

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE



Date: 27 April 2015

Country: UNDP - Thailand

Description of the assignment: Re-advertisement National consultant - Mid Term Review (MTR) on Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand.

Duty Station: Home-based with travel to Bangkok for sites visit.

Project name: Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand (PIMS#3937)

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): During May 2015 – August 2015 with maximum of 27 working days

Proposal should be submitted a by email to rcb.procurement.th@undp.org no later than **4 May 2015**

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

1. BACKGROUND

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full -sized project titled Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand (PIMS#3937) implemented through the Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency (DEDE), Ministry of Energy, Thailand, which is to be undertaken in 2015. The project started on the 14 November 2012 and is in its fourth year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#) ([Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#).)

The PEECB project is a four-year (2012-2015) collaboration project implemented through the Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency (DEDE) under Ministry of Energy, Thailand. The project was designed to promote and facilitate the widespread application of building energy efficiency technologies and practices in commercial buildings in Thailand. The realization of this objective will be facilitated through the removal of barriers to the uptake of building energy efficiency technologies, systems, and practices. The project is in line with the GEF-4 Strategic Program No. 1, which is on Promoting energy-efficient buildings and appliances (CC-SP1). It is comprised of activities aimed at improving energy efficiency and promoting the widespread adoption of energy efficient building technologies and practices in the Thai commercial building sector).

This project's objective and primary outcome is to strengthen national capacity to manage the environment in a sustainable manner while ensuring adequate protection of the poor. Also as a secondary outcome, the project aims to support capacity development for countries to ensure that environment and energy are taken into account in drawing up and implementing national policies, strategies and programs, also considering the inclusion of multilateral environmental agreements.

Additionally the project also targets some key outcomes that correspond with the country's plan (CP) as its implementation is expected to support the development of an efficient community network in sustainable use of local natural resources and energy with engagement in policy and decision-making processes. As well as increasing the capacity of the national focal points in addressing policy and removal of barriers in pursuing local sustainable management of environmental flow and renewable energy. Ultimately leading to a strengthened policymaking process based on evidenced-based knowledge management.

As for the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) outputs, the implementation of the project is expected to increase capacity of national agencies to set policy priorities and remove barriers to pursuing sustainable management of biodiversity, renewable energy and water resources in response to national priorities and in compliance with international treaties. Supporting the process and the practice of developing Evidence-based data for barriers removal and policy decision making.

The total project budget is USD. 15,904,773. The allocated resources including the co-financing amount are as follows:-

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| • GEF | USD. 3,637,273 |
| • Government (cash and In-kind) | USD. 6,500,000 |
| • Private Sector (cash and In-kind) | USD. 5,767,500 |

2. OBJECTIVE, SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

Objective of the assignment

The National consultant - Mid Term Review (MTR) on Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project

success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

Scope of Work

The National consultant - Mid Term Review (MTR) on Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/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 review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency (DEDE), Ministry of Energy; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Bangkok, Thailand.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

The National consultant - Mid Term Review (MTR) on Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand will to assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved

Yellow= On target to be achieved

Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) in Thailand			
Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description	
Project Strategy	N/A		
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)		
	Etc.		
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)		
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)		

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

I. Academic Qualifications:

- Thai National only with A Master's degree in energy, engineering, environmental studies or closely related subjects and/or A university degree in energy, engineering, environmental studies or closely related subjects with more than 13 years of experience directly related to the evaluation of project also be accepted.

II. Years of experience:

- At least 10 years work experience in relevant technical areas on Buildings Energy Efficiency as well as review and evaluation of related UNDP GEF projects ;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Asia and the Pacific would be an advantage;

III. Language:

- Good command of English both spoken and written.

IV. Competencies:

Functional Competencies:

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

Client Orientation

- Contributing to positive outcomes for the client
- Anticipates client needs;
- Works towards creating an enabling environment for a smooth relationship between the clients and service provider;
- Demonstrates understanding of client's perspective.

Promoting Organizational Learning and Knowledge Sharing

Developing tools and mechanisms

- Makes the case for innovative ideas documenting successes and building them into the design of new approaches;
- Identifies new approaches and strategies that promote the use of tools and mechanisms.

Core Competencies:

- Promoting ethics and integrity, creating organizational precedents;
- Building support and political acumen;
- Building staff competence, creating an environment of creativity and innovation;
- Building and promoting effective teams;
- Creating and promoting enabling environment for open communication;
- Creating an emotionally intelligent organization;
- Leveraging conflict in the interests of UNDP & setting standards;
- Sharing knowledge across the organization and building a culture of knowledge sharing and learning. Promoting learning and knowledge management/sharing is the responsibility of each staff member;
- Fair and transparent decision making; calculated risk-taking.

4. DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

Contract Duration: During May 2015 – July 2015 with maximum of 27 working days.

Duty Station: Home-based with travel to Bangkok for sites visit.

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Thailand's Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Thailand's Country Office.

5. FINAL PRODUCTS

The consultant is expected to deliver followings:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team or the National Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR 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.

Payment schedule would be as follows;

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
60% upon finalization of the MTR report

6. PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

The consultant will work under the overall supervision of the Programme Specialist, Inclusive Green Growth & Sustainable Development, UNDP Thailand

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
3 April to 17 April 2015	Advertisement
20 April 2015	Application closes
20 April – 8 May 2015	Select MTR Team/contract issuance process
11 May 2015	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
12-14 May 2015 (3 days)	Document review, preparing MTR Inception Report, submission
15-17 May 2015 (3 day)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
25 May – 3 June 2015 (10 days)	MTR mission: opening session, stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
3 June 2015 (1 day)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTR mission
4-12 June 2015 (7 days)	Preparing draft report
15 June-26 June 2015	Circulation of draft report for comments
29 June - 2 July 2015 (3 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/finalization of MTR report
6 July 2015	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
17 July 2015	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultant must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate your qualifications:

1. **Proposal:** Brief proposal explaining why you are the most suitable for this consultancy including confirmation on availability to take up assignment for the whole period.

2. **Financial proposal:** The financial proposal must indicate Lump sum professional fee in Thai Baht(THB). To submit Financial Proposal, please use Template of Submission of Financial Proposal provided in Annex I.
To submit Financial Proposal, please use Template of Submission of Financial Proposal provided in Annex I.
3. Personal CV and/or P.11⁹ including past experience in similar projects and the name and contact details of 3 references

8. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The financial proposal will specify the **Lump sum professional Fee (with breakdown of Daily fee x number of working day) and lump sum travel related expenses (with breakdown of all travel related expenses) in Thai Baht (THB).** The payments will be made to the Individual Consultant based on the completion of the deliverables indicated in the TOR. To submit Financial Proposal, please use Template of Submission of Financial Proposal provided in Annex I.

9. EVALUATION

The award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 350 technical points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<u>Technical</u>	70%	500
• Experience related to services	40	200
• Written proposal/test and/or interview result	20	100

⁹ UNDP P.11 Form can be downloaded from http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

• Expertise & Availability	40	200
<u>Financial</u>	30%	100

ANNEXES

ANNEX I – TEMPLATE FOR OFFEROR’S LETTER TO UNDP CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT AND SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

ANNEX II - INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

ANNEX III – GUIDEDANCE FOR CONDUCTION MIDTERM REVIEWS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS

ANNEX IV- UNDP-GEF MIDTERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE