

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

Maximizing Carbon Sink Capacity and Conserving Biodiversity and through Sustainable Conservation,
Restoration and Management of Peat-Swamp Ecosystem (PIM 4951)

BASIC INFORMATION

Location: Kuan Kreng Landscape in Nakhin Sri Thammarat, Songkhla, Phatthalung provinces in Thailand

Application Deadline: 17 December 2020 (NY Time)

Type of Contract: National TE Consultant (Individual Consultant)

Assignment Type: Short term

Languages Required: English and Thai

Starting Date: 25 December 2020

Duration of Initial Contract: 25 working days

Expected Duration of Assignment: 25 December 2020 – 10 February 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

UNDP Thailand Country Office is looking for a national consultant who will work together with an international consultant in conducting the Terminal Evaluation (thereafter referred to as the “Evaluation Team”).

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) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled Maximizing carbon sink capacity and conserving biodiversity and through sustainable conservation, restoration and management of peat-swamp ecosystems (PIMS 4951) implemented through the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE). The project started on the 21 July 2016 and is in its final year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ ([Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)).

The national consultant will work together with an international consultant in conducting the project terminal evaluation (thereafter referred to as the Evaluation Team).

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Maximizing carbon sink capacity and conserving biodiversity and through sustainable conservation, restoration and management of peat-swamp ecosystems			
GEF Project ID:	00092458		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00084475	GEF financing:	3,224,400	
Country:	Thailand	UNDP:	300,000	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:	11,980,680	
Focal Area:	Multi-Focal Areas	Other:	1,102,031	

FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CCM-1, BD-1, SFM/REDD-1	Total co-financing:	13,382,711	
Executing Agency:	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and planning (ONEP), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)	Total Project Cost:	16,607,111	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		21 July 2016
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Planned: 21 July 2020	Actual: January 2021

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project was designed to conserve and restore peatlands to increase their capacities to act as carbon sinks, as habitats for global important species, and as sources for ecosystems services for improved livelihoods. The Kuan Kreng landscape (KKL) in south eastern Thailand contains the country's second largest peat swamp forest area. By some estimates, however, about 65% of the KKL remains under constant threat of degradation from various threats with the primary one being conversion to oil palm cultivation and associated drainage and forest fires. The long-term solution is to change the trajectory of baseline approaches and facilitate a transformative shift from unsustainable to sustainable and integrated use of peat swamps in Thailand. In doing so it will improve the status of indicator species in KKL, demonstrate good peat swamp forest management practices, maintain the carbon pool, reduce emissions from peatlands, enhance institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks, and develop a national strategy to guide the management of peat swamps.

The objective of the project is to conserve and restore peatlands to increase their capacities to act as carbon sinks, as habitats for globally important species, and as sources of ecosystem services for improved livelihoods. This objective will be realized through the following outcomes;

Outcome 1: Expanding protection of high conservation value peat swamp forests and demonstrating their sustainable use within the broader landscape

Outcome 2: Implementing technologies to avoid peat swamp forest degradation and restore degraded peat swamp forests.

Outcome 3: Improving policies, standards and enforcement mechanisms for conservation and sustainable use of peat swamp forests

The project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through UNDP with a total budget of US\$ 3,224,400, including UNDP US\$300,000 cash co-finance. The project is being implemented in Kuan Kreng landscape (KKL) in Nakhon Sri Thammarat, Songkhla, Phatthalung, Thailand for 5 years from (2016 – 2021). The Project implementing partner is the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and planning (ONEP).

UNDP Thailand Country Office has received a request from the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP), the Implementing Partner of the said project, to extend the project for six months. This request was approved by the Project Board on 8 June 2020. This exceptional request is due to the prolonged strict COVID-19 lockdown that has significantly impeded the final months of project implementation. The project has been unable to finalize its exit strategy and the delayed

implementation of critical activities under the Outcome 3 which will put at risk the sustainability of the project's impacts.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The project is entering to the final phase of implementation. The project end date is on 21 January 2021. The Implementing Partner (ONEP), Project Board members, and UNDP Thailand Country Office will use the project's evaluation results to ensure effectiveness of exit strategy during the 6-month project extension and take away key recommendations to embed into the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP).

