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Executive Summary:

A. Objectives of evaluation.

The CPD 2012 – 2016 for Thailand defines the main objective as follow: “promoting a just society in Thailand” and, in accordance with the terms of reference, the evaluation should assess the strength of the results chain by reviewing achievements at the output level and their corresponding contribution to meeting the outcome targets.

Specifically, the four outcomes of the CPD 2012 – 2016 for Thailand, are:

1. National legislation, policies and justice administration comply with international human rights norms and standards;
2. Increase and effective international cooperation based on a harmonized national development cooperation policy;
3. Climate change adaptation mainstreamed by the key line ministries into their sectoral and provincial plans, policies and budget; and
4. Substantive gender-equality norms and standards are recognized and mainstreamed into key policy planning and implementation at national and local levels.

The specific objectives of the outcome evaluation were:

- assess progress towards the outcome;
- assess the factors affecting the outcome;
- assess key UNDP contributions (outputs), including those produced through "soft" assistance to outcomes, and
- assess the partnership strategy.

B. Evaluation mission development.

In accordance with the terms of reference the evaluation methodology was founded on a participatory approach.

Firstly, a review of documents has been realized and a methodological approach, work plan, questionnaires for interview with different actors and evaluation matrix, elaborated.

All these documents, with the Inception Report, were sent to UNDP Bangkok, for approval.

Being given that the evaluation methodology included the consultation of different actors involved in the elaboration and implementation of the projects by structured and semi-structured interviews, the specific questionnaires were elaborated, by actor’s group (UNDP, national authorities’ representatives, project’s implementation actors, beneficiaries, local community, etc).

The evaluation mission had structured and semi-structured interview with the actors involved in the projects elaboration and implementation.
The consultant is arrived in Bangkok on November 29, 2015 and the mission was started on November 30, 2015.

C. The findings of the evaluation.

After the documents review and the interviews with different actors, the evaluation mission would like out in evidence the following findings:

1. Findings from UNDP’s Integrity Risk Assessment in public procurement are used to spearhead reforms to improve integrity and value for money in public contract. A UNDP’s assessment, which was jointly conducted with key stakeholders in the Thai Government, found that risks to integrity in Thailand’s public procurement process are rife, resulting in a negative impact on essential public services for human development. The assessment recommends a 20-point action plan including modernizing the public procurement system based on economic, integrity, environmental and social goals and the adoption of a coherent, sound and modern public procurement law. Taking on board the recommendations, the Comptroller General’s Department has set up a team of experts to draft and propose the new Public Procurement Act based on international legal models and the Public Procurement Reform Sub-Committee in the National Reform Council will also use the findings as a basis to propose reform measures.

2. Thailand has ratified the core international human rights treaties, namely the ICCPR, ICESCR, ICERD, CEDAW, CAT, CRC, CRPD, CED (only a signatory). Thus the State has an obligation to review its existing legislations and make suitable amendments where needed or adopt new laws in order to ensure conformity with the international human rights standards. As part of a collaborative project of UNDP and the Law Reform Commission of Thailand, the Handbooks on Checklists for the core human rights treaties have been developed and will provide a systematic review of the Thai laws to ensure respect, protection, and fulfillment of human rights in the country.

3. Effective legal aid schemes produce significant positive outcomes both for individuals and for the wider society, leading to increased accountability and respect for the rule of law. With UNDP support, the Law Reform Commission of Thailand is working with local universities and government and non-government legal aid providers in 5 pilot provinces to improve service standards as espoused by this UN Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems. The results and findings will be used to draft and propose a new Legal Aid Act that will ensure prompt access to legal aid at all stages of the justice process, the involvement of a diversity of legal aid providers including lawyers, CSOs, university legal clinicians and paralegals, and the development of a nationwide legal aid system that is sufficiently staffed and resourced to ensure effective and quality legal aid services delivery.

D. Lessons learned.

As lessons learned:

a) The programme is in line with the Thailand’s National Policy, Strategies and Action Plans.
b) The programme extends UNDP’s partnership with Thai counterparts in a number of key development areas, promoting policy linkages and community participation.

c) Key elements of programme design include the identification of problems and the development of suitable solutions through systematic planning with key stakeholders, and effective coordination of different actors.

d) The programme has provided the catalytic effect in building relationship between different partners such as youth networks, women’s groups, civil society organizations, educational institutes and government authorities by creating peace building platform where information has been exchanged both vertically and horizontally and peaceful norm is established and commonly accepted.

E. Conclusions and recommendations.

**Conclusion 1:** The programme provided significant and efficient support to the realization of projects that directly contribute to the achievement of main priorities of the Government of Thailand.

**Recommendation 1:** In the CPD 2017 - 2021, UNDP should focus on the same objectives and, also, includes in its support the development of institutional, organizational and operational capacities of the governmental institutions, but also, to the partners involved in the project’s execution and implementation.

