**Basic Data / Basic Project & Finance Data**

***Basic Project Information***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PIMS ID** | 3937 |
| **Project Title** | Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings in Thailand (PEECB) |

***Project Contact Information***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Name** | **Email Address** |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator** | Mr. Kamol Tanpipat | kamolt@bright-ce.com |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | Sutharin Koonphol, Ph. D | sutharin.koonphol@undp.org |
| **GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP)** |  |  |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | Mrs. Sirinthorn Vongsoasup | sirinthorn\_v@dede.go.th |
| **Other Partners** |  |  |

***Finance***

[Will be automatically uploaded to each PIR by end June. No input required. Data to be uploaded: GEF Grant Amount; PPG Amount; Total GEF Grant; Co-financing; Total GEF Grant Disbursement as of 30 June]

***Project Milestones and Timeframe***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Revised planned closing date** | 3 April 2017 |

***Project Supervision***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period (30 June 2013 to 1 July 2014)** | 19 September 2013, 4February 2014 |

***Terminal PIR***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report?** | [no] |

***General Comments on Basic Data***

|  |
| --- |
| Please insert any comments to the finance data here. |
| n/a |

**Development Objective Progress / Progress Toward Development Objectives**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2014** |
| **Objective:** Improved energy efficiency in the commercial building sector | Cumulative energy savings from the buildings sector, GWh | 0 | 11 | The project effectively commenced in April 2013 due to delays in the government’s procurement process to select the consultants to implement the project. Most of the activities are in progress. The actual results on energy savings will be reported after the completion of related activities, scheduled to begin in mid-2015. |
|  | % Energy savings by EOP | 0 | 0.001 | Most of the activities are in progress. The actual results on energy savings will be reported after the completion of related activities, scheduled to begin in mid-2015. |
|  | % of new buildings fully complied with the new Building Energy Code by EOP | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3[[1]](#footnote-1) |
|  | % of new buildings in Thailand that are classified as energy efficient buildings by EOP | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| **Outcome 1:** Enhanced awareness of the government, building sector and banks on EE technologies and practices | % of overall commercial building stakeholders that agree to greater availability of pertinent information on EE technologies and practices through the PEECB project activities by Year 2015 | 0 | 80% (at least) | The activities related to this outcome are in progress. The Commercial Building Energy Efficiency Information Center (CBEEC) has initially been established as a web-based platform attached to DEDE’s website. Promotional package and training course development have progressed well. |
|  | % of overall commercial building stakeholders that are satisfied with availability and quality of information available from the PEECB project by Year 2015 | 0 | 70% (at least) | The seminar to launch the project was organized. Focus group meetings have also been organized as necessary to gather opinions from all stakeholders to ensure their satisfaction with the project results. |
| Outcome 2: Effective implementation of favorable policies that encourage EE technologies and practices for commercial building in Thailand | No. of new policy measures for commercial building EE approved and implemented by Year 2015 | 0 | 2 | Progress achievement for this component stands at 5.42% according to the actual implementation plan. Currently, 3 new policies have been prepared and were proposed to DEDE. |
|  | No. of fiscal policies approved by DEDE for implementation by Year 2013 | 0 | 1 | This activity is in progress according to the new implementation plan. Fiscal policies have been prepared and will be proposed to DEDE according to the new project schedule. |
|  | No. of short and long term action plans for commercial building EE integrated into DEDE’s national Energy Conservation Program by EOP | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| **Outcome 3.1:** Improved confidence in applying EE technologies and practices in commercial buildings in Thailand | No. of commercial building owners/managers expressing interests and commitments in implementing EE investments by EOP | 10 | 40 | 10 |
|  | No. of building EE projects that adopted EE measures and designs being demonstrated and promoted by EOP | 5 | 10 | There are several buildings interested in adopting the demonstrated measures to be implemented in their buildings. |
| **Outcome 3.2:** Improved local technical and managerial capacity to design, manage and maintain EE technologies and practices | % of overall no. of demo building personnel that are gainfully employing learned skills on EE building design, operation and maintenance by Year 2015 | 0 | 70% (at least) | 0 |
|  | No. of new buildings constructed that are partly or entirely based on the information regarding success of the demonstrations by EOP | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| **Outcome 3.3:** Replication of demonstration projects within the commercial building sector | No. of new EE building projects designed based on, or influenced by, the results of the demonstration projects by EOP | 0 | 20 | 0 |

