



TERMS OF REFERENCE

PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION

Position: 01 international consultant and 1 national consultant to conduct a terminal evaluation of the project **Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam**

Duty Station: Home base, Hanoi and travel to provinces¹

Type of appointment: Individual contract

Duration: From October 2020 to June 2021)

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam			
GEF Project ID:	5245		<i>At Endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>At completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00092225	GEF financing:	\$3,198,000	To be completed during the TE
Country:	Viet Nam	IA/EA own:	\$2,220,000	"
Region:	Country wide	Government:	\$ 2,700,000	"
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Private Sector:	\$16,578,550	"
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CCM1_2.1 Appropriate policy, legal and regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced CCM1_2.2 Sustainable financing and delivery mechanisms established and operational	Total co-financing:	\$21,498.550	"
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Construction	Total Project Cost:	\$24,696,550	"
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Industry and Trade (MoIT), Ministry of Science and Technology	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		April 5 th , 2016
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 March 2021	Actual:

¹ International and domestic travels will be determined subject to the impact of COVID-19

1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a TE of the project **Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam (PIMS #:5245)**.

The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.²

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

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Although the building construction market went through a long period of volatility after the crisis in 2008, the total construction activities outputs (including both building and infrastructure works) still grew by 9% in 2019 compare to 2018, likewise it already achieved what it did during the 2015 -2018 period. The Government of Viet Nam has realized the significance of the energy consumption and GHG emissions responsible by the building sector in the country, and to respond to this alarming trend, considerable efforts have been undertaken by responsible government agencies to enhance EE in the building sector

The Project was designed to reduce intensity of GHG emissions from the building sector in Viet Nam. The project objective is to improve the energy utilization performance of commercial and high-rise residential buildings in Ho Chi Minh and Hanoi. Realization of this objective will be achieved through implementation of three components.

- (1) Improvement and Enforcement of Energy Efficiency Building Code;
- (2) Building Market Development Support Initiatives, and
- (3) Building EE Technology Applications and Replications.

Each component comprises a number of complementary activities designed to remove barriers to the stringent enforcement of the revised EEBC, and to the greater uptake of building energy efficiency technologies, systems, and practices in commercial and residential buildings. By EOP, the GEF investment will have catalysed direct GHG emission reduction of about 37,680 tCO₂e. The cumulative direct reduction in GHG emissions over the lifetime of the project is envisioned to be 236,382 tCO₂e.

The Project was designed for 4-year period from 2016 – 2020 and was extended until Mar 31, 2021. 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

Since the start of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak, Vietnam has closely monitored the situation and installed a series of proactive, comprehensive measures to combat the spread of the virus within the country and prepare its public health facilities. The first confirmed cases of COVID-19 appeared in Vietnam on January 23, 2020. As of September 11, Viet Nam had confirmed 1,059 cases of COVID-19 with 893 of the affected patients recovered and 35 deaths. Vietnam has reported no cases of community spread since September 2. In light of the recent COVID-19 outbreak, Vietnam has imposed several travel restrictions on those entering the country. Flights, public transportation, inter-provincial transportation, hotels, monuments, tourism attractions, and government offices have reopened with safety measures in place. Viet Nam has lifted the mandatory 14-day quarantine for foreign experts, investors, managers, and diplomats on short business trips of less than 14 days. However, they must comply with all other health measures and must follow their scheduled itinerary.

² Please refer to: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>.

If after 14 days they wish to stay in Viet Nam, they can do so without quarantining, provided they test negative for the virus³.

3 OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the *Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.

The objectives of the evaluation are (1) to assess the achievement of project results, and (2) to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP country programme 2017 – 2021 (CPD), One Strategic Plan 2017-2021 (OSP), and recommendations for the new Programming Period.

4 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method⁴ for conducting project terminal evaluations for 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 has been drafted and is included with this TOR (see [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 ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts including Ministry of Construction, Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of Industry and Trade, the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders including demonstration site owners, etc. Depending on the travel restriction due to the COVID, the evaluators might be expected to conduct a field mission to Viet Nam including the project sites in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh city.

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

Depending on COVID situation, if it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

³ Further update can be found at <https://vietnam.travel/things-to-do/information-travellers-novel-coronavirus-vietnam> and <https://ncov.moh.gov.vn/>

⁴ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultant can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5 EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

EVALUATION RATINGS			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA & EA Execution	Rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP implementation	
M&E plan implementation		Quality of execution – Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of implementation / execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

6 PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

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 evaluators 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's 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								
---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

7 MAINSTREAMING

UNDP-supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming on promotion of sustainable low-carbon development while strengthening resilience of targeted groups, 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 equality.