**Conclusion 2:** The support to the Government of Thailand in the identification of the realistic needs and priorities should be extend and improved.

**Recommendation 2:** UNDP should extend its support to the Government of Thailand in order to strengthen the strategic reflection in the policies development and consolidation of the Democratic Governance & Social Advocacy work of the Country Office to better tailor UNDP’s portfolio to current and emerging democratic governance challenges.

**Conclusion 3:** The media have been little involved in the dissemination of information concerning the projects included in the program and they do not play the role devoted to them to inform and raise awareness, especially regarding the fight against corruption and violence against women and democratic practices.

**Recommendation 3:** It is suitable that in the CPD 2017 - 2021, the UNDP includes as objective, a concrete support, in order to ensure the involvement of the media and universities in the projects achievement.

**Conclusion 4:** The dissemination of information between the different actors involved in the physical and financial execution and implementation of the projects should be improved.

**Recommendation 4:** It is suitable that in the future programme, UNDP includes the establishment of dialogue’s platforms between the different actors involved on the project’s achievement.

**Conclusion 5:** The strategic coordination between the partners involved in the realization of the program should be improved.
**Recommendation 5**: UNDP should strengthen its role as coordinator of international aid and define (in collaboration with other partners) a resources mobilization strategy.

**Global conclusion of the evaluation mission**: The results of the programme implementation, for all 4 outcomes, are worthy and the synergy established between UNDP Country Office and national partners, excellent.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Thailand, officially the Kingdom of Thailand formerly known as Siam is a country at the centre of the Indochinese peninsula in Mainland Southeast Asia. It is bordered to the north by Myanmar and Laos, to the east by Laos and Cambodia, to the south by the Gulf of Thailand and Malaysia, and to the west by the Andaman Sea and the southern extremity of Myanmar. Its maritime boundaries include Vietnam in the Gulf of Thailand to the southeast, and Indonesia and India on the Andaman Sea to the southwest.

Totaling 513,120 square kilometers (198,120 sq mi), Thailand is the world’s 51st-largest country by total area. It is slightly smaller than Yemen and slightly larger than Spain.

Thailand comprises several distinct geographic regions, partly corresponding to the provincial groups. The north of the country is the mountainous area of the Thai highlands, with the highest point being Doi Inthanon in the Thanon Thong Chai Range at 2,565 metres (8,415 ft) above sea level. The northeast, Isan, consists of the Khorat Plateau, bordered to the east by the Mekong River. The centre of the country is dominated by the predominantly flat Chao Phraya river valley, which runs into the Gulf of Thailand.

Southern Thailand consists of the narrow Kra Isthmus that widens into the Malay Peninsula. Politically, there are six geographical regions which differ from the others in population, basic resources, natural features, and level of social and economic development. The diversity of the regions is the most pronounced attribute of Thailand’s physical setting.

The Chao Phraya and the Mekong River are the indispensable water courses of rural Thailand. Industrial scale production of crops use both rivers and their tributaries. The Gulf of Thailand covers 320,000 square kilometres (124,000 sq mi) and is fed by the Chao Phraya, Mae Klong, Bang Pakong, and Tapi Rivers. It contributes to the tourism sector owing to its clear shallow waters along the coasts in the southern region and the Kra Isthmus. The eastern shore of the Gulf of Thailand is an industrial centre of Thailand with the kingdom’s premier deepwater port in Sattahip and its busiest commercial port, Laem Chabang.

The Andaman Sea is a precious natural resource as it hosts the most popular and luxurious resorts in Asia. Phuket, Krabi, Ranong, Phang Nga, and Trang and their islands all lay along the coasts of the Andaman Sea and despite the 2004 tsunami, they are a tourist magnet for visitors from around the world.

Thailand is the 20th-most-populous country in the world, with around 66 million people. The capital and largest city is Bangkok, which is Thailand’s political, commercial, industrial, and cultural hub. About 75–95% of the population is ethnically Tai, which includes four major regional groups: central Thai, northeastern Thai (Khon [Lao] Isan), northern Thai (Khon Mueang); and southern Thai. Thai Chinese, those of significant Chinese heritage, are 14% of the population, while Thais with partial Chinese ancestry comprise up to 40% of the population. Thai Malays represent 3% of the population, with the remainder consisting of Mons, Khmers and various “hill tribes”. The country’s official language is Thai and the primary religion is Theravada Buddhism, which is practiced by around 95% of the population.

Thailand experienced rapid economic growth between 1985 and 1996, becoming a newly industrialized country and a major exporter. Manufacturing, agriculture, and tourism are leading sectors of the economy. Among the ten ASEAN countries, Thailand ranks third in quality of life and
the country’s HDI is rated as "high". Its large population and growing economic influence have made it a middle power in the region and around the world.