**Development Objectives Rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Manager / Coordinator** is the person managing the day to day operations of the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** |
| Following a delay in the inception phase, the project has progressed well according to the actual project schedule. Most activities under outcome 1 are scheduled to begin in mid-2015 and by the end of 2015 for outcomes 2 and 3. The progress level of these activities will be reported after the completion of each related activity. An effective monitoring system has been put in place since the project start. Overall, the project is on course to achieve its objective.  In order to ensure the successful implementation of the project towards project objectives, the project management structure and implementation strategy were carefully defined and set up. The Project Board (PB) has successfully been set up since the early stage of the project. The structure of PB consists of all related government agencies and professional associations to supervise and provide recommendations, comments and direction to the project team. Project annual budget and annual targets have also been prepared and are presented annually to the PB for approval.  Several project meetings between the project consultant, stakeholders and DEDE have been organized regularly on a monthly basis to follow up and track progress of the project. Meetings with an international consulting team, NIKKEN SEKKEI Research Institute, have been held regularly on a quarterly basis to discuss the technical support to the project. Focus group meetings (FGMs) with DEDE, related government agencies, educational institutions and the private sector have been held to exchange a wide range of inputs and recommendations on the study results of component 1 and component 2. Weekly meetings between project consultants and DEDE have been held to follow up on the work progress and ensure the implementation timeframe.  Importantly, the project team has reviewed the energy efficiency policy and come up with 4 recommendations that will be presented to the focus group meeting for further comments and recommendations in order to improve the existing energy policy framework. Last but not least, the project conducted a study on site selection for the demonstration projects identifying 7 commercial buildings (hotels, offices, hospitals, hypermarket) namely: Samrong General Hospital, Provincial Electricity Authority, Central World, and Katinal Hotel – Phuket, TESCO Lotus, Ake Chon Hospital (Chonburi), Chaweng Beach Resort & Spa (Samui Island). The estimation of energy savings gained from the said selected participating buildings will be approximately 4,368,892 kWh which would be higher than the targeted amount of energy savings set in the project document (4,291,552 kWh).  The achievement trend of project outcomes is positive as per the updated information provided in the DO sheet. However, attention should be given to the achievement of outcome no. 2, policy implementation, as the recommended new policies have been prepared and proposed but the success of this outcome depends on the recommendations being approved and implemented by related agencies. In order to manage this concern, the project team has regularly organized meetings, working closely with DEDE’s management team. A focus group meeting on specific recommended policies has also been organized to gather opinions from related stakeholders and to incorporate significant comments into the recommended new policies. The project team is also working closely with DEDE in preparation of required new or additional budgeting to support the implementation of recommended new policies. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| **Satisfactory** |
| The rating for 2014 is satisfactory because the project, despite the delay in starting up, has progressed well according to the adjusted plan; and the risks identified are addressed with appropriate mitigation measures for the time being. The project document was signed on 14 November 2012 and the recruitment of the project personnel and consultants completed in Q1/ 2013, with the first Project Board meeting organized in May 2013. After the initial delayed start-up due to complications in the government recruitment process, the project has been progressing according to the work plan as approved by the Project Board in May 2013.  The positive trend includes:   1. Engagement among key stakeholders has been established since the kick-off event in Q3/ 2013, with networks of commercial buildings knowing about the project and have become regular participants in capacity building/ awareness raising the project organized throughout last year; 2. The development of the simulation models and training curriculum under Outcome 1 has made substantial progress with good participation from DEDE staff and the wider target groups. The capacity needs assessment has been completed and it is expected that both the simulation models and curriculum will be completed for dissemination and training by end of 2014; 3. For Outcome 2, the key progress is on the policy gap analysis and developing options for more effective policy measures on energy efficiency in commercial buildings; 4. For Outcome 3, the key progress is on confirming the participation of the seven demo buildings as identified in the project document. Two of the demo sites pulled out because they have made progress towards the EE measures already as the project took a longer time to start. The project management team managed to engage new demonstration sites (1 hospital, 1 hotel), with the estimation of energy savings gained from the final list totaling 4,368,892 kWh which will be slightly higher than the target set in the project document (4,291,552 kWh); 5. The project has also updated the key targets to be in line with the newly developed 20 year Energy Efficiency Development Plan (2011-2030), which came out after the project was approved.   The risks identified in this reporting period are:   * In the beginning of the project implementation, the cross-bureau working group within DEDE to work closely on this project was not formed. There was a risk that the project process would be not be taken up by the targeted bureaus. The project management unit has been able to link in other bureaus and form a regular working group to work on the project. * The direction of the policy work under outcome 2 set out to be rather broad with no clear entry points. The Project Board made recommendations that the responsible team should make the work more focused to particular policy entry points in support of the implementation of the Energy Efficiency 20 year Plan. The project management unit and the consultant team have taken measures to address this shortfall, by asking for advice from related bureaus and experts to pin down the scope of the policy work. They have organized regular meetings with related bureaus to ensure that they participate in this process from the start to pave the way for policy endorsement along the process. * As the project has taken a long time to take off, some of the demonstration sites were no longer eligible. The project management team demonstrated good adaptive management to come up with criteria and a process to select new sites, and ensure that the set GHG emission reduction target is still met. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point. | HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [DO rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **Project Implementing Partner** is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS). | RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** |
| Overall, the project has progressed significantly according to the project schedule. As Project Director, I am quite satisfied with the good participation from both DEDE personnel and relevant stakeholders in focus group and necessary meetings. The project received many valuable comments and recommendations beyond expectation. This is due in part to the effective organization of the project team. Weekly meetings also make the activities move forward smoothly.  DEDE has appointed relevant officers from the Bureau of Energy Regulation and Conservation, the Bureau of Human Resource Development and the Bureau of Energy Efficiency Promotion to be members of the project management unit (PMU) in order to supervise the implementation of the project and to ensure that the results of the project will effectively support the country’s Energy Efficiency Development Plan (EEDP).  The outcomes of each component indicated a positive trend toward project objectives. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the implementation of the project, the Project Board (PB) consists of representatives from all relevant government agencies and professional associations. The PB has actively provided inputs and recommendations in three meetings which were organized during this reporting period. Annual budget, annual targets and annual project planning were extensively discussed and approved by the Project Board. |
| **Other Partners**: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank). | RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [DO rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective). 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** |
| This report represents the project’s first PIR. So far the project is on track toward meeting its development objective. This is an important initiative as the commercial sector is the fastest growing energy end-use sector in Thailand. Already, the commercial sector accounts for about 35% of the total electricity consumption in the country. The project has three main components: enhanced awareness on energy efficient technologies and practices, favorable policy frameworks, and the demonstration of EE building technologies and applications. Satisfactory progress has been made under each of the three components.  Under component 1, the Commercial Building Energy Efficiency Information Center (CBEEC) has initially been established as a web-based platform attached to DEDE’s website. The idea is to provide a central source of data and information on energy efficiency in commercial buildings. The data includes: specific energy consumption, simulation models, building technologies and suppliers, demonstration buildings, training courses, and knowledge and statistics. Eventually, a physical Contact Center attached to DEDE will be established. Important preparatory work has been done on the Building Energy Simulation Model. In addition, 11 technical training modules have been proposed to be developed under the PEECB project including modules on, among others, air conditioning system, lighting system, renewable energy for commercial buildings, and building automation system.  Under component 2, the project has reviewed building energy labeling and green building schemes in Thailand and in other countries. It has also reviewed specific energy consumption in various building types in Thailand and in other countries. Importantly, three new policy measures for commercial building energy efficiency have been proposed to DEDE. The initial response from DEDE to these policy recommendations has been favorable. One of the recommendations on the building energy consumption disclosure programme has been proposed as a pilot project in DEDE and has also been proposed to the ECON Fund to support the implementation of 10 pilot buildings. Additionally, fiscal policies have been identified and will be proposed to DEDE for approval.  Component 3 centers on the demonstration buildings. The project has developed selection criteria for the demonstration buildings, which include conformity with related energy laws and regulations, full executive management support, and energy saving potential. On the basis of this criteria, the project selected and confirmed the participation of the seven demonstration buildings. While two demo sites identified in the project document withdrew their participation, the project team managed to engage one hospital and one hotel to take their place. If the demonstrations are implemented successfully, the estimated energy savings will exceed those mentioned in the project document.  One of the positive trends has been the project’s coordination mechanism as well as the level of engagement and participation of a wide range of stakeholders. Representatives of three bureaus within DEDE serve as members of the project management unit, forming a regular working group. Their respective areas of expertise correspond to the content of the three components. The Project Board, which comprises representatives from all relevant government agencies and professional associations, has actively provided inputs and recommendations to the project team. The project has also coordinated effectively with related initiatives. |

