

## 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 Promotion of Non-Fired Brick (NFB) Production and Utilization in Viet Nam Project** (PIMS #:4546)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

|                          |  |  |                                      |   |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Project Title:           | The Promotion of Non Fired Brick (NFB) Production and Utilization in Viet Nam  |  |                                      |   |
| GEF Project ID:          | 4801   |  | <i>At Endorsement (Million US\$)</i> | <i>At completion (Million US\$)</i>             |
| UNDP Project ID:         | 87517  | GEF financing:                         | \$2,800,000                          | To be completed upon the commencement of the TE |
| Country:                 | Viet Nam   | IA/EA own:                             | \$110,000                            | "   |
| Region:                  | Country wide   | Government:                            | \$ 8,220,000                         | "   |
| Focal Area:              | Climate Change   | Private Sector:                        | \$6,000,000                          | "   |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):  | CCM1_2.1 Appropriate policy, legal and regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced<br><br>CCM1_2.2 Sustainable financing and delivery mechanisms established and operational                              | Total co-financing:                    | \$36,080,000                         | "   |
| Executing Agency:        | Ministry of Science and Technology   | Total Project Cost:                    | \$38,880,000                         | "   |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministries of Construction (MoC), Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE), Ministry of Industry and Trade (MoIT), and Planning and Investment (MPI), Viet Nam Association of Building Materials (VABM) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): |                                      | November 4, 2014                                |
|                          |  | (Operational) Closing Date:            | Proposed: November 30, 2019          | Actual: Tentatively 30 April 2020               |

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to reduce annual GHG emissions by limiting the use of fossil fuels and promoting the usage of good quality soil for brick making through the increased production, sale and utilization of non-fired bricks (NFBs) in Viet Nam. This objective was to be achieved by removing barriers to increased production and utilization of NFBs through 4 components:

- Component 1: Policy support for non-fired brick (NFB) technology development
- Component 2: Technical capacity building on NFB technology application and operation and use of NFB products
- Component 3: Sustainable financing support for NFB technology application

- Component 4: NFB technology application, investment and replication

The Project was implemented over a 5-year period and is expected to generate GHG emission reductions through the displacement of coal-fired clay brick kilns. Direct GHG reduction estimates are 383 ktonnes CO<sub>2</sub>. Indirect emission reductions are 13,409 ktonnes CO<sub>2</sub> that is cumulative for a 10-year period after the end of the Project.

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

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

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> 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 TE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>2</sup> ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts including Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of Industry and Trade, Ministry of Construction, Viet Nam Environmental Protection Fund (VEPF) the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders including Viet Nam Association of Building Material and demonstration site owners, etc. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Viet Nam including the project sites in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh city. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual 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> |
|----------------------------|

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

| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation            | rating | 2. IA& EA Execution                           | rating |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| M&E design at entry                     |        | Quality of UNDP Implementation                |        |
| M&E Plan Implementation                 |        | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency       |        |
| Overall quality of M&E                  |        | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |        |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes               | rating | 4. Sustainability                             | rating |
| Relevance                               |        | Financial resources:                          |        |
| Effectiveness                           |        | Socio-political:                              |        |
| Efficiency                              |        | Institutional framework and governance:       |        |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating          |        | Environmental :                               |        |
|   |        | Overall likelihood of sustainability:         |        |
|   |        |   |        |
| Environmental Status Impact Improvement |        |   |        |
| Environmental Stress Reduction          |        |   |        |
| Progress towards stress/status change   |        |   |        |
| <b>Overall Project Results</b>          |        |   |        |

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

| Co-financing (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US\$) |        | Government (mill. US\$) |        | Partner Agency (mill. US\$) |        | Total (mill. US\$) |        |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|
|                            | Planned                         | Actual | Planned                 | Actual | Planned                     | Actual | Actual             | Actual |
| Grants                     |                                 |        |                         |        |                             |        |                    |        |
| Loans/Concessions          |                                 |        |                         |        |                             |        |                    |        |
| • In-kind support          |                                 |        |                         |        |                             |        |                    |        |
| • Other                    |                                 |        |                         |        |                             |        |                    |        |
| Totals                     |                                 |        |                         |        |                             |        |                    |        |

## MAINSTREAMING

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

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project

has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in energy savings, b) verifiable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>3</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.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Viet Nam. 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, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

**Duration and Timing:** Estimated 25 working days for an international consultant and 20 working days for one national consultation during October 2019 – January 2020.

