



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Date: 28 August 2017

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE – PN170828-1IC-1NC

for individual consultants and individual consultants assigned by consulting firms/institutions

Country:	Viet Nam
Description of the assignment:	01 International (team leader, TL) and 01 national (team member, TM) for Annual Review 2017 and Final Programme Evaluation (2013-2018)
Project name:	Annual Review 2017 and Final Evaluation of UN-REDD Vietnam Phase II Programme - Project code 00085319
Period of assignment/services (if applicable):	Estimated 60 working days for TL and 50 working days for TM, including: - 45 TL days and 38 TM days between September and November 2017 - 15 TL days and 12 TM days in October 2018 - A minimum of 50% of each consultants' time in Hanoi
Tender reference:	1-170806

1. Submissions should be sent by email to: nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org no later than: **6 September 2017 (Hanoi time).**

With subject line:

(1-170806) 01 International (team leader) for review of UN-REDD Programme Phase II

Or

(1-170806) 01 national (team member) for review of UN-REDD Programme Phase II

Submission received after that date or submission not in conformity with the requirements specified this document will not be considered.

Note:

- Any individual employed by a company or institution who would like to submit an offer in response to this Procurement Notice must do so in their individual capacity, even if they expect their employers to sign a contract with UNDP.
- Maximum size per email is **7 MB**.
- Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. Procurement Unit – UNDP Viet Nam 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.
- After submitting proposal, bidder should send notification by email (without attachment) to: procurement.vn@undp.org informing that the bidder has submitted proposal. UNDP will not be responsible for the missing of proposal if the bidder does not send notification email to above address.

- Female consultants are encouraged to bid for this required service. Preference will be given to equally technically qualified female consultants.

2. Please find attached the relevant documents:

- [Terms of Reference \(TOR\)](#)..... (Annex I)
- [Individual Contract & General Conditions](#)..... (Annex II)
- [Reimbursable Loan Agreement](#) (for a consultant assigned by a firm)..... (Annex III)
- [Guidelines for CV preparation](#)..... (Annex IV)
- [Format of financial proposal](#)..... (Annex V)

3. Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information **(in English, PDF Format)** to demonstrate their qualifications:

a. Technical component:

- Signed Curriculum vitae

b. Financial proposal (with your signature):

- The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in **US Dollar (for International consultant) and VND (for National consultant)** including consultancy fees and all associated costs i.e. airfares, travel cost, meal, accommodation, tax, insurance etc. – see format of financial offer in Annex V.
- Please note that the cost of preparing a proposal and of negotiating a contract, including any related travel, is not reimbursable as a direct cost of the assignment.
- If quoted in other currency, prices shall be converted to the above currencies at UN Exchange Rate at the submission deadline.

4. Evaluation:

The international consultant and national consultant will be evaluated and selected separately. The technical component will be evaluated using the following criteria:

The technical component will be evaluated using the following criteria:

International Consultant

Consultant' experiences/qualification related to the services		Score
1	Advanced university degree in social, environmental or development science, agronomy, forestry, M&E, or other relevant fields.	200
2	Minimum 10 years of related, identical, or similar professional experience is required in development projects, including proven experience from developing and middle income countries	200
3	Demonstrated experience in evaluations of similar types of programmes.	200
4	Good technical understanding of REDD+; and	200
5	Having in-depth knowledge of Viet Nam, ODA management regulations and operational modalities of UN/Gov. projects.	100
6	Demonstrated to have excellent writing and editing skills in English	100
Total		1000

National Consultant

Consultant' experiences/qualification related to the services		Score
1	Advanced university degree in social, environmental or development science, agronomy, forestry, M&E, or other relevant field relevant;	200
2	Minimum 7 years of related, identical, or similar professional experience is required in ODA funded projects, including proven experience from forestry related sector(s);	200
3	Demonstrated experience from evaluations of similar types of programmes;	250
4	In-depth knowledge of policy making process and/or ODA project management in Viet Nam;	250
5	Demonstrated to be fluent in Vietnamese and English	100
Total		1000

A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the submissions, with evaluation of the technical components being completed prior to any price proposals being opened and compared. The price proposal will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score of 70% of the obtainable score of 1000 points in the evaluation of the technical component.

The technical component is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Term of Reference (TOR).

Maximum 1000 points will be given to the lowest offer and the other financial proposals will receive the points inversely proportional to their financial offers. i.e. $S_f = 1000 \times F_m / F$, in which S_f is the financial score, F_m is the lowest price and F the price of the submission under consideration.

