

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### 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 *Building Sector Energy Efficiency Project in Malaysia*.

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Building Sector Energy Efficiency Project			
GEF Project ID:	3598 (GEF PMIS #)		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	3108 (UNDP PIMS #) 00072266 (Atlas ID)	GEF financing:	5,000,000	4,950,000 (TBC – Aug 2016)
Country:	Malaysia	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	19,405,326	20,000,000 (TBC)
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	5,230,556	6,000,000 (TBC)
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP 5 / SP 1	Total co-financing:	24,635,882	26,000,000 (TBC)
Executing Agency:	Public Works Department	Total Project Cost:	29,635,882.00	30,950,000
Other Partners involved:	N/A	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		8 July 2010 (Note: Project Manager onboard 1 Jan 2011)
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: Dec 2015	Actual: Dec 2016

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: BSEEP has for its goal the reduction in the annual growth rate of GHG emissions from the Malaysia buildings sector. The project objective is the improvement of the energy utilization efficiency in Malaysian buildings, particularly those in the commercial and government sectors, by promoting the energy conserving design of new buildings and by improving the energy utilization efficiency in the operation of existing buildings. 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's climate change strategic program on Promoting Energy Efficiency in Residential and Commercial Buildings (SP-1). It is comprised of activities aimed at improving energy efficiency and promoting the widespread adoption of energy efficient building technologies and practices in the Malaysian buildings sector. Specifically, the proposed project will reduce carbon emissions by an estimated 581.1 ktons CO<sub>2</sub> per year (or cumulative total of about 1,421.3 ktons CO<sub>2</sub>) by end of the project. This represents about 4% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions compared to the magnitude of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions under a business-as-usual scenario<sup>13</sup>. Five years after the project end, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are forecast to be about 7.2% lower in annual emissions if there will be no BSEEP.

The expected outcomes of the project are the following:

**Outcome 1:** Clear and effective system of monitoring and improving the energy performance of the building sector

**Outcome 2:** Implementation of, and compliance to, favorable policies that encourage the application of EE technologies in the country's buildings sector

**Outcome 3:** Availability of financial and institutional support for initiatives on EE building technology applications

**Outcome 4:** Enhanced awareness of the government, public and the buildings sector on EE building technology applications

**Outcome 5:** Improved confidence in the feasibility, performance, energy, environmental and economic benefits of EE building technology applications leading to the replication of the EE technology application demonstrations.

BSEEP is Nationally-Executed (NEX) (or Nationally Implemented Modality – NIM) by the Malaysian Government and JKR is the appointed executing agency.

The Project Document and other relevant GEF documents can be downloaded from the following weblink:

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/repository/11-30-09%20ID3598%20-%20Council%20letter.pdf>

Information on the UNDP evaluation process and experience from other countries can be referred to the Evaluation Resource Center at the following weblink

<http://erc.undp.org>

Information on project can be viewed at <http://www.bseep.gov.my/>

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. 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 ([fill in 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 [Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia](#) including the following project sites [in greater Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya](#). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- National Project Director
- National Project Manager
- Project Executive
- Component Managers (all) if any
- Key government stakeholders in building energy efficiency (i.e. EPU International Cooperation, EPU Energy, MEGTW, Energy Commission, and Sustainable Energy Development Authority (SEDA))
- Other sections/departments in the Implementing Partner relevant to BSEEP
- Representative from the Industry association
- Representative from the academia relevant to BSEEP
- Selected members of the NSC meeting
- Consultants
- Participating industries / demonstration sites
- Other project partners relevant to the outcome of the project

---

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

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

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA &amp; EA Execution</b>	<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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<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 governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The evaluation will examine this project's contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

## 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.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

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

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

---

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days (1.5 months) according to the following plan.

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	3 working days	3 Aug 2016
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	12 working days	19 Aug 2016
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	10 working days	2 Sep 2016
<b>Final Report</b>	5 working days	9 Sep 2016

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	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. See Annex 1 for an audit trail template.

## **TEAM COMPOSITION**

---

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

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

### International Consultant

#### Education

Tertiary education in building science, engineering or in relevant environmental disciplines related to climate change mitigation. Post-graduate or with relevant professional qualification is preferred;

#### Experience

- More than 10 years working experience in climate change mitigation projects with good knowledge of the state-of-the-art approaches and international best practices of similar projects;
- Experience with UN / UNDP / GEF result-based management evaluation methodologies. Project evaluation experiences within UNDP/GEF in Climate Change mitigation projects will be preferred.
- Experience applying Logical Framework Analysis and SMART indicators, project design and validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in project Adaptive Management
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills.