8 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:

- 1) verifiable improvements in ecological status;
- 2) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems; and/or
- 3) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.⁵

9 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.

10 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 while travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team will be made by the PMU. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator Team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

11 EVALUATION TIMEFRAME, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

The total duration of the evaluation will be over a time period of 10 weeks (20 days for IC and 25 for NC) according to the following plan:

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 management unit or UNDP based on UNDP policy or UN-EU cost-norm.

Duration and Timing: Estimated 30 working days for an international consultant and 25 working days for one national consultant during October 2020 – September 2021.

The tentative schedule is according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing (international consultant)	Timing (national consultant)	Completion Date
----------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------

⁵ 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](#).

Reviewing documents and Preparation of inception report	10 working days	10 working days	15 December 2020
Evaluation Mission, stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc	5 working days (tentatively during 11 – 22 January 2021)	5 working days	18 – 22 January 2021
Draft Evaluation Report	10 working days	8 working days	15 February 2021
Final Evaluation Report that incorporate comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report	5 working days	2 working days	15 March 2021

12 EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TTR Inception Report	TR team clarifies timing, objectives and methods of Terminal Review	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: (15 December 2020)	TE team submits to the UNDP CO and project team the Inception Report
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: (22, January 2021)	TE team presents to UNDP and PMU
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the TE mission: (15 February 2021)	TE team submits to PMU and UNDP; reviewed by GEF RTA
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft: (15 March 2021)	TE team submits both documents to UNDP

13 TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of **01 international evaluator** and **1 national evaluator** (the international evaluator will be the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report). 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.

QUALIFICATIONS

The team members must present the following qualifications:

For International Consultant (Team Leader)

- Master’s degree in project management, energy efficiency, construction 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 in building 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, construction 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 (in buildings), 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.

14 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*.⁶

⁶ <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

15 PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	Payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by UNDP
40%	Payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to UNDP
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

(To be included in the project document packages upon commencement of the assignment)

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

The following documents will be reviewed:

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Inception Report
- Project document
- Project inception report
- Annual Workplans of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020
- Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
- Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
- Audit reports
- Project budget and financial data
- Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term
- Mid-term Review Report
- Oversight mission reports, Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings
- All monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Technical reports of key activities/results by the project
- One UN Plan II 2017-2021
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional, and national levels (including CPD & OSP 2017 – 2021)?			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution:</p> <p>6 – Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5 – Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 – Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</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>Sustainability Ratings:</p> <p>4 – Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 – Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2 – Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1 – Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance Ratings:</p> <p>2 – Relevant (R)</p> <p>1 – Not Relevant (NR)</p>
<p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3 – Significant (S)</p> <p>2 – Minimal (M)</p> <p>1 – Negligible (N)</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 Form⁷

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 _____ on _____

Signature: _____

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

I. OPENING PAGE

- Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID #s
- Evaluation timeframe 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.)⁹

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)¹⁰*

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

⁸The report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008.

¹⁰ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see [Annex D](#) for ratings explanations.

- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

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

Project Results

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

4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success

5. ANNEXES

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Summary of field visits
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail
- Annexed in a separate file: relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by:

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team 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 listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH ASSIGNED SCORES

International Consultant

Consultant(s)' experiences/qualification related to the services		
1	Master's degree in project management, energy efficiency, construction or relevant fields	150
2	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
3	Recent experience leading results-based management evaluation of international donor supported project in climate change mitigation, energy efficiency in buildings	250
4	Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be an asset	150
5	Work experience in climate change mitigation, energy efficiency projects in developing countries in Asia is an advantage	150
6	Demonstrated command over writing professional reports in English with sample of 2 similar reports submitted.	100
Total		1000

National Consultant

Consultant(s)' experiences/qualification related to the services		
1	Graduate degree in degree in project management, energy efficiency, construction or relevant fields	150
2	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
3	Familiarity and past experience with evaluation of donor supported project, especially energy efficiency in buildings, climate change mitigation projects.	200
4	Work experience in climate change mitigation for donor-supported projects is an advantage	200
5	Experience with evaluation of GEF supported project is an asset	100
6	Excellent English skills with evidence through practical experience.	150
Total		1000