The tentative schedule is according to the following plan:

| Activity                                   | Timing (international consultant)             | Timing (national consultant) | Completion Date  |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Reviewing documents and Preparation</b> | 7 working days                                | 7 working days               | 3 November 2019  |
| <b>Evaluation Mission</b>                  | 5 working days (tentatively 18 - 22 November) | 5 working days               | 22 November 2019 |
| <b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>             | 9 working days                                | 6 working days               | 13 December 2019 |
| <b>Final Report</b>                        | 4 working days                                | 2 working days               | 15 January 2020  |

Duty station: Home based and Hanoi with in-country travel as required. The international consultant is expected to have 5 working day mission to Hanoi, Viet Nam. In case of in-country travel (if required), local travel cost shall be covered by the project based on UNDP policy or UN-EU cost-norm.

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| # | Deliverable                | Content   | Timing  | Responsibilities                                |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1 | <b>TR Inception Report</b> | TR team clarifies timing, objectives and methods of Terminal Review | No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: (3, November 2019) | TE team submits to the UNDP CO and project team |

<sup>3</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](#)

|   |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| 2 | <b>Presentation</b>  | Initial Findings  | End of TE mission: (22, November 2019)                                | TE Team presents to project team and the UNDP CO   |
| 3 | <b>Draft Final Report with Notes of all meetings with stakeholders</b> | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes  | Within 3 weeks of the TE mission: (13, December 2019)                 | Sent to the UNDP CO, reviewed by CO, project team, RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 4 | <b>Final Report*</b>   | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: (15 January, 2020) | Sent to UNDP 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.

All deliverables shall be in English.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international team lead and 1 national consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The team lead 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:

### For International Consultant (Team Leader)

- Master's degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields.
- At least ten (10) years of international experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in developing countries.
- Recent experience in leading results-based management evaluation management evaluation for international donor supported projects in climate change mitigation, energy efficiency
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be an asset;
- Work experience in climate change mitigation, energy efficiency projects in developing countries in Asia is an advantage;
- Good interpersonal and analytical skills and ability to work under diverse/varied cultural environments;
- Demonstrated command over writing professional reports in English.

Specifically, the international expert (team leader) will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission; Guide the national expert in collecting data and information and preparation of relevant sections in the report
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);

- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the entire evaluation report.

#### **For National Consultant (Team member)**

- Graduate degree in degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields
- At least five (5) years of experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in Viet Nam;
- Familiarity and past experience with evaluation of international donor supported projects, especially energy efficiency, climate change mitigation projects;
- Work experience in climate change mitigation for donor-supported projects is an advantage
- Experience with evaluation of GEF supported projects is an asset
- Good interpersonal and analytical skills and ability to work under diverse/varied cultural environments;
- Excellent English skills with evidence through practical experience.

Specifically, the national expert will perform the following tasks:

- Documentation of evaluation and data gathering and consultation meetings;
- Contributing to the development of evaluation plan and methodology;
- Conducting specific elements of the evaluation determined by the International Lead Consultant;
- Contributing to presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations at the evaluation wrap-up meeting;
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the TR reports, notes of the meetings and other related documents prepared by the international consultant
- Performing translation for the international consultants during meetings with various stakeholders and necessary documents discussed during the international consultant’s mission.

## **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  |
|-----|--|
| 60% | 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 and all products under the contract |

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

---

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. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (UPDATED AT MTR, 2018)

|  |
|--|
| <b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.</b> |
| <b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 CCM Strategic Program SP2: Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector</b>  |
| <b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> Appropriate policy, legal and regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced, sustainable financing and delivery mechanisms established and operational, and GHG emissions avoided  |
| <b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> Energy efficiency policy and regulation in place, investment mobilized, and energy savings achieved  |

| Strategy   | Indicators  | Baseline  | Target   | Sources of Verification  | Risks and Assumptions  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Project Objective:</b><br>Reduce the annual growth rate of GHG emissions by displacement of fossil fuel use and the usage of good quality soil for brick making through the increased production, sale and utilization of non-fired bricks (NFBs) in Viet Nam | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative direct project and post-project CO2 emission reductions resulting from the NFB plant investments and technical assistance by EOP, Mtons CO2.</li> </ul>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No NFB production lines in operation using modern technology</li> <li>No emission reduction through replacement of CFBs through modern NFBs</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.088<sup>4</sup> (direct project) + 1.270<sup>5</sup> (direct post-project) Mt CO2 emission reduction</li> </ul>                                   | Project final report as well as annual surveys of energy consumption & reductions for each NFB project   |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative direct energy saving (TOE) from displacement of coal through the demonstration NFB plants (3 CBB plants and one AAC plant and 21 replication project during project time) by EOP</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No NFB production lines in operation using modern technology</li> <li>No energy savings through replacement of CFBs through modern NFBs</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30,782 TOE / year energy savings</li> </ul>   | Project final report as well as annual surveys of energy consumption & reductions for each NFB project   | Willingness of current brick SMEs and entrepreneurs to transform the industry to NFB technologies is ensured.          |
| <b>Outcome 1:</b><br>Approval and enforcement of an improved legal framework to encourage NFB production and use, and enhanced government  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of policies, regulations and standards approved and enforced to encourage the increase in the production and usage of NFB and decrease the use of FCBs</li> </ul>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of plans/policies have been adopted to encourage NFB developments: (i) Master plan on development of building materials by 2020; (ii) Decision No. 567/2010/QD-TTg; (iii) Directive No. 10/CT-TTg (2012)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13 additional policies approved and enforced to encourage NFB development (Investment, production and use) and decrease FCB usage by EOP</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official documentation on approved NFB policies, standards and quality regulations</li> <li>Project annual reports</li> </ul> | Continued government support for strengthening current NFB legal framework as well as regulations, standards and codes |

<sup>4</sup> This is the direct emission reduction during the course of the 5-year Project

<sup>5</sup> This is the direct post-project emission reduction from NFB plants that received technical assistance from Project Output 4.9 during Years 4 and 5 to be implemented after EOP

| Strategy  | Indicators  | Baseline  | Target   | Sources of Verification  | Risks and Assumptions |
|---|---|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| <b>capacity and knowledge to regulate NFB development and usage</b>                         |   | <p>on promotion of NFB production and utilization: (iv) circular 09/2012/TT-BXD creating NFB demand; (v) decision No. 1449/QD-TTg for retirement of traditional claps kilns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of standards and policies on NFB equipment to encourage and attract local enterprises to invest in NFB production lines</li> <li>• Insufficient NFB standards make it difficult to control quality of NFB produced, quality of buildings where NFBs are used;</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2 standards/policies approved to promote local manufacturers of NFB equipment and technology by year 4</li> <li>▪ 3 standards/ regulations approved by year 3 to govern quality of NFBs</li> </ul>                                      |  |                       |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of standards/norms on energy efficiency (EE) and emissions reduction in NFB production developed and recommended</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No standards/norms have been adopted for EE and emission reduction for production of construction materials as well as NFBs</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2 standards/norms on energy efficiency and emission reduction in NFBs production adopted by EOP</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Official document approved on the EE and emission standards for NFB production</li> </ul> |                       |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced government capacity to improve NFB regulation, control and mandate NFBs production and markets</li> </ul>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited capacity of the government officers in NFBs in general, quality control of NFB manufacturing, production and uses in particular;</li> <li>• No training courses have been held to enhance capacity of the government officers in NFB development and management</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By EOP, 940 government officers at national and provincial level trained on various aspects of NFBs (types, characteristics, requirement for control and promotion of NFB manufacturing, production technology, usage, etc.)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training reports/ workshops proceedings</li> </ul>  |                       |
| <b>Outcome 2: Increased availability of technically skilled and qualified local service</b> | Number of local firms that can manufacture NFB plant equipment based on set   | Lack of local technical knowledge on how to manufacture equipment for NFB production lines that can be competed with  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 local firm able to manufacture NFB plants' equipment based on set of</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study on NFB equipment standardization</li> </ul>   |                       |



| Strategy  | Indicators  | Baseline  | Target  | Sources of Verification   | Risks and Assumptions  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>providers for NFB plants, and enhanced stakeholder knowledge on NFB usage.</b>                                 | standards developed under this project  | those internationally produced (quality and price)  | standards developed under this project by year 4.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical report by the project</li> </ul>   |  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of building developers and owners used NFBs as building construction materials</li> </ul>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of consumer confidence and knowledge on using NFBs;</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 300 building developers and owners correctly use NFBs as building construction material by EOP</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents of market research</li> <li>• Report from Department of construction from provinces</li> </ul>   |  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced technical skills and stakeholder knowledge/ information on NFB associated issues</li> </ul>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No training has been provided to stakeholders regarding NFB associated issues;</li> <li>• Limited NFB knowledge amongst engineers, designers and building developers;</li> <li>• Little or no knowledge amongst construction workers on NFB building techniques and best practices on using NFBs in construction;</li> <li>• Low awareness on the advantages and environmental benefits of NFBs within the construction and building sector in Viet Nam</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By EOP, 21 training courses with total of 1500 people from 50 provinces trained on various NFBs' aspects. Of these: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 940 governmental and local officers</li> <li>- 121 designers and constructors</li> <li>- 399 NFB investors</li> <li>- 40 people from other related areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 2 training courses for 60 people from vocational colleges of construction</li> <li>• A NFB website developed, maintained and updated regularly</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training materials on various aspects of NFB</li> <li>• Training reports;</li> <li>• Documentation on NFB website</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>Outcome 3: Improved availability and sustained access to financial support for NFB technology applications</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loan volume provided by financial institutions (including commercial banks) for NFB investments (USD m)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of financial institutions such as Vietinbank, VEPF, NOFOSTED, Green Investment Facility (GIF) have interest in supporting SMEs for NFB investment, however:</li> <li>• No dedicated financing for NFB production</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least US\$24 million provided by financial institutions for NFB production investment by year 3</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop report organized for financial institutions;</li> <li>• Report by the financial institutions (VEPF and Vietinbank, etc.) on their lending to NFB producers</li> </ul> | Sufficient capital replenishments are available for NFB scale-up (estimated to be around USD 221 million to Year 2020) |

| Strategy  | Indicators  | Baseline  | Target   | Sources of Verification   | Risks and Assumptions   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of SMEs and NFB entrepreneurs with confirmed financing</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many potential NFB investors are SMEs who have difficulties in accessing to loans,</li> <li>Lack of knowledge and ability of potential SME investors to apply for concessionary financing of NFB projects</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30 NFB SMEs get loans from financial institutions by EOP (10 NFB projects get loan from VEPF and 20 projects get loans from VietinBank)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financing agreements between new NFB entrepreneurs and financing sources that are a part of NFB financing scheme</li> </ul>  | Willingness of SMEs and entrepreneurs to shift towards NFB technology from FCB kilns is ensured |
| <b>Outcome 4:<br/>Boosted confidence in NFB technology application resulting in an increased market share of NFBs</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of NFB demonstration plants in operation</li> </ul>   | <p>As of 2015 there exist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) more than 1,000 CBB production lines (with yearly production of 6 million SBUs);</li> <li>(ii) 12 AAC companies (with yearly production of about 1.3 million SBUs); and</li> <li>(iii) 17 foamed brick companies (with yearly production of 0.12 billion SBUs).</li> <li>Most of CBB technologies imported from China are low quality;</li> <li>NFB entrepreneurs lack knowledge on the production of qualified NFBs, lack of knowledge in designing, constructing, operating and maintaining an NFB plant;</li> <li>Very few examples of well-managed and profitable NFB production facilities existed</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 CBB demonstration plants operating at 90% designed capacity by EOP, with cumulative annual production of 65 million SBUs by EOP;</li> <li>1 AAC demonstration plant operating at 90% designed capacity by EOP;</li> </ul>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bankable feasibility studies;</li> <li>Financial agreement;</li> <li>Technical assistance reports</li> <li>Monitoring and evaluation reports for each demonstration plant (demonstration production and energy consumption)</li> </ul> | Support of SMEs and entrepreneurs to ensure excellent demonstration of NFB technologies         |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of NFB plants received technical assistance on optimization of raw materials, product quality control procedures, staff training and technology transfer, feasibility studies planned and operated</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of local technical knowledge on planning, designing, constructing, operating and maintaining an NFB plant;</li> </ul>   | <p>With the project support, it's expected by EOP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21 NFB plants received direct support in development of feasibility studies, optimization of inputs materials, production management, quality control, etc. and operated;</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical report of replication projects</li> <li>Provincial reports on the NFB production</li> </ul>  | Willingness of existing brick SMEs to embrace new NFB technologies is assured                   |

