategy	Success Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
OUTPUT 3.3.1: Completed project documents/recommendations for EE project replication in the commercial building sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of identified proven and feasible EE technologies and techniques that are applicable and applied in the Thai commercial building sector by EOP 	0	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment report 	

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 criterial 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 biodiversity and 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><i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</i></p> <p>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</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>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 See Annex D for rating scales.

- Project Finance
- 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