Plans have resurfaced for a canal which would connect the Andaman Sea to the Gulf of Thailand, analogous to the Suez and the Panama Canals. The idea has been greeted positively by Thai politicians as it would cut fees charged by the Ports of Singapore, improve ties with China and India, lower shipping times, and eliminate pirate attacks in the Strait of Malacca, and support the Thai government’s policy of being the logistical hub for Southeast Asia. The canal, it is claimed, would improve economic conditions in the south of Thailand, which relies heavily on tourism income, and it would also change the structure of the Thai economy by making it an Asia logistical hub. The canal would be a major engineering project and has an expected cost of US$20–30 billion.

II. THE PROGRAM EVALUATED

The Country Program Document (CPD 2012-2016) will end in December 2016. The UNDP Country Program Document (CPD) 2012-2016 was approved by the Executive Board in September 2011 and was based on a mutually beneficial partnership whereby UNDP would serve as a crucial gateway for Thailand to access international expertise and best practices, and Thailand, with its knowledge and development experience, would serve as an indispensable link in the UNDP global development network. The country program was firmly anchored in Thailand’s eleventh National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP) 2012-2016, which outlines Thailand’s overall development framework and identifies short- and medium-term national priorities and strategies. As its core theme it incorporates the six aspects of human security of the 2009 Thailand Human Development Report. The CPD outlines four program areas in which UNDP would work in the 5 year period from 2012 to 2016:

1) Improved social equity through inclusive governance,

2) Thailand as an active global partner for development,

3) Effective response to climate change, and

4) Advocacy for human development and Millennium Development Goals.

The country program document is an integral part of the United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) 2012-2016. In alignment with the UNPAF and national priorities, and complementing normative and program work of other United Nations agencies, the country program seeks to work with a wide range of Government and non-state actors, while ensuring the participation of vulnerable and marginalized groups. Gender is mainstreamed across the thematic program interventions. Special emphasis is placed on increasing women’s participation in decision-making and on increasing their access to justice mechanisms.

The country program document (CPD 2012 – 2016) is based on a mutually beneficial partnership in whereby UNDP would serve as a crucial gateway for Thailand to access international expertise and best practices, and Thailand, with its knowledge and development experience, would serve as an indispensable link in the UNDP global development network. The country program is firmly anchored in Thailand’s eleventh National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP) 2012-2016, which outlines Thailand’s overall development framework
and identifies short- and medium-term national priorities and strategies. As its core theme it incorporates the six aspects of human security of the 2009 Thailand Human Development Report.

The Eleventh Economic and Social Development Plan (2012-16) was approved in October 2011. While noting the uncertainty of the future it notes that it will ‘...continue to implement the key elements of the “Philosophy of Sufficiency Economy.”... place “people at the center of development,” and promote “balanced development” in all aspects.’ (NESDP 2011 p12), and sets out the following vision and missions:

Vision: “A happy society with equity, fairness and resilience.”

Missions:

1. To promote a fair society of quality so as to provide social protection and security, to enjoy access to a fair judicial system and its resources, and to participate in the development process under good governance.
2. To develop people with integrity, knowledge and skills appropriate to the age of each, and to strengthen social institutions and local communities to ensure positive adaptation to changes.
3. To enhance the efficiency of production and services based on local wisdom, knowledge, innovation and creativity by developing food and energy security, while reforming the structure of economy so that consumption becomes more environmentally friendly, and strengthening relations with neighboring countries in the region for economic and social benefits.
4. To build secure natural resource and environmental bases through supporting community participation and improving resilience that will cushion impacts from climate change and disasters.

Success in these vision areas will be measured using a number of indicators:

1. Overall national development: Main indicators are the Thai Green and Happiness Index, the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) Peace Index, the ratio between the highest 10 percent of the population by income and the lowest 10 percent, the poverty line, the ratio of workers in the informal sector having access to social protection, and the TI Corruption Perception Index.
2. Social Aspect: Many indicators are applied, including average years of schooling, the proportion of population with access to communication networks and high-speed internet, the number of R&D personnel per 10,000 persons, the rate of non-communicable diseases, and Thailand’s Warm Family Index.
3. Economic Aspect: Important indicators are the GDP growth rate, the inflation rate, TFP, national competitiveness, and the proportion of production (output) of GDP by SME’s.
4. Natural resource and environmental aspect: A variety of indicators include quality of water and air, the proportion of conservation forest area to total land area, and the ratio of greenhouse gas emissions per capita to GDP.

III. OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATION

The CPD 2012 – 2016 FOR Thailand defines the main objective as follow: “promoting a just society in Thailand” and, in accordance with the terms of reference, the evaluation should assess the strength of the results chain by reviewing achievements at the output level and their corresponding contribution to meeting the outcome targets.