***General comments on Development Objective Rating***

|  |
| --- |
| Due to the delay in the government’s recruitment process, the project only started full implementation in April 2013. Most of the activities are in progress according to the project schedule. The monitoring process has also been planned and started since the early stage of the project. Progress figures for some of the outputs can only be reported after the related activities are carried out, most of which are planned for the end of 2015. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DO Progress: Rating Definitions** | |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives and yield substantial global environmental benefits without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits with only minor shortcomings. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

**Implementation Progress**

For each project Outcome briefly describe up to four (4) major outputs delivered this reporting period only (i.e. annual progress not cumulative progress). **Do not repeat outputs reported in previous PIRs.** If you have any general comments about the information in this section of the PIR, please note them at the bottom of this page.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Outputs reported as of 30 June 2014** |
| **Outcome 1** | Enhanced awareness of the government, building sector and banks on EE technologies and practices |
|  | 1.1 Development of Information Center on Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings through project website  1.2 Development of training structure on energy efficiency in commercial buildings  1.3 Development of Building Energy Simulation Model (BESM) Structure  1.4 Capacity building on SMART Building Technologies for Government Officers |
| **Outcome 2** | Effective implementation of favorable policies that encourage EE technologies and practices for commercial building in Thailand |
|  | 2.1 Development of study report on the implementation of energy efficiency policy in Thailand  2.2 Development of new policy framework on Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings  2.3 Development of Database Structure on Energy Efficiency Material and Equipment to support BESM  2.4 Development of study report on Measurement and Verification (M&V) for Energy Efficiency Project in Commercial Buildings |
| **Outcome 3.1** | Improved confidence in applying EE technologies and practices in commercial buildings in Thailand |
|  | 3.1 Development of selection criteria for demonstration buildings on energy efficiency in commercial buildings  3.2 Selection of demonstration buildings on Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings  3.3 Development of guidelines to conduct the feasibility study on energy efficiency measures for demonstration buildings  3.4 Conduct preliminary analysis on the energy efficiency measures for selected demonstration buildings |
| **Outcome 3.2** | Improved local technical and managerial capacity to design, manage and maintain EE technologies and practices |
|  | Not applicable |
| **Outcome 3.3** | Replication of demonstration projects within the commercial building sector |
|  | Not applicable |