Further to this, the objectives of the evaluation will be to:

- assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e. progress of project's outcome targets)
- assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant environmental management plans or climate and biodiversity management policies
- assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Country Programme Document for Thailand (2017-2021) and recommendations on the way forwards
- assess any cross cutting and gender issues
- assess impact of the project in terms of its contribution to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved awareness on maximizing a carbon sink capacity of peat swamp throughout the stakeholders
- examination on the use of funds and value for money and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming

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.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Country Programme Document for Thailand (2017-2021), UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP,) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area, Core Indicators/Tracking Tools, submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders are vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the RECOFTC, : executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the national TE consultant may require conducting field missions to Kuan Kreng Landscape (KKL), Nakhon Sri Thammarat, Songkhla, Phatthalung provinces and brief information to the International TE consultant (due to travel restriction on COVID-19).

List of Stakeholders

Bangkok

Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (Implementing Partner)

- UNDP Thailand Country Office
- Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation
- Royal Forest Department
- Department of Marine and Coastal Resources
- Department of Water Resources
- Department of Land Development
- Royal Irrigation Department
- Office of Agricultural Land Reform
- RECOFTC
- Wisdom Vast Company Limited
- Thailand Environment Institute
- Kasetsart University

Kuan Kreng Landscape (Nakhon Sri Thammarat, Songkhla, Patthalung)

- Office of the Royal Development Projects Board in Nakhon Sri Thammarat province
- Provincial Offices for Natural Resources and Environment (Nakhon Si Thammarat)
- Provincial Offices for Natural Resources and Environment (Phatthalung)
- Provincial Offices for Natural Resources and Environment (Songkhla)
- General Affairs Division Office of the Permanent secretary Natural Resources and Environment
- Protected Area Regional Office 5 – Forest Fire Control Division
- Protected Area Regional Office 6
- Forest Resources Regional Office 13
- Faculty of Environmental Management, Prince of Songkhla University

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

(Note: The TE team can use questionnaires, field visits and interviews for data collection, but the TE team should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the UNDP M&E focal point and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.)

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

In case that the International TE consultant cannot enter to Thailand due to the COVID-19 VISA protocol, the TE team should develop a methodology that reflects the adaptive management. It includes 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 governments and national and KKL landscape counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects ([Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)). The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Maximizing carbon sink capacity and conserving biodiversity and through sustainable conservation, restoration and management of peat-swamp ecosystems Project*

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The TE *consultant/team* shall prepare and submit:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: <i>(by 25 December 2020)</i>	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: <i>(by 10 January 2021)</i>	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report <i>(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)</i> with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: <i>(by 12 January 2021)</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
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 <i>(See template in ToR Annex H)</i>	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: <i>(10 February 2021)</i>	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U)

*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.²

7. TE ARRANGEMENT

Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Thailand Country Office. The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team, if the travel is permitted. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The UNDP Thailand Country Office and Project Team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings if travel to project site is restricted. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the UNDP Thailand Country Office to the TE team.

8. DURATION OF WORK

The total duration of the TE will be **25 working days** over a time of **six weeks** starting on 25 December 2020. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
25-26 December (2 days)	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
25- 30 December 2020 (5 days)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
31 December 2020 (1day)	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
2-6 January 2021 (5 days)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
9-10 January 2021 (2 days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission (including preparation for the presentation)
27 – 12 January 2021 (14 days)	Preparation of draft TE report
12 January 2021 (1 day)	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
13-27 January 2021 (15 days)	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
25 -31 January 2021 (7 days)	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
1 February 2021	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
10 February 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report. The expected date start date of contract is 25 December 2020– 10 February 2021

9. DUTY STATION

The National Consultant will travel to the project site at Kuan Kreng Landscape in Nakhon Sri Thammarat, Songkhla, Phatthalung provinces in order to interview the local stakeholders and beneficiaries. Also, the

² Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

National Consultant will interview the stakeholders in Bangkok as per the list provided by the UNDP Thailand Country Office.

Travel Note:

- The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

10. TE TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS

A team of *two independent evaluators* will conduct the TE – *one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one national expert from Thailand*. The international consultant will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report. The national consultant will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.