Specifically, the four outcomes of the CPD 2012 – 2016 for Thailand, are:
• National legislation, policies and justice administration comply with international human rights norms and standards;

• Increase and effective international cooperation based on a harmonized national development cooperation policy;

• Climate change adaptation mainstreamed by the key line ministries into their sectoral and provincial plans, policies and budget; and

• Substantive gender-equality norms and standards are recognized and mainstreamed into key policy planning and implementation at national and local levels.

The specific objectives of the outcome evaluation were:

• assess progress towards the outcome;
• assess the factors affecting the outcome;
• assess key UNDP contributions (outputs), including those produced through "soft" assistance to outcomes, and
• assess the partnership strategy.

IV. OUTCOME EVALUATION.

Outcomes describe the intended changes in development conditions that result from the interventions of governments and other stakeholders, including international development agencies such as UNDP. They are medium-term development results created through the delivery of outputs and the contributions of various partners. Outcomes provide a clear vision of what has changed or will change globally or in a particular region, country or community within a period of time. They normally relate to changes in institutional performance or behaviour among individuals or groups. Outcomes cannot normally be achieved by only one agency and are not under the direct control of a project manager.

It is this latter point that is key to understanding the nature of outcomes. Outcomes are beyond the managerial responsibility, beyond the immediate control, of UNDP programme or project managers.

However, UNDP is responsible for planning and implementing initiatives in such a way that they are most likely to contribute to the achievement of outcomes; UNDP can thus be held accountable for the achievement of results. Outcomes happen as a result of, all the work that has been done by UNDP in cooperation with development partners. Outcomes reflect the developmental momentum that has been gained by primary stakeholders in programme countries, as a consequence of UNDP's initiatives. Outcomes are what primary stakeholders do under their own steam, upon their own initiative, following UNDP's delivery of outputs – the services and products generated under a programme or project. Outcomes are not the sum of outputs delivered through UNDP programmes and projects; rather, they occur when outputs are used by primary stakeholders to bring about change.

Knowledgeable training workshop participants are not an outcome. UNDP advisory reports are not an outcome. UNDP procurement of medication is not an outcome. An outcome is when men and women use knowledge gained through UNDP training in their day-to-day work and bring about changes. An outcome is when UNDP advisory reports are used by government officials to develop new policies.
An outcome is when counterparts use UNDP models and systems to develop transparent and accountable procurement systems of their own.

Outcomes are not what UNDP delivers, but the developmental achievement to which UNDP contributes. Outcomes are what UNDP’s work is ultimately all about: making a difference.

An outcome evaluation investigates whether changes have occurred for the people participating in a program. It quantifies the magnitude (how big) and direction (positive or negative) of those changes and the circumstances associated with them. An outcome evaluation also seeks to tie these changes to specific elements of the program. This is a way of testing whether the logic model or rationale for the program is valid. An outcome evaluation essentially asks, “What is my program accomplishing in the short term?” and “Am I meeting my objectives?” When an outcome evaluation demonstrates the effectiveness of a program in achieving its intended outcomes, it not only argues for continued investment in the program but can provide justification for replication elsewhere.

The purpose of outcome-level evaluation is to find out how UNDP has gone about supporting processes and building capacities that have, indeed, helped make a difference. In doing so, evaluation aims to identify which UNDP approaches have worked well and which have faced challenges, and to use lessons learned to improve future initiatives and generate knowledge for wider use. Evaluation also serves the purpose of holding UNDP accountable for the resources invested in its work.

All decentralized evaluations should, in principle, be pitched at the outcome level.

In evaluating any kind of UNDP initiative, it should not only be possible to ascertain to what extent it was designed to contribute to the achievement of outcomes; it should also be possible to obtain an indication of how successful the initiative was in, in fact, contributing towards the achievement of outcomes.

While outcome-level evaluations focus on outcomes, this does not mean that other aspects of UNDP initiatives are neglected. In order to understand whether everything has been done to contribute to the achievement of outcomes, evaluations also need to look at how well the initiative was planned, what activities were carried out, what outputs were delivered, how processes were managed, what monitoring systems were put in place, how UNDP interacted with its partners, etc. Outcome-level evaluation does not, therefore, imply an exclusive preoccupation with outcomes; but it does mean that all UNDP initiatives should be evaluated in terms of their overriding intention to bring about change in human development conditions at the outcome level.