| Strategy | Indicators  | Baseline  | Target  | Sources of Verification  | Risks and Assumptions |
|----------|---|---|---|--|-----------------------|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of market share of NFBs in the local brick market</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By the project start, there exist about 70 NFB production facilities, with annually designed capacity of over 4.3 billion SBUs, accounted for 13% of the brick market share in Vietnam</li> <li>Lack of consumers' confidence in the quality of NFBs limits development of the NFB market in Viet Nam</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50 NFB plants with approved investment plan</li> <li>25 % of the NFB market share in the local brick markets by EOP</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Market survey of brick market</li> <li>Ministry of Construction statistics</li> </ul> |                       |

---

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

---

1. Project Identification Form
2. UNDP Project Document
3. Project Inception Report
4. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
5. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
6. Audit reports
7. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*climate change mitigation*)
8. Oversight mission reports, Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
11. Technical reports of key activities/results by the project

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Project site location maps
15. Guidance for conducting mid-term reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects
16. [UNDP Evaluation Policy](#)
17. UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation
18. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System
19. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
20. UNDP Viet Nam Policy on Gender-Responsive Evaluation

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by the evaluation team, CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser during the inception phase of the TE.*

| 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> |            |         |             |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| <b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>  |            |         |             |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>  |            |         |             |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| <b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>                            |            |         |             |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| <b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>                     |            |         |             |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |
| •   | •          | •       | •           |

**ANNEX D: RATING SCALES**

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

---

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>7</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>8</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>9</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
  - Project Finance:
  - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
  - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

---

<sup>7</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>8</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>9</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.



---

**3.3**

## Project Results

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

**4.**

## Conclusions, Recommendations &amp; 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

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 the Promotion of Non-Fired Brick (NFB) Production and Utilization in Viet Nam Project (PIMS #:4546)

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

| Author | # | Para No./<br>comment<br>location | Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report | Evaluator response and<br>actions taken |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |
|        |   |                                  |   |   |

**EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH ASSIGNED SCORES**

**International Consultant**

| <b>Consultant(s)' experiences/qualification related to the services</b> |   |             |
|---|---|-------------|
| <b>1</b>  | Master's degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields   | 150         |
| <b>2</b>  | At least ten (10) years of international experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in developing countries | 200         |
| <b>3</b>  | Recent experience leading results-based management evaluation of international donor supported project in climate change mitigation, energy efficiency  | 300         |
| <b>4</b>  | Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be an asset   | 150         |
| <b>5</b>  | Work experience in climate change mitigation, energy efficiency projects in developing countries in Asia is an advantage  | 100         |
| <b>6</b>  | Demonstrated command over writing professional reports in English.  | 100         |
| <b>Total</b>  |   | <b>1000</b> |

**National Consultant**

| <b>Consultant(s)' experiences/qualification related to the services</b> |   |             |
|---|---|-------------|
| <b>1</b>  | Graduate degree in degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields   | 150         |
| <b>2</b>  | At least five (5) years of experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in Viet Nam | 200         |
| <b>3</b>  | Familiarity and past experience with evaluation of donor supported project, especially energy efficiency, climate change mitigation projects.                               | 200         |
| <b>4</b>  | Work experience in climate change mitigation for donor-supported projects is an advantage   | 150         |
| <b>5</b>  | Experience with evaluation of GEF supported project is an asset   | 100         |
| <b>6</b>  | Excellent English skills with evidence through practical experience.  | 200         |
| <b>Total</b>  |   | <b>1000</b> |