The national consultant will work closely with the International Consultant in supporting any work that needs to be undertaken as laid out in this ToR, and other tasks, as required. The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Thailand. In the case of international travel restriction and the mission is not possible, the TE team will use alternative means of interviewing stakeholders and data collection (i.e. Skype interview, mobile questionnaires, etc.) including the field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant's guidance

The evaluators cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Terminal Evaluation and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of **National Consultants** will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Master's degree in ecology, wetland management, conservation science, natural resource management, environment science, and/ or other related fields

Experience

- Minimum of two (2) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management;
- Demonstrable previous experience in conducting mid-term evaluation and/or terminal evaluation of the GEF funded projects;
- Proven communication, facilitation, and writing skills;
- Evaluation skills, including conducting interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, qualitative and quantitative analysis
- Excellent command of English both writing and speaking;

- Familiarity with Thailand national and local development policies, programs and projects;
- Some project management experience in biodiversity conservation and ecosystems protections would be an advantage
- Some knowledge of UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy would be an advantage
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management
- Experience in evaluating projects
- Experience working in *in Thailand*
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least **5 years**
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management
- experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis
- Excellent communication skills
- Demonstrable analytical skills
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English and Thai

Responsibilities

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

11. EVALUATION ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

12. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

APPLICATION PROCESS

1. Recommended Presentation of Proposal

Interested individual consultant must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications.

Please group them into one (1) single PDF document as the application system only allows to upload maximum one document:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability with Financial Proposal (in THB)** using the template provided as **Annex III**;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** attached Template as **Annex IV**;
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal (in THB)** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template **Annex III**. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.

Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are Nakhon Sri Thammarat, Sogkhla, Phatthalung provinces, which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination (*Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.*)
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

2. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES:

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative Analysis: The candidates will be evaluated through Cumulative Analysis method. When using the weighted scoring method, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of set of weighted combine technical evaluation of desk review and interview (70%), and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

Technical Evaluation (Total 70 points) – 70%

- **Criteria 01:** At least Master's degree in a discipline relevant to Natural Resource Management, Environmental Science, Development Studies, Economic or other closely related field - **Max Point 5**;
- **Criteria 02:** Minimum of two (2) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management - **Max Point 25**;
- **Criteria 03:** Previous experiences in project evaluation/project design/implementation in relevant thematic areas (i.e. peatland, climate change, livelihood, environmental conservation, land use planning, water management) - **Max Point 25**;
- **Criteria 04:** Proven experiences in field level data collection with adequate knowledge of data collection tools - **Max Point 10**;
- **Criteria 05:** Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and community-based management, peatland & climate change - **Max Point 5**.

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

Financial Evaluation (30%)

Financial proposals from all technically qualified candidates will be scored out 30 marks based on the formula provided below. The maximum marks (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal.

All other proposals will receive points according to the following formula:

- $p = y (\mu/z)$.

Where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated;
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal;
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal;
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated.

3. Annexes to the TE ToR

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail
- Annex in a separate file: Relevant TE tracking tools (list)
- Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcomes as defined in the 2012-2016 CPD for Thailand: Thailand is better prepared to address climate change and environmental security issues through the enhancement of national capacity and policy readiness.

Country Programme Outcome Indicators:

Indicator 1: Number of national and local (networking) platforms supported and/or strengthened.

Baseline: As of 2011, there are few (networking) platforms fully operated by the Thai Government and participated by communities and stakeholders.

Target: At least 3 national and local platforms developed with UNDP support by 2016.

Indicator 2: Number of climate-related policies and model actions established applied and/or replicated by national and local partners; as well as exchanged in south-south cooperation forums.

Baseline: As of 2011, no strong climate-related national policies and model actions established, applied and/or replicated by national and local partners.

Target: At least 3 climate-related policies and model actions established, applied and/or replicated by 2016 with support by UNDP. At least 3 south-south exchange forums conducted addressing the three outputs and other key issues (e.g. mitigation, adaptation, environmental security, climate fiscal framework, etc.)