## National Consultant

### Education

Tertiary education in building science, engineering or in relevant environmental disciplines related to climate change mitigation. Post-graduate or with relevant professional qualification is preferred;

### Experience

- More than 5 years working experience in the energy field or in any climate change mitigation projects
- Experience in implementing projects with the Government of Malaysia
- Have strong linkage with national stakeholders related to energy and climate change mitigation projects
- Experience in Project evaluation especially on UNDP/GEF in Climate Change mitigation projects will be preferred.
- Excellent in English and Bahasa Malaysia writing and communication skills will be a must

## **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%	Following submission and approval of TE inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

---

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as <http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.



**ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND ANNUAL TARGETS (BASED ON REVIEWED AND CHANGES MADE LATEST JUNE 2015)**

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline	Target
GOAL: Reduced intensity of GHG emissions from the building sector	Cumulative CO2 emission reduction from the buildings sector by end-of-project (EOP, Year 2016), kton CO2eq * Direct GHG ER (including 15-20 yr. lifetime ER of EE measures) achieved by project investments such as technology demonstrations and discrete investments financed or leveraged during the project's supervised implementation period according to STAP methodology 'Calculating GHG Benefits of GEF EE Projects, Version 1.0., March 2013.	0	1,421.3
	% reduction in GHG emissions from the buildings sector by EOP	0	7.2
	Average emission reduction in the building sector by EOP, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	0	5.3
OBJECTIVE: Improved energy utilization efficiency in the buildings sector	Cumulative energy savings from the buildings sector by EOP (GWh)	0	2,078
	Average BEI in the Malaysian buildings sector by EOP (kWh/m <sup>2</sup> -yr)	205	187.3
	% Energy savings reduction by EOP	0	7.2
	No. buildings with EMS and/or EMP in place by EOP	160	576
	% improvement of BEI in the buildings sector by EOP	0	8.6
	No. of new EE buildings by EOP (Basis: End -2010)	0	39
	% of new buildings that are considered EE buildings at EOP (Basis: End 2010)	0	30

Outcome 1: Clear and effective system of monitoring and improving the energy performance of the buildings sector.	Annual Energy use in 25 GOM buildings (GWh)	264 (2013)	225 (2016)
Output 1: GOM agencies/departments that employ and implements energy management systems	Cumulative no. of government agencies/institutions that have employed BEM programs by EOP	10	150
Activity 1.1: Capacity Needs Assessment in the GOM Institutions on Building Energy Management	No. of training programs on building energy management in Government Agencies/Institutions conducted by EOP starting Year 2012	0	20
	Cumulative no. of government agencies/institutions that are aware of, and the benefits of, building energy management (BEM) in their day-to-day operations by EOP	10	150
	Cumulative no. of government agencies/institutions that have employed BEM programs by EOP	10	150
Activity 1.2: Development of a Malaysian Federal Building Energy Management Program (MFBEMP)	An established and fully operational Malaysian Federal Buildings Energy Management Programme (MFBEMP) by Year 2015	0	1
	Total budget for the MFBEMP by EOP, (RM Million).	0	-2

Activity 1.3: Preparation of Specific Energy Management (EM) Guidelines for Government Institutions	Completed and approved guidebook on Energy Management Guidelines for Government Institutions by Year 2015	0	1
	Cumulative no. of government building managers that are satisfied in using the EM guidelines by EOP	0	50
	Cumulative no. of government buildings with BEM programs designed based on the EM guidelines by EOP	0	100
Activity 1.4: Monitoring and Evaluation of the MFBEMP Impacts	Average level of investment/budget each year on energy efficiency per building starting Year 2012, RM	0	20,000
	Average annual energy savings per building generated from EE projects and BEM activities starting Year 2013, RM	0	100,000
Activity 1.5: Building Energy Reporting and Monitoring (BERM) Program-under the National Building energy Management System (NBEMS)	Cumulative no. of buildings actively participating in the NBEMS by EOP	0	350
	Cumulative no. of reporting buildings that have implemented no cost measures by EOP	0	20
	% Improvement in the BEI (i.e., reduction) per building category by EOP		
	Office buildings	0	10

Activity 1.6: Establishment of a Centralized Building Energy Efficiency Database System (CBEED) under the National Building energy Management System (NBEMS)	a fully established and operational Centralized Building Energy Efficiency Database System (CBEED) by Year2015	0	1
	No. of database-keepers (national and international) linked and/or contributing to the CBEED by EOP	0	10
	No. of EE information offices (EIOs) operating by EOP	0	10