***General comments on Implementation Progress***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Implementation Progress Rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Manager / Coordinator** is the person managing the day to day operations of the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| [IP rating in 2014]   * + - 1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [Satisfactory (S)]       2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [Satisfactory (S)]       3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [Satisfactory (S)]       4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [Not Applicable]       5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [Satisfactory (S)] |
| **Satisfactory (S)** |
| The project effectively commenced in April 2013. Two consultants have been engaged to implement the project, namely BRIGHT Management Consulting Co., Ltd. (BMC) and Engineering Solution Provider Co., Ltd. (ENSOP). BMC, contracted in April 2013, is responsible for project management and all activities of component 1. ENSOP, contracted in August 2013, is the main consultant for components 2 and 3. Taking an average of the implementation progress across the three components, the overall percentage of actual project progress as of June 2014 stands at around 9%**,** slightly behind original schedule.  All project activities, according to the yearly plan, have been conducted and are progressing well. Completed work for project management attained 3.98 % progress, component 1 was at 14.79 % which mainly includes the preparation work on Commercial Building EE Information Center, Building Energy Simulation Model (BESM), preparation on promotional scheme and the design of training courses on energy efficiency in commercial buildings for both technical and non-technical modules. Component 2 progressed at 5.42 % which consists of reviewing the existing energy efficiency policy in Thailand, best energy efficiency options for commercial buildings, information on Building Energy Labeling and Green Building Scheme, specific energy consumption (SEC) for each specific type of commercial building and reviewing the applicability of Measurement and Verification (M&V) protocol for energy efficiency projects. Component 3 progressed at 6.64 % comprising of activities on preparing the selection criteria for demonstration buildings, pre-feasibility studies and selection of buildings that will participate in the demonstration projects.  According to the DO reported in this PIR, the project has been progressing well according to the project schedule. The delivery of outputs has proceeded and budget resources are being spent as planned. The project has planned to manage the project risks concerning outcome no. 2 by working closely with DEDE’s team to prepare supporting information, documentation and related materials that might be required for the implementation of recommended new policies.  The project expenditure as of 30 June 2014 is at 27.08% of total project budget which is as proposed in the annual budget.  We turn now to the effectiveness of the project management unit (PMU) in guiding the project implementation. As the activities under the 3 components of the project require the involvement of several bureaus in the Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency, DEDE, therefore the project management unit has been set up by appointing representatives from three related bureaus in DEDE namely, Bureau of Energy Regulation and Conservation, Bureau of Human Resource Development and Bureau of Energy Efficiency Promotion. The project management unit has participated regularly in the related meetings to provide valuable inputs to the project. Project weekly meeting has also been set up to continuously follow up on the progress of the project. PMU members have also been invited to participate in the weekly meeting as necessary.  The Project Board (PB) has been set up since the early stage of the project by inviting representatives from related government agencies and professional associations related to energy efficiency in commercial buildings. Three Project Board meetings have been arranged in May 2013, September 2013 and February 2014 to approve the project plan, project targets, annual budget and supervise the overall project implementation. In each PB meeting, Project Board members have actively provided recommendations and valuable inputs to each component and activity to strengthen the effectiveness of the project. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** |
| The rating is satisfactory across the five areas mentioned above. This is because the implementation steps as well as coordination mechanism among team members are progressing smoothly.  In the first year of implementation, the project has established a good system of coordination for project management, among the project management unit, consultant teams, and working committee within DEDE. The project has been conducting regular meetings among team members to update progress and constraints, on a monthly basis. The results of the meetings and the actions to be taken are summarized in minutes with systematic follow-ups. The quarterly meeting with UNDP has also been organized according to plan. The reporting of the project is timely and of high quality.  The key annual outputs include:   * The training needs assessment to inform the development of the energy efficiency in commercial building training programmes for government officials and practitioners; * The simulation programme developed with participation from the users themselves; * The policy work initiated with clear guidance from DEDE on the specific entry points; * The finalization of the seven demonstration sites and the guidelines for feasibility studies as well as the initial orientation with the targeted buildings; * The network with at least 50 commercial building owners/ practitioners established through the project’s launch and regular information sharing through the project website, workshops, and other platforms; * There are several similar projects going on in Thailand with regards to energy efficiency in various aspects. Key among them are GIZ’s Thai-German Programme on Energy Efficiency Development Plan (TGP-EEDP); and NAMA Development in Building Sector in Asia under UNEP. There is a risk that PEECB and other projects would work on overlapping and/ or repetitive outputs. The project management team has made good efforts in coordinating with these key parallel projects to create a regular communication channel to share information and keep one another informed on the progress and work plans.   