Primary applicable Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:

Biodiversity Focal Area Objective 1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems; Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas

Climate Change Focal Area Objective 5: Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry; Outcome 1: Good management practices adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape; Outcome 2: Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non-forest lands; Outcome 5.3: GHG emissions avoided and carbon sequestered

Sustainable Forest Management/ REDD+ Focal Area Objective 1: Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services; Outcome 1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests; Outcome 2.1: Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:

BD-1 Indicator 1.1: Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

CCM-5 Indicator: Hectares of peatlands restored to enhance carbon stocks; GHG emissions avoided and carbon sequestered in tones of CO₂ equivalent

SFM REDD 1 Indicator: 1.3 (a): Forest ecosystem services generated in peatland forest pilot sites

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks/ Assumptions					
The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the conservation and sustainable use of all peatlands in Thailand to maintain the range of ecosystem services they generate										
Project Objective: To conserve and restore peatlands to increase their capacities to act as carbon sinks, as habitats for globally important species, and as sources of ecosystem services for improved livelihoods	Extent of peat swamp area under effective management (IUCN Category IV, V) in KKL, under the framework of a National Strategy for Peat swamps (NSP)	Currently there is no NSP; there are 2 NHAs (IUCN category IV) as follows: <table border="1"><tr><td>Thale Noi NHA and buffer zone</td><td>48,000 ha</td></tr><tr><td>Bor Lor NHA</td><td>10,016 ha</td></tr></table>	Thale Noi NHA and buffer zone	48,000 ha	Bor Lor NHA	10,016 ha	154,363 ha comprising the following classified as EPAs (IUCN Category V)		Project Reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations	Government continues to support sound management of peatlands in line with the principles and criteria enshrined in the NSP
			Thale Noi NHA and buffer zone	48,000 ha						
			Bor Lor NHA	10,016 ha						
			EPA Songkhla	Sathingpra Peninsula	80,000					
				Thale Noi NHA and buffer zone	48,000					
				Sub-total	128,000					
			EPA Kuan Krang	Bor Lor NHA	10,016					
				Peat swamps in reserved forests around Bor Lor	4,357					
				Agricultural land reform zones, ALRO	9,085					
				Public land/ other land outside ALRO	2,905					
Sub-total	26,363									
Total	154,363									

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks/ Assumptions
Outcome 1: Expanding protection of high conservation value peat swamp forests and demonstrating their sustainable use within the broader landscape	Peat swamp forests in KKL under protection	Thale Noi NHA – 48,000 ha Bor Lor NHA – 10,016 ha	Additional 16,347 ha brought under EPA status consisting of areas that are important for maintaining carbon in the peat layer and connecting patches of peat swamp forests (peat swamps in reserved forests around Bor Lor, areas under ALRO and public land outside ALRO)	Reports from Provincial Committee in charge of Kuan Kreng EPA	Stakeholder support is secured for the creation and management of protected areas
	Area covered by EPA Management Plans that will result in the release of pressures on the 29 million tC pool	0	154,363 ha	Reports from Provincial Committees in charge of Kuan Kreng and Songkhla Lake EPAs	National plan to declare the Songkhla EPA remains unchanged. ONEP has the mandate to process declaration of EPA
	Enhanced management effectiveness at existing PAs (NHAs) and new PAs (EPA Songkhla and EPA Kuan Kreng) as measured by METT	Thale Noi NHA: 64 Bor Lor NHA: 42 EPA Kuan Kreng: 12 EPA Songkhla: 19	Thale Noi NHA: 75 Bor Lor NHA: 70 EPA Kuan Kreng: 20 EPA Songkhla: 30	METT Scorecard	There is cooperation between communities and relevant government agencies at sub-district level.
	Incidence of violations of NHA regulations	NHA	Baseline number of violations		Reports from NHA administrators
			2013	2014 (up to Sept.)	
		Bor Lor	2 (1 cutting tree, 1 invasion)	1 (invasion)	
		Thale Noi	21 (4 cutting tree, 17 burning forest for land)	15 (1 cutting tree, 14 burning forest for land)	No tree cutting, Less than 6 invasions
	Incidence of fires	Wildfires burning on average 680 ha per year (0.91%) of KKL	Wildfires burning on average 408 ha per year KKL		Reports from Fire Department
	Number of units trained for patrolling, managing water levels, fire protection, and enforcement of regulations	0	6 units in Thale Noi NHA 2 units in Bor Lor NHA 3 units in in Kreng, Cha-uad and Baan Tul sub-districts		Project reports on training workshops, training evaluations by participants
	Area of peat swamp forests in Kuan Kreng landscape under participatory community forestry management plans	495 ha under some form of community forestry as follows:	495 ha under improved peat swamp forest participatory management plans		Documentation in TAO, PAO and NHAs