Outcome 2: Implementation of, and compliance to, favorable policies that encourage the application of EE technologies and practices in the country's buildings sector	Percentage of new buildings (nationally by area) which comply to the provisions of MS1525 by EOP	0%	30%
Output 2.1: Improved Malaysian EE Building policies, legislation, regulations and action plan	Cumulative no. of approved policies on building EE technology applications by EOP	0	2
Activity 2.1.1: Conduct of Building EE Policy Studies	Cumulative no. of policy studies conducted by EOP	0	10
	Cumulative no. of recommended policies from completed policy studies that are implemented and enforced by local governments, JKR and MHLG by EOP	0	2
Activity 2.1.2: Formal & informal discussions with policymakers	Cumulative no. of policy making agencies endorsing the proposed policies by EOP	0	5
	Cumulative no. of approved policies on building EE technology applications by EOP	0	2

Output 2.2: Approved and Enforced EE Buildings Code of Practice	Cumulative no. of upgraded provisions in the MS 1525 completed and approved/endorsed for incorporation in the UBBL by the MHLG by EOP	0	5
Activity 2.2.1: Review of Existing Buildings Code of Practice	Cumulative no. of existing articles and provisions in the MS 1525 that were reviewed, adjusted/modified or upgraded to facilitate incorporation in the UBBL by EOP	0	10
Activity 2.2.2: Formulation, Approval and Enforcement of a Policy on EE Building Design	Cumulative no. of upgraded provisions in the MS 1525 completed and approved/endorsed for incorporation in the UBBL by the MHLG by EOP	0	5
	Cumulative no. of MHLG personnel trained on the enforcement of MS 1525 as part of the UBBL by EOP	0	150
Activity 2.2.3: Capacity Building on the Application of Building Energy Codes	Cumulative no. of training courses conducted on building energy codes for building practitioners by EOP	0	20
	Cumulative no. of training courses conducted on the design, construction, economic feasibility evaluation, operation and maintenance of EE buildings by EOP	0	20
	Cumulative no. of technically capable building practitioners and building service providers by EOP.	0	600
	Cumulative no. of local engineering and engineering consulting firms that are providing EE building system services by EOP	0	20
Activity 2.2.4: Development of an EE Code of Practice in Residential Buildings	A completed government-endorsed EE Code of Practice in Residential Buildings officially launched by Year <del>2012</del> 2016	0	1

Output 2.3: Utility regulations that promote/support EE technology applications in buildings	Cumulative No. of buildings that applied, will benefit or benefited from the incentive given by EOP	0	20
Activity 2.3.1: Assessment of Utility Regulations Promoting/Supporting EE Building Technology Applications	Completed assessment report on applicable policies and regulations that are supportive of the implementation of EE initiatives in the design, construction, retrofit and operation of buildings by Year 2014	0	1
Activity 2.3.2: Design of EE System Incentives in Buildings	Cumulative No of approved incentives for EE buildings by EOP	0	5
	Cumulative No. of buildings that applied, will benefit or benefited from the incentive given by EOP	0	20
Activity 2.3.3: Review of Utility Tariffs Focusing on EE in the Buildings Sector	Satisfactorily completed and acceptable report on the Electricity Pricing Study that is intended for EE policy decision making regarding pricing issues by Year 2016	0	1
Activity 2.3.4: Discussions on Energy Pricing for Buildings	Cumulative no. of tariff adjustments made by public utilities that are supportive of EE buildings incentive schemes by EOP	0	2
Activity 2.3.5: Web-based Monitoring of Incentives Scheme Implementation	An operational web-based online fiscal/financial incentive mechanism monitoring service by Year <del>2011</del> 2015	0	1

Outcome 3: Availability of financial and Institutional support for initiatives on EE Building technology applications	Total volume of financing provided by local banks /financial institutions for EE building projects and to the local ESCOs for EE building projects by EOP (RM million)	0	500
Output 3: Enhanced availability and accessibility of financing for EE building projects	Total private sector funding committed to financial mechanisms designed by the BSEEP by EOP (million USD)	0	5
Activity 3.1: Streamlining Processes for Financing Applications	Approved streamlined procedures for applying for and getting financial incentives for building EE activities by Year <del>2012</del> 2014	0	1
Activity 3.2: Capacity Building on EE Building Technologies for the Banking/Financial Sector	Cumulative no. of training courses on EE building technologies for the banking/financial institutions designed and conducted by EOP	0	10
	Total No. of EE building projects that are financed by local banks/financial institutions by EOP	0	10
	Total volume of financing provided by local banks/financial institutions for EE building projects by EOP (RM million)	0	100
Activity 3.3: Development of an Action Plan for EE Building Project Financing	Completed and approved action plan for the facilitation of the provision of financing of energy efficiency initiatives by Year 2013	0	1
Activity 3.4: Design of Financing Schemes for EE Building Project Financing	No. of applicable project financing schemes on building EE identified and designed by Year 2013	0	3