The delivery rate of 2013 was at 85.31% (USD 433,497) against the ASL (USD 508,085). The project expenditures as of 30 June 2014 is at 27.08% of the 2014 ASL (USD 829,992).  The Project Board meets regularly as planned, despite the fact that DEDE office was under siege during the political unrest earlier in the year. The project team managed to find an alternative venue under the Ministry of Energy and the board members participated in full. Members of the board provide practical as well as constructive advice, with strong policy commitment from the current senior management of DEDE. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point. | HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **Project Implementing Partner**is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS). | RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2014]   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)?   [Satisfactory (S)]   1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?)   [Satisfactory (S)]   1. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively?   [Satisfactory (S)]   1. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year?   [Not Applicable (n.a.)]   1. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation.   [Satisfactory (S)] |
| **Satisfactory (S)** |
| On behalf of DEDE, we are very optimistic about the project. We have confidence that the project outcomes could help DEDE strengthen the Energy Efficiency Development Plan particularly in the buildings sector.  The Building Energy Simulation Software should be friendly for designers to use broadly and help our staff as a tool to monitor the Building Energy Code.  One of the recommended new policies, the building disclosure program, has been proposed as a pilot project in DEDE for the next fiscal year. The results of implementation will be reported later.  The training structure on Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings recommended as one of the outcomes of component 1 is very useful for human resource development in the area of energy efficiency. The structure covered all target groups, namely project owner or developer, designer, professional that works in the buildings and project consultants. The project team is currently working closely with the Bureau of Human Resource Development to integrate the newly developed curriculums together with the existing curriculums.  Currently, DEDE is planning to move forward on each outcome of the project. One of the notable recommended policies on “Building Energy Consumption Disclosure Programme” has been proposed to ECON Fund to support the implementation of 10 pilot buildings. For the other outcomes which are progressing, DEDE will also plan to take further action to move forward for implementation phase upon completion of each related activity. |
| **Other Partners**: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank). | RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** |
| After a delayed start, the project is making steady progress in both the delivery of outputs and the efficiency in the delivery of outputs, as per the adjusted work plan approved by the Project Board in May 2013. According to the project’s monitoring system, overall implementation progress stands at around 9%, taking an average of the implementation progress across the three components. Approximately 15% of the planned activities under component 1 have been completed. While the project is slightly behind the original schedule, it has established a solid foundation from which to proceed. A capable project management team is in place, led by BRIGHT Management Consulting and Engineering Solution Provider. Representatives from three bureaus within DEDE also form part of the PMU. Regular working group meetings have proven effective in guiding implementation.    The key targets for 2013 as entered into the ERBM include:     * Project board set-up, project management unit and technical team established; * Pre-inception workshops to introduce the project to key stakeholders and re-engagement with demo sites; * Inception phase completed with the inception workshop organized by end of June 2013; * Completed training courses on financial assessment of EE application projects in commercial buildings.   All targets for 2013 were achieved, with the exception of the training courses on the financial assessment of EE application projects. Importantly, the key targets and the quarterly progress for 2014 have not yet been entered into the ERBM. These should be entered on a priority basis. Some of the key outputs delivered during the reporting period as reported in this PIR include identifying the training modules for government officials and building sector professionals, laying the groundwork for the Building Energy Simulation Model, putting forward specific policy recommendations to DEDE, and identifying and confirming the participation of the seven demonstration buildings, among others.  The delivery rate for 2013 was a healthy 85%, while the delivery rate at the midpoint of 2014 is right on target at 50%. So far, the project has spent $412,203 this year out of the budgeted amount of $829,992. As of June 2014, total expenditure stands at $845,701 out of a total GEF budget of $3,637,273representing a cumulative delivery rate of about 23%. The actual results achievement trails the level of financial delivery but that is probably due to the procurement of fairly large sub-contracts with results still forthcoming. Importantly, the project is geared to make substantial progress on its work plan, with a supportive management structure in place. A robust monitoring system precisely tracks progress achievement for each component and is updated continuously.  The degree and quality of risk management and adaptive management have been noteworthy. One of the main risks faced by the project during the reporting year was political instability, which culminated in a coup by the Thai army on 22 May 2014. Despite the fact that the DEDE office was occupied by protesters during the unrest, the project team found an alternative venue for the Project Board meetings. Moreover, although two of the demo sites had withdrawn their participation from the initiative, the project demonstrated effective adaptive management by developing selection criteria for the demonstration buildings and reaching out to additional partners. The main recommendation at this stage would be to carry out the mid-term review in a timely manner following the completion of next year’s PIR report. |