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks/ Assumptions
		Community Forest Kuan Ngoen (90 ha; Baan Tul) Community Forest Suan Somdej Chao Fa Chulabhorn (240 ha; Cha-uad) Baan Sai Kannon (100 ha; Kreng sub-district) Kanthulee (65 ha; Kanthulee)	Additional 1,500 ha established as community forest with management plan as follows: Community Forest Baan Sai Kanoon (1,500 ha; Kreng sub-district)		
	Ecosystem Health Index (EHI) ³ monitoring system for monitoring peatland health is developed and in place for 2 NHAs in order to ensure good quality habitat for Yellow-headed Tortoise, Fishing Cat	No EHI monitoring system in use	System applied at 2 NHAs	Reports from Heads of NHAs	
Outcome 2: Implementing technologies to avoid peat swamp forest degradation and restore degraded peat swamps forests	Peat swamp area in KKL that is under effective water table management regime	0 ha	4,600 ha	Report of experts from monitoring plots	Government cofinancing for the project is provided in a timely manner for implementing the project strategy at pilot peatland sites where hydrological regime is to be improved Restoration activities undertaken in pilot peatland sites are not undermined by climate changes such as more
	Water levels at 4,600 ha of peat swamp forest (pilot sites where hydrotechnical measures are to be implemented)	20-90 cm below surface during dry season. To be confirmed by detailed study on the hydrological system at the pilot sites under Output 2.1	Drainage will be stopped or significantly reduced and the water level will substantially increase for all project sites. At least for 25% of the area (1,150 ha) the water level will never drop more than 20 cm below surface.	Report of experts from monitoring plots	
	GHG emissions at 4,600 ha of peat swamp forest (pilot sites where hydrotechnical measures are to be implemented)	2.793 Mt CO ₂ -eq	1.959 Mt CO ₂ -eq	Carbon monitoring reports produced by the project	

³ Draft outline of EHI scorecard was developed during the PPG (see Annex 13). Scorecard will be completed in the first year of the project for the 2 NHAs and targets for end of project developed.

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks/ Assumptions
	Carbon sequestration through reforestation at 300 ha with native species	0	129,000 tCO ₂ eq		frequent drought, warmer summers and winters
Outcome 3: Improving policies, standards, and enforcement mechanisms for conservation and sustainable use of peat swamp forests	Cross-sectoral WG for promoting a landscape approach to peatlands conservation and sustainable use	Cross-sectoral platform exists in the form of National Wetland Management Committee, but no specific working group on landscape approach to peatlands conservation and sustainable use	Working Group formed by Year 1	Minutes of meetings	Government cofinancing for the project is provided in a timely manner for development of the peatland inventory, and NSP
	Criteria and methodologies for assessment of peatlands' state, function and services that take into account full range of ecosystem services	No documented criteria exist	Criteria and methodology endorsed by Year 2 and includes ecological criteria	Endorsement of criteria by National Technical Wetland Committee	
	Inventory of all peatlands	Outdated listing of peatlands exists and it is spotty (not comprehensive)	Current and comprehensive listing of peatlands status, functions, services (based on above criteria) by Year 3	Database with GIS maps	
	National Strategy for Peat swamps	None	New 20-year strategy that takes economic and ecological benefits into account in determining use of peatlands	Strategy approved and adopted by NEB	

Note: Further explanation of how the project will mitigate risks is in Annex 9 on Risk Analysis of the Project Document

Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
28	Project knowledge Management Approach (exist strategy)

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁴)
 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - 4.1 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

⁴ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

4.2 Project Results

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender
- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- Social and Environmental Standards
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country Ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

6. 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

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

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 level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
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, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

<p>Terminal Evaluation Report for <i>(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)</i> Reviewed and Cleared By:</p> <p>Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)</p> <p>Name: Saengroj Srisawaskraisorn /Programme Specialist / Team Leader Inclusive Green Growth and Sustainable Development Unit /United Nations Development Programme - Thailand</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p> <p>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p>

ToR 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 *Maximizing carbon sink capacity and conserving biodiversity and through sustainable conservation, restoration and management of peat-swamp ecosystems (Project PIMS #4951)*

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