Notwithstanding the above, it is conceivable that some decentralized evaluations would focus exclusively on issues relating to processes, implementation or management arrangements, especially in a larger organizational context. Such evaluations may, but would not necessarily, address UNDP’s contribution at the outcome level. However, they would be highly specialized evaluations that may be warranted in particular circumstances, e.g., during periods of organizational change.
V. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation criteria are applied to focus evaluation objectives: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, appropriation by national part of the program assets and impact.

a) **Relevance**: the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

b) **Effectiveness**: a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.

c) **Efficiency**: measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopt.

d) **Impact**: the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.

e) **Sustainability**: is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The program needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

f) **Appropriation**: the commitment, the motivation and the repetition (rehearsal) are prerequisites required for the appropriation of the knowledge. The knowledge management indicates the management of all the knowledge and the know-how in action mobilized by the actors of the national part to allow them to reach its goals. Specifically in the case of the support provided by the international community and as evaluation indicator, the appropriation represents the level of knowledge and competencies acquired by the actors of the national part in order to manage and continue the process and activities contained in the support provided by international community.

VI. LIMITS OF THE EVALUATION.

Two aspects had limited the evaluation:

a. the interviews were limited to the actors involved in only 9 of the 42 projects included in the CPD 2012 – 2016;
b. the mission duration.
VII. UNDP COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

A prominent comparative advantage of the UNDP is that the UNDP upholds the norms, standards and principles of the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and statutory and customary international law and international treaties as well as the Millennium Declaration. The UNDP is the custodian of these instruments, advocates for their implementation, monitors adherence, and supports Governments in complying with their obligations. The UNDP stands for a principled, norm-based, constructive engagement. The following principles, amongst others, are fundamental to UNDP engagement: a human rights based approach, dignity, growth with equity, inclusiveness, accountability, transparency, anti-corruption and a focus on results.

The work of the UNDP in Thailand and the program areas identified in the UNPAF have been shaped by the confidence that national partners have in the UNDP to respond quickly, flexibly and effectively to both on-going and emerging needs, and to operate in harmony with other stakeholders while remaining neutral and impartial. These advantages have been reinforced by the long-term presence of the UNDP in the country.

The UNDP in Thailand has supported national partners to undertake important normative and analytical work on priority development issues, the value of which is recognized by the Government and other development partners. This includes supporting the preparation of national human development reports, periodic reports on the status of children, periodic reports on status of women; the state of population report, as well as studies on child poverty, human trafficking, food security and nutrition, etc. In addition to strengthening national capacities at the individual and institutional levels, these studies have enriched the development debate in Thailand, informed public policies, provided evidence for programming, and resulted in important allocations of national and international resources. Likewise, UNDP support to poverty mapping at the national and regional levels has guided the design, implementation, and monitoring of poverty programs.

In order to address effectively key development challenges in Thailand, the UNDP will continue to work closely with Government, both at the central level and with increasing emphasis at the local level. At the same time, to ensure broad national ownership and sustainability of results, the UNDP is developing a more substantive partnership for dialogue and consultation with a wide variety of relevant national development partners from the public and non-public sectors (including the Parliament, civil society organizations, youth-led groups and associations, the private sector, foundations, academia, and the media), as well as Thailand’s international development partners (bilateral, multilateral and foundations), both from the North and the South. This expanded engagement builds on the UNDP’s demonstrated capacity to facilitate the participation of a wide array of national and international actors including through existing initiatives, multi-stakeholder platforms and strategic joint programs on multi-sectoral issues, such as climate change, human trafficking, etc.

As in other middle income countries, the UNDP is expected to work less on direct program implementation and increase its work in the areas of upstream policy advice, advocacy, and capacity development, drawing on its strong and varied country presence, healthy mix of international managers and highly-capable national professionals with local knowledge that is backed by regional and international expertise. Facilitating access to the UNDP’s worldwide experience and knowledge is an important asset the UNDP brings to bear, as well as supporting Thailand in South-South Cooperation (SSC) – both in terms of brokering incoming SSC to address domestic needs and helping Thailand to expand its role as a provider of development services to other countries.
The UNDP will continue to undertake and promote the use of analytical work on priority development issues to enrich the development debate, inform public policies, provide evidence for programming and policy making, and guide allocations of national and international resources.

The UNDP in Thailand has demonstrated a strong capacity to mobilize and facilitate interaction with national and international actors. Indeed, the role of the UNDP in supporting national development actors to bring together a wide variety of development partners from the public and non-public sectors (including NGOs, CSOs, the private sector, foundations, and academia) to engage on complex development issues has been highlighted as being particularly important, as exemplified by several on-going UNDP supported initiatives.

Given that voluntary action is deeply embedded in Thailand culture, the UNDP is committed to fostering volunteerism in its various forms, especially amongst youth, to build local capacities and achieve UNPAF objectives.

Finally, the UNP has been called upon in Thailand to support both the Government and its international partners to make progress on the aid effectiveness agenda, as set forth in the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness.