***General comments on Implementation Progress Rating***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Implementation Progress: Ratings Definitions** | |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. |

**Adjustments**

***Project Planning***

If delays have occurred in reaching key projects milestones - the inception workshop, the Mid-term Review and/or the Terminal Evaluation - then note below the current status of that milestone, the original planned and actual/expected dates, and comments to explain the reasons for the delays and their implications.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Project Milestone** | **Status**  (pick one option below) | **Original Planned Date** | **Actual/Expected Date** | **Comments** including reasons for delays and their implications |
| **Inception Workshop** | Completed delay | March 2013 | May 2013 | The project actually commenced in April 2013 due to delays in the government procurement process to select the consultants to implement the project. |
| **Mid-term Review** | n/a | [month/year] | March 2015 |  |
| **Terminal Evaluation** | n/a | [month/year] | March 2017 |  |

***Critical Risk Management***

Select from below the critical risks only that appear in the ATLAS project risk log and briefly describe actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk. Please ensure that any 'social' risks identified during the environmental and social screening of the project are reflected in the ATLAS risk log under type/description 'other'. Note that the total number of critical risks is used to calculate the overall risk rating of the project. The methodology to determine the overall risk rating is explained further on this page.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Current/Active Critical Risks**  (pick one option below;  add rows as necessary) | **Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2014** |
| Strategic | The approaches proposed for the policy component (Outcome 2) at this point could seem to be too broad and/or too challenging for the implementing partner (DEDE) to adopt. In order to ensure that any policy options coming out from the project process will be endorsed by the relevant agencies, the project has set up a policy advisory group consisting of representatives from DEDE and the Energy Policy and Planning Office to meet on an ad-hoc basis to help guide the direction of the policy options and actions to be taken, so that they are more relevant and applicable. |

***General comments on Adjustments***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Evaluations**

***Mid-term Review (MTR)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Has a Mid-term Review report for this project been completed since the last PIR was submitted? | | No |
| Will this project undertake a mid-term review? | | No |
| Will the mid-term report be completed and translated into English by December of this year? | | No |
| **Actual Co-financing at Mid-term**(Answer these questions only if the MTR was completed this reporting period)  Co-financing for GEF-financed projects, excluding LDCF and SCCF projects, is defined as resources that are additional to the GEF grant and that are provided by the GEF Partner Agency itself and/or by other non-GEF sources that support the implementation of the GEF-financed project and the achievement of its objectives. | | |
| How much of the total planned co-financing as committed in the Project Document has *actually been realized*? | | US$ |
| Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans. (word limit = 200 words) |  | |
| For projects that completed an MTR since the last PIR was submitted, please respond to the following (500 words or less):   * Briefly outline the key findings and recommendations of the MTR report and the management response. * Discuss any problems/issues with the final MTR report or the MTR process. * Discuss any problems/issues with the related GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool. |  | |