Activity 3.5: Promotion of EE Building Projects to Local 'ESCOs'	Cumulative no. of seminar-workshops on EE building project ventures for local ESCOs conducted by EOP	0	10
	Total volume of financing provided to the local ESCOs for EE building projects by EOP (RM million)	0	100
Activity 3.6: Capacity Building on EE Building Project Financing	Cumulative no. of seminar-workshops conducted for the buildings sector on potential financing options for supporting their EE building and EE building technology projects by EOP from 2012	0	8
Activity 3.7: Business Development Matching and Strategic Partnership Establishment	An operational EE Building Market Services Group (MSG) with a clear mandate of identifying business opportunities through providing technical support to EE building project financing by Year 2013	0	1
	Cumulative no. of EE building project developers/owners, banks and financial institutions assisted by the MSG building their capacity to deliver EE building and EE building technology application project financing, and market their projects and financing products by EOP	0	10



Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness of the government, public and the building sector on EE building technology applications	Cumulative no. of trained EE building practitioners by EOP	0	480
Output 4.1: Tools for enhancing the skills and experience of local building practitioners in the design of energy efficiency projects in buildings	Government (JKR) - endorsed Guidebook on EE Building Design officially launched by Year 2012  Government-endorsed Building Performance Prediction Software Tool officially launched by Year 2015		
Activity 4.1.1: Detailed Study on the Current Building Designs and EE Building Applications	Completed study on best practices in the application of EE technologies and techniques in the design, construction and operation of buildings by Year 2012	0	1
Activity 4.1.3: Establishment of a Comprehensive Guidebook on EE Building Design	Government (JKR) - endorsed Guidebook on EE Building Design officially launched by Year 2012	0	1
Activity 4.1.4: Development of a Peer-Reviewed, User-Friendly Building Performance Prediction Software Tool	Government-endorsed Building Performance Prediction Software Tool officially launched by Year <del>2014</del> 2015	0	1
	No. of downloads of the building performance prediction software tool by EOP		100

Output 4.2: Implemented market oriented EE programs in the buildings sector both at the national and local levels	Government-endorsed energy efficiency assessment tool officially launched by Year 2015		
Activity 4.2.1: Design of the Energy Efficiency assessment tool for Buildings	Government-endorsed MEERB officially launched by Year 2015	0	1
Activity 4.2.2: Development of the Institutional Mechanism for the energy efficiency assessment tool Scheme	Approved implementing rules and regulations on the energy efficiency assessment tool implementation by Year-2015	0	1
Activity 4.2.3: Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of the energy efficiency assessment tool Scheme	Cumulative no. of buildings actively using the energy efficiency assessment tool by EOP	0	18
Activity 4.2.4: EE Buildings Advocacy and Promotion	Cumulative no. of promotional campaigns conducted each year to promote EE in buildings and EE building design starting Year 2012	0	10
Output 4.3: Government agencies and private sector entities capable of designing and implementing EE building projects	Cumulative no. of trained EE building practitioners by EOP	0	480

Activity 4.3.1: EE Buildings Training Needs Assessment and Planning	Cumulative no. of subjects/concepts on energy efficient design, construction, operation and maintenance of buildings identified for inclusion in training courses by Year 2010	0	20
Activity 4.3.2: Design and Implementation of EE Building Training Courses	Cumulative no. of sets of training materials developed and disseminated by EOP	0	20
	Cumulative no. of training courses conducted EOP	0	20
	Overall no. of personnel trained by EOP	0	480
	% of overall no. of trainees that are gainfully employing learned skills on EE building design / construction/operation & maintenance of new and/or retrofitted building by EOP	0	70
	Cumulative no. of trained EE building practitioners by EOP	0	480
Activity 4.3.3: Sustainable Training Program Design	A completed, ready-for-implementation and funded sustainable follow-up EE building training program approved by the National Steering Committee by Year 2014	0	1
Outcome 5: Improved confidence in the feasibility, performance, energy, environmental and economic benefits of EE building technology applications	Combined annual CO2 Emission reductions from planned pipeline projects resulting from demonstration projects by EOP (ktonCO2/yr)	0	45

Output 5.1: Completed demonstration projects showcasing successful applications of building EE technologies, techniques and practices.	Combined annual CO2 Emission reductions from demonstration projects by EOP (ktonCO2/yr)	0	15
Activity 5.1.1: Demonstration of EE Building and EE Building Technology Applications	A set of criteria ready to be used for selecting demonstration projects by Year 2011	0	1
	Cumulative no. of detailed technical and financial feasibility studies done for demonstration site selection by Year 2012	0	30
	Cumulative no. of finalized and approved demonstration project designs (engineering & construction) by Year 2012	0	10
	Cumulative no. of financed demonstration projects confirmed and approved for implementation by EOP	0	10
Activity 5.1.2: Demonstration Project Implementation	Cumulative no. of demo projects implemented <del>each year</del> by EOP	0	10
	Cumulative no of dissemination exercises conducted e by EOP	0	2
Output 5.2: More knowledgeable, technically capable and competent building practitioners in the GOM and the private sector	Cumulative no. of practitioners experienced in EE building practices by means of the demonstration buildings by EOP.	0	30

Activity 5.2.1: Follow-up Capacity Building for the Local Building Industry	Completed assessment report on the viability of a local industry for the manufacture of EE building materials and EE building equipment/components by <del>Year 2013</del> EOP	0	1
	Cumulative no. of training courses designed and conducted for local building materials producers/suppliers on EE building materials applications by EOP	0	8
	Cumulative no. of training courses designed and conducted for local engineering firms on EE building materials production and applications by EOP	0	8
	Cumulative no. of new EE building projects designed based on, or influenced by the results of the demonstration project by EOP	0	40

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

---

Key documents to be reviewed are as below:

- Project Initial Form (PIF)
- UNDP/GEF BSEEP Project Document
- Inception Report
- All output reports and documents produced under BSEEP
- Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings and National Steering Committee meetings.
- Amendments to the inception report (if any)
- Mid-Term Review (MTR)
- Review/evaluation report
- Latest project document review report
- Latest Project Implementation Report PIR
- Latest NEX audit reports or any other audit reports
- Past consultancies' assignments and summary of the results
- Quarterly reports
- Pictures of equipment, installations and sites if any
- Newspaper/publication articles
- 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.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
a) 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?	•	•	•
b) How does the project support the energy security, environment and sustainable development objectives of the Government of Malaysia	•	•	•
c) What was the level of stakeholder participation and ownership in project design and implementation?	•	•	•
d) How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders and has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?	•	•	•
e) Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	•	•	•
f) Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?	•	•	•
g) Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	•	•	•

<p>h) Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</p>	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<p>a) Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Outcome 1: Clear and effective system of monitoring and improving the energy performance of the building sector.</li> <li>➤ Outcome 2: Implementation of, and compliance to, favorable policies that encourage the application of EE technologies in the country's buildings sector</li> <li>➤ Outcome 3: Availability of financial and institutional support for initiatives on EE building technology applications</li> <li>➤ Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness of the government, public and the buildings sector on EE building technology applications</li> <li>➤ Outcome 5: Improved confidence in the feasibility, performance, energy, environmental, and economic benefits of EE building technology applications leading to the replication of the EE technology application demonstrations.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<p>b) What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</p>	•	•	•
<p>c) What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</p>		•	•



Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
a) Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?	•	•	•
b) Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
c) Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements?	•	•	•
d) Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)	•	•	•
e) Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?	•	•	•
f) Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?	•	•	•
g) To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?	•	•	•
h) What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?	•	•	•
i) Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?	•	•	•
j) Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?	•	•	•

k) Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
a) How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers for financial, institutional, social and economic being managed?	•	•	•
b) What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?	•	•	•
c) Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?	•	•	•
d) Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?	•	•	•
e) What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?	•	•	•
f) How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc.)?	•	•	•
g) What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?	•	•	•

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
a) Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework towards reduces environmental stress and enhanced energy security in the country in its design and its implementation?	•	•	•
b) Are there any indicators that the project has contributed towards reducing the annual growth rate of GHG emissions from the Malaysian buildings sector?	•	•	•
c) Are there any indicators that the project has contributed in strengthening the supply side in particular the Malaysian buildings sector?	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

<b><i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&amp;E, IA &amp; EA Execution</i></b>	<b><i>Sustainability ratings</i></b>	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b>
<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 problems</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</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>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 Form<sup>3</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- 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 Manual<sup>5</sup>)
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 rated<sup>6</sup>)
- 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

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> See ToR Annex D for rating scales. See the UNDP-GEF TE Guidance section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

**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 TEMPLATE**

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