Specifically, in Thailand UNDP develops the following axis:

**Axis 1:** the corroboration between the strategic vision and the field realities:

The UNDP support to the national partners allow the development and the implementation of innovative initiatives and to evaluate them in accordance with the international standards. The UNDP management and planning framework, though formal and systemic, offers a flexibility in management of the activities compared to the national administrative procedures, thus offering a potential experimentation.

**Axis 2:** A recognized expertise concerning the reinforcement of national capacities:

The UNDP analysis, respecting the international standards and principles, allow to orient the national policies. The expertise provided integrates as principles programming sciences broader as than proposes the various bilateral cooperations: approach based on the human rights, the approach environment, planning and management centered on the results, the development of the institutional capacities.

**Axis 3:** A key position for the mobilization of the partners and the setting in network.

**Axis 4:** A recognized expertise for advocacy.

**Axis 5:** The facilitation of the coordination of the international assistance.
In accordance with the terms of reference (annex 1) the evaluation methodology was founded on a participatory approach.

Firstly, a review of documents has been realized (the list of documents reviewed is presented in annex 2), a methodological approach (presented below) and work plan (annex 4) elaborated.

**VIII. DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVALUATION MISSION**

**Review of the existing documentation (CPD in progress, studies, analysis, reports, etc) in order with the Programme**

**Briefing with UNDP, National Authorities and stakeholders**

**Elaboration of the Inception report, including detailed methodology, work plan (chronogramme), questionnaires, evaluation matrix and submission to UNDP and National Authorities for validation**

**Arrival of the consultant in Bangkok.**

**Evaluation**

- The trajectory of the program comparatively with the work plan and specific matrix included in the program document. Analysis of the relationship with other actors involved in the programme.
- Programme accomplishments
- Evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, Impact
- Appropriateness of the components of the programme in relation with the objectives and the awaited results of the programme
- Coordination and management of the programme. Analysis of the mechanisms and tools used
Identify the assets and achievements.

Identify the constraints, weaknesses, difficulties, deficiencies, gaps.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Elaboration of the Draft of Evaluation Report and PowerPoint presentation, underlining the findings, lessons learned and good practices
Include the comments, suggestions and recommendations of the validation workshop and Final Evaluation Report elaboration and presentation to UNDP and National Authorities

Workshop (Power Point presentation) for the validation of the Draft of Evaluation Report

Submission of the Draft of Evaluation Report and Power Point presentation to UNDP and National Authorities

Elaboration of the Draft of Evaluation Report and Power Point presentation, underlining the findings, lessons learned and good practices
Being given that the evaluation methodology had as base the consultation of different actors involved in the elaboration and implementation of the projects by structured and semi-structured interviews, the specific questionnaires, by actor’s group (UNDP, national authorities representatives, project’s implementation actors, beneficiaries, local community, etc) were elaborated (annex 5). Also, the evaluation matrix has been elaborated (annex 6).

The consultant had developed the Inception Report that was submitted for approval to UNDP Bangkok with annexes mentioned above and this report has been approved by the Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP Office in Bangkok.

The consultant is arrived in Bangkok on November 29-th, 2015 and the evaluation mission started on November 30-th, 2015.

After the briefing with UNDP Bangkok, the consultant has begun the interviews with different actors involved in the elaboration and execution of the CPD 2012 – 2016 projects. (list of persons interviewed is in annex 7). Some “Synthesis tables” of interviews with different actors are presented, as sample, in annex 8.

A Power Point presentation has been elaborated by the consultant and presented to different actors interviewed (validation workshop, on December 22-nd, 2015).

The suggestions, comments and recommendations of the participants (list of participants in annex 9) were included in the present final evaluation report.

---

**IX. TABLE OF RESULTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENABLING – MONITORING ACTIONS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Thailand’s International Development Cooperation is strengthened through the execution of good strategic sectoral cooperation plans. (Contributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs:Output 7.5) | 1. Supporting consultancy for Thailand International Cooperation Agency for the preparation of sectoral cooperation plans.  
2. Supporting the development of materials that demonstrate good practices of Thailand development in line with the identified sectoral cooperation plans. | This output will be fully achieved provided that resource mobilization be successful. Activity 1 will be achieved since the scope of consultancy has currently been identified in consultation with the key implementing partner (Thailand International Cooperation Agency). However, it is unlikely that Activity 2 will be achieved in 2015 since there will be no adequate budget for Activity 2 by the end of 2015. Expected to be achieved. |
| B. Development partnership dialogues and initiatives in southern Thailand are engaged by all actors including CSOs, local communities and local governments. (Contributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs:Output 2.4) | 1. Supporting local dialogues for broadening the participation in peace and development processes at the grass-root level.,  
2. Supporting capacity of community and religious leaders in alternative disputes resolution process.  
3. Providing small grants and expertise to support local initiatives rooted in development dialogues. | Dialogues among stakeholders on participatory peace monitoring were held on southern local Media day and lessons learned from Mindanao case studies were shared in May. - Research to map the existing demands and current practice of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and to explore feasibility of its expansion was conducted and is being finalized. Consultations with community leaders and religious leaders on the feasibility of ADR were held. Pilot activities are expected to start within the third quarter. - Criteria for providing small grants to communities were set up with a call for proposal opened to communities mainly in Pattani province. Expected to be achieved. |
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### C. National and provincial governments equipped with essential skills and tools for mainstreaming climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in development policies, plans, and budget processes.  
(Ccontributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs: Output 5.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Analyzing national and provincial disaster risk management-related public expenditure and institutional arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Engaging private sectors in the investment of social innovations for disaster risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of pilot provinces formally agreed by the government - A national technical briefing session and inception workshops in the pilot provinces took place in July. Grant agreement signed with the Responsible Party to engage private sector actors in the investment of social innovations for DRR. Expected to be achieved.