***Terminal Evaluation (TE)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Has a Terminal Evaluation report for this project been completed since the last PIR was submitted? | | [yes / no] |
| If the TE report has been completed, has it been uploaded to the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre](file:///C:/Users/ciara.daniels/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/U20SVW6P/erc.undp.org)? | | [yes / no] |
| **Actual Co-financing at Project End**(Answer these questions only if the TE was completed this reporting period)  Co-financing for GEF-financed projects, excluding LDCF and SCCF projects, is defined as resources that are additional to the GEF grant and that are provided by the GEF Partner Agency itself and/or by other non-GEF sources that support the implementation of the GEF-financed project and the achievement of its objectives. | | |
| How much of the total planned co-financing as committed in the Project Document has *actually been realized*? | | US$ |
| Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans. (word limit = 200 words) |  | |
| For projects that completed a TE since the last PIR was submitted, please respond to the following (500 words or less):   * Briefly outline the key findings and recommendations of the TE report and the management response. * Discuss any problems/issues with the final TE report or the TE process. * Discuss any problems/issues with the related GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool. |  | |

**Communications & KM**

***Tell us the story of your project, focusing on the impacts and results achieved during this reporting period.***

|  |
| --- |
| Please use 500 words or less.  Avoid UN jargon, acronyms, and technical terms. Use plain language.  Include quotes from beneficiaries, if possible, and be sure to provide their names  The following questions can be used as guidance for your story:  What is this project about – the issue, interventions, and impacts?  Who are the beneficiaries of this project?  How have project interventions improved people's livelihoods?  What was the most notable achievement during this reporting period?  This text will be used for UNDP corporate communications, the UNDP-GEF website, and/or other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts. |
| The Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency (DEDE), a government agency responsible for energy conservation, in cooperation with UNDP, is implementing the project on Promoting Energy Efficiency in Commercial Buildings (PEECB) with financial support from the GEF and co-financing from Thai private and government sectors. The project’s goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from commercial buildings by promoting the use of building energy efficiency (EE) technologies. The three outcomes that will contribute to the achievement of this objective are:  1. Enhance awareness on energy efficiency in commercial buildings in Thailand including the establishment of EE Information Center, personnel training, and development of an energy use simulation programme for commercial buildings in Thailand;  2. Study and set the policy framework, practical long- and short-term implementation plans for EE promotion in commercial buildings, as well as evaluate and improve policy measures of EE in commercial buildings;  3. Demonstrate the application of EE technologies in commercial buildings which can be disseminated and replicated to other buildings.  The project set the objectives to be consistent with the Energy Ministry’s 20 Year Energy Efficiency Development Plan, EEDP (2011-2030) which has as one of its targets the long-term reduction of energy imports and environmental impacts in part through energy efficiency in commercial buildings.  Since the project’s effective start in April 2013, several activities have been organized during the reporting period. A summary of the notable results of the implemented activities include:   * + - 1. Development of Information Center on Energy Efficiency in Commercial Building, CBEEC       2. Development of training structure on energy efficiency in commercial buildings       3. Development of Building Energy Simulation Model (BESM) structure       4. Recommendation on the new energy efficiency policy. |

***Adaptive management this reporting period.***

|  |
| --- |
| Describe a problem that was encountered and how the project team overcame that problem. Give multiple examples if possible.  This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region. |
| The project team encountered two problems during the reporting period, to which it had to adapt. First, there was a change in the top management position of the implementing partner organization (Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency, DEDE), which caused delays in requesting quarterly budget and submitting expenditure forms to UNDP. To address this issue, the project team prepared all necessary information and documentation in advance. The draft version of all related documentation were submitted to UNDP for initial approval and preparation.  A second challenge faced is that in the selection process for the demonstration sites, some organizations required a longer time in considering whether to invest in the proposed technologies. The project team worked closely with the owners of the demonstration sites to provide necessary information and support. Additional demonstration sites have been invited to participate in the project to ensure that the overall energy savings amount and CO2 emission reduction targets remain consistent with those in the project document. |

***Lessons learned***

|  |
| --- |
| Describe lessons learned in the course of the project's implementation relating to any aspect of the project - technical, social, political, administrative, etc.  This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region. |
| Planning on the project timeframe should take into account the government procurement process which might take a longer time than expected. At least 6 months should be allowed for this process. |

***Project links & social media***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Please list below the website addresses (URLs) that exist for this project, including any links to social media sites.Please include: Project website, Project page on the UNDP website, Adaptation Learning Mechanism (UNDP-ALM) platform, Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, Google +** | http://dede-peecb.bright-ce.com/ |
| **Please share hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside, external source.** |  |
| **Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents.** | [uploading only possible in PIR system; list here the files that you plan on uploading] |

***General comments on Communications & KM***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Partnerships**

This information is used to get a better understanding of the work GEF-funded projects are doing with key partners, including the GEF Small Grants Programme, indigenous peoples, the private sector, and other partners. The data may be used for reporting to GEF Sec, the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP Corporate Communications, posted on the UNDP-GEF website, and for other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts. The RTA should view and edit/elaborate on the information entered here. All projects must complete this section. Please enter "N/A" in cells that are not applicable to your project.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Partners** | **Describe innovative aspects of the project in working with**  **(limit = 2000 characters for each section)** |
| **Civil Society Organisations/NGOs** | N/A |
| **Indigenous Peoples** | N/A |
| **Private Sector** | 7 commercial buildings participate in the project as demonstration sites and will implement energy efficiency technologies. These buildings are:   1. Samrong General Hospital 2. Provincial Electricity Authority of Thailand, Office Building 3. Central Word 4. Katina Hotel 5. TESCO Lotus 6. Ake Chon Hospital 7. Chawaeng Garden Beach Report, Samui Island |
| **GEF Small Grants Programme** | N/A |
| **Other Partners** |  |

***General comments on Partnerships***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Gender**

This information is used in the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP-GEF Annual Gender Report, reporting to the UNDP Gender Steering and Implementation Committee and for other internal and external communications and learning.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Has a gender or social assessment been carried out this reporting period?** | Will be carried out in the future |
| **If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings?** | N/A |
| **Does this project specifically target woman or girls as key stakeholders?** | No |
| **Have there been any changes in specifically targeting women or girls as key stakeholders this reporting period?** | No |
| **If yes, please explain** | N/A |
| **Please discuss any of the points above further or provide any other information**  **on the project’s work on gender equality undertaken this reporting period.**  Some points to consider: impact of project on daily workload of women, # of jobs created for women, impact of project on time spent by women in household activities, impact of project on primary school enrolment for girls/boys, increase in women's income etc. Be as specific as possible and provide real numbers (e.g. 100 women farmers participating in sustainable livelihoods programme). | The project is open for men and women to participate in all activities. In this reporting period, we have had women participation in the following activities:   * + - 1. Project management       2. Design development       3. Software programming       4. External Experts Focus Group Meeting (32% of participants are women) |
| **Please upload the gender or social needs assessment and any other documents related to the project's gender-related results.** | [uploading only possible in PIR system; list here the files that you plan on uploading] |

***General comments on Gender***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Environmental or Social Grievance**

This section must be completed by the UNDP Country Office if a grievance related to the environmental or social impacts of this project was addressed this reporting period.

It is very important that the questions are answered fully and in detail.

*If no environmental or social grievance was addressed this reporting period then please do not answer the following questions.*

*If more than one grievance was addressed, please answer the following questions for the most significant grievance only and explain the other grievance(s) in the comment box below.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?** | [Environmental/Financial/Organisational/Political/ Operational/Regulatory/Strategic/Other] |
| **What is the current status of the grievance?** | [Resolved / On-going / Both] |
| **How would you rate the significance of the grievance?** | [Minor / Significant / Serious] |
| **Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here.** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Minor | The grievance had/has a low impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project. |
| Significant | The grievance had/is having a significant impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project, but the project is still expected to achieve its objective. |
| Serious | The grievance had/is having a serious impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project, and there is a risk (50% or higher) that the project may not be able to achieve its objective. |

**Approve and Submit Page**

***UNDP-GEF Region-based Technical Adviser (RTA)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RTA Revised Overall Ratings**(optional) | |
| **Revised overall DO rating** |  |
| **Revised overall IP rating** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Explanation for change to Overall DO Rating or Overall IP Rating** (required only if the Overall DO or IP Rating have been revised by the RTA). |  |
| **Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents** associated with this project that have not been uploaded elsewhere in the PIR(i.e. via the Adjustments, Communications KM or Gender tabs). The files will be saved in the UNDP-GEF PIMS database and used for internal and external learning and communications. | [uploading only possible in PIR system; list here the files that you plan on uploading] |

1. Refers to initial information from the Department of Alternative Energy Development and Efficiency (DEDE). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Refers to initial information from DEDE. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)