### D. Guideline on Climate Change Analysis Framework developed in Thailand to provide criteria in national budget allocation and in international financial supports allocation.  
(Ccontributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs: Output 1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Series of 6 capacity building workshops and policy dialogues to develop the guideline on climate change analysis framework, focusing on budget analysis tools as well as on climate benefit criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 capacity building workshops have been conducted, including the consultation forum on the draft guideline. The second draft of the guideline is in process of revision per the comments and suggestions from the consultation. Third draft will be finalized through peer review and policy dialogues by December 2015, as planned. Expected to be achieved.

### E. Optional legal aid systems are proposed as part of legal reform to increase access to justice.  
(Ccontributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs: Output 2.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Reviewing current legal aid systems and explore alternatives that can be linked with new model of justice fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Piloting alternative legal aid systems in provinces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft legal aid legislation submitted to the Law Reform Committee. The Thai Government is hosting an ASEAN conference on legal aid. Legal aid model pilots underway in 4 provinces. Expected to be achieved.

### F. Models for women’s empowerment and multi-stakeholder partnership for decision making at subnational level are in place.  
(Ccontributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs: Output 4.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conduct sectoral corruption risk assessments (justice or health sector) to generate “actionable” information to help shape anti-corruption strategies, policies, and advocacy based on evidence of the underlying causes of corruption. Develop measures and tools for mitigating integrity risks in public procurement and to provide support to the Royal Thai Government in its efforts to reform and modernise the public procurement system based on a revised set of priorities, including economic, integrity, environmental, and social goals, Empower youth for a culture of integrity and against corruption in Thailand through i) the social enterprise &quot;Refuse To Be Corrupt&quot; café as a focal point for advocacy activities, and ii) integration of integrity curriculum into Thai universities, Pilot community-based monitoring mechanisms to increase social accountability in the utilization of public funds at the local level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This output is unlikely to achieve within the time frame of 2015 due to the need for additional resource mobilization to the current budget and the restructuring of the key implementing partner, the Department of Women and Family Affairs. Partial achievement can be expected with regard to the initiation plan for women’s empowerment in decision making process in 2015. Not expected to be achieved.

### G. Strengthening links between the government, private sector, citizens and other development actors to keep the momentum in the fight against corruption and help avoid public disillusionment with anti-corruption efforts.  
(Ccontributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs: Output 2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conduct sectoral corruption risk assessments (justice or health sector) to generate “actionable” information to help shape anti-corruption strategies, policies, and advocacy based on evidence of the underlying causes of corruption. Develop measures and tools for mitigating integrity risks in public procurement and to provide support to the Royal Thai Government in its efforts to reform and modernize the public procurement system based on a revised set of priorities, including economic, integrity, environmental, and social goals, Empower youth for a culture of integrity and against corruption in Thailand through i) the social enterprise &quot;Refuse To Be Corrupt&quot; café as a focal point for advocacy activities, and ii) integration of integrity curriculum into Thai universities, Pilot community-based monitoring mechanisms to increase social accountability in the utilization of public funds at the local level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cost sharing from the UK Prosperity Fund to support our work on public procurement reform - High-level support and buy-in from the government on the support to be provided by UNDP. - The first "Refuse To Be Corrupt" social enterprise café has been launched - Sectoral corruption risk assessments proposal submitted to the government. Expected to be achieved.
focal point for advocacy activities, and ii) integration of integrity curriculum into Thai universities, Pilot community-based monitoring mechanisms to increase social accountability in the utilization of public funds at the local level.

H. DPC implementation improved across the CO.  
(Contributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs: Organizational Result 7.2)  
Develop and implement a system to track and charge DPC to all relevant development related projects.  
Achieved.

I. Staff capacities on programme re-alignment strengthened. (Contributing Results to ABP Priority Outputs: Organizational Result 1.1)  
Plan for and implement a CO training including a diagnostics exercise on the programmatic SP Alignment Workshop has been conducted on 29 June to 1 July.  
Achieved.

X. PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY.

Clear and realistic programmatic strategy and planning, based on the technical, operational and institutional capacities of the national actors involved in the projects implementation has been defined and employed by UNDP in the programme elaboration and implementation.

XI. LESSONS LEARNED.

As lessons learned:

e) The programme is in line with the Thailand’s National Policy, Strategies and Action Plans.

f) The programme extends UNDP’s partnership with Thai counterparts in a number of key development areas, promoting policy linkages and community participation.

g) Key elements of programme design include the identification of problems and the development of suitable solutions through systematic planning with key stakeholders, and effective coordination of different actors.

h) The programme has provided the catalytic effect in building relationship between different partners such as youth networks, women’s groups, civil society organizations, educational institutes and government authorities by creating peace building platform where information has been exchanged both vertically and horizontally and peaceful norm is established and commonly accepted.

XII. FINDINGS.

After the documents review and the interviews with different actors, the evaluation mission would like out in evidence the following findings:
• Findings from UNDP’s Integrity Risk Assessment in public procurement are used to spearhead reforms to improve integrity and value for money in public contract. A UNDP’s assessment, which was jointly conducted with key stakeholders in the Thai Government, found that risks to integrity in Thailand’s public procurement process are rife, resulting in a negative impact on essential public services for human development. The assessment recommends a 20-point action plan including modernizing the public procurement system based on economic, integrity, environmental and social goals and the adoption of a coherent, sound and modern public procurement law. Taking on board the recommendations, the Comptroller General's Department has set up a team of experts to draft and propose the new Public Procurement Act based on international legal models and the Public Procurement Reform Sub-Committee in the National Reform Council will also use the findings as a basis to propose reform measures.

• Thailand has ratified the core international human rights treaties, namely the ICCPR, ICESCR, ICERD, CEDAW, CAT, CRC, CRPD, CED (only a signatory). Thus the State has an obligation to review its existing legislations and make suitable amendments where needed or adopt new laws in order to ensure conformity with the international human rights standards. As part of a collaborative project of UNDP and the Law Reform Commission of Thailand, the Handbooks on Checklists for the core human rights treaties have been developed and will provide a systematic review of the Thai laws to ensure respect, protection, and fulfillment of human rights in the country.

• Effective legal aid schemes produce significant positive outcomes both for individuals and for the wider society, leading to increased accountability and respect for the rule of law. With UNDP support, the Law Reform Commission of Thailand is working with local universities and government and non-government legal aid providers in 5 pilot provinces to improve service standards as espoused by this UN Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems. The results and findings will be used to draft and propose a new Legal Aid Act that will ensure prompt access to legal aid at all stages of the justice process, the involvement of a diversity of legal aid providers including lawyers, CSOs, university legal clinicians and paralegals, and the development of a nationwide legal aid system that is sufficiently staffed and resourced to ensure effective and quality legal aid services delivery.

XIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCLUSIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion 1:</strong> The programme provided significant and efficient support to the realization of projects that directly contribute to the achievement of main priorities of the Government of Thailand.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1:</strong> In the CPD 2017 - 2021, UNDP should focus on the same objectives and, also, includes in its support the development of institutional, organizational and operational capacities of the governmental institutions, but also, to the partners involved in the project’s execution and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion 2: The support to the Government of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2:</strong> UNDP should extend its support to the Government of Thailand in order to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thailand in the identification of the realistic needs and priorities should be extend and improved.

**Conclusion 3:** The media have been little involved in the dissemination of information concerning the projects included in the program and they do not play the role devoted to them to inform and raise awareness, especially regarding the fight against corruption and violence against women and democratic practices.

**Recommendation 3:** It is suitable that in the CPD 2017 - 2021, the UNDP includes as objective, a concrete support, in order to ensure the involvement of the media and universities in the projects achievement.

**Conclusion 4:** The dissemination of information between the different actors involved in the physical and financial execution and implementation of the projects should be improved.

**Recommendation 4:** It is suitable that in the future programme, UNDP includes the establishment of dialogue’s platforms between the different actors involved on the project’s achievement.

**Conclusion 5:** The strategic coordination between the partners involved in the realization of the program should be improved.

**Recommendation 5:** UNDP should strengthen its role as coordinator of international aid and define (in collaboration with other partners) a resources mobilization strategy.

As global conclusion of the evaluation mission, we consider that the results of the programme implementation, for all 4 outcomes, are worthy and the synergy established between UNDP Country Office and national partners, excellent.

Bangkok, December 24-th, 2015.