The weight of technical points is 70% and financial points is 30%.

Submission obtaining the highest weighted points (technical points + financial points) will be selected.

Interview with the candidates may be held if deemed necessary.

5. Contract

"Lump-sum" Individual Contract will be applied for freelance consultant (Annex II)

"Lump-sum" RLA will be applied for consultant assigned by firm/institution/organization (Annex III)

Documents required before contract signing:

- Personal History (following UNDP form)
- International consultant whose work involves travel is required to complete the courses on Basic Security in the Field and Advanced Security in the Field and submit certificates to UNDP before contract issuance.

Note: In order to access the courses, please go to the following link: <https://training.dss.un.org>
The training course takes around 3-4 hours to complete. The certificate is valid for 3 years.

- Full medical examination and Statement of Fitness to work for consultants from and above 62 years of age and involve travel. (This is not a requirement for RLA contracts).
- Release letter in case the selected consultant is government official.

6. Payment

UNDP shall effect payments to the consultant (by bank transfer to the consultant's bank account provided in the vendor form (Annex V) upon acceptance by UNDP of the deliverables specified the TOR.

Activities, time budget, deliverables and payments in 2017:

Activity	Team Leader	Team Member	Deliverables	Payment*
Preparation of inception report	4 days	3 days	Inception report	20%
Review mission and desk review	20 days	18 days		
Missions to provinces	8 days	8 days		
Present preliminary findings and recommendations to stakeholders	2 days	2 days		
Draft review report - Draft 1	5 days	3 days	Draft 1 - 2017 Review Report	40%
Revise review report - Draft 2	4 days	2 days		
Final 2017 annual review report	2 days	2 days	Final 2017 Review Report	15%
Total	45 days	38 days		

*** Payment for each team member upon acceptance of deliverables**

Activities, time budget, deliverables and payments in 2018:

Activity	Team Leader	Team Member	Deliverables	Payment*
Build on comments to the 2017 Review report and possible changing circumstances to update the scope of the report and work plan.	2 days	2 days	Detailed work plan and final table of content of the Final Evaluation report	
Update mission, desk review and consultations	11 days	10 days		
Draft and finalize Programme's final evaluation report	4 days	2 days	Programme's Final Evaluation Report	25%
Total	15 days	12 days		

If two currencies exist, UNDP exchange rate will be applied at the day UNDP instructs the bank to effect the payment.

7. Your proposals are received on the basis that you fully understand and accept these terms and conditions.

TERMS OF REFERENCE**Annual Review 2017 and Final Programme Evaluation (2013-2018)**

TITLE:	Annual Review 2017 and Final Evaluation of UN-REDD Vietnam Phase II Programme
Duty Station:	Hanoi and travel to provinces
Procurement	01 International (team leader, TL) and 01 national (team member, TM)
Duration	Estimated 60 working days for TL and 50 working days for TM, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 45 TL days and 38 TM days between September and November 2017- 15 TL days and 12 TM days in October 2018- A minimum of 50% of each consultants' time in Hanoi
Reporting	UNDP and National Programme Director of UN-REDD Vietnam Phase II Programme
Budget	Programme Management Costs (allocated to UNDP)
Project code	00085319

1. Background and Context

Viet Nam took early steps to integrate REDD+ in its national strategies for the forestry sector, climate change and other relevant development plans to develop national capacity and structures for REDD+ through different REDD+ initiatives, including the UN-REDD Phase I Programme for Viet Nam, which ended in 2012. In the following Phase II (starting mid-2013 and extended until December 2018), the piloting and pre-implementation phase of REDD+ began. The UN-REDD Programme for Viet Nam is implemented jointly by three UN Agencies: FAO, UNDP and UN Environment. The Viet Nam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST) under the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) is the national implementing partner of the Programme. The UN-REDD Programme provides technical expertise to establish, sustain, and support national REDD+ through direct and complementary support. More information about the UN-REDD Viet Nam Phase II Programme can be found at

<http://vietnam-redd.org/Web/Default.aspx?tab=project&zoneid=110&lang=en-US>.

Viet Nam has been supported by international partners in this context, notably the Government of Norway through the UN-REDD Programme, the multi-donor World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, the Governments of Germany, Japan, the United States, and various NGOs. Recognizing the growing scale and diversity of international partners, the GoVN called for increased coordination and established a REDD+ organizational set-up at (pilot-) provincial level as well as at the national level, inclusive of National REDD+ Steering Committee, Vietnam REDD+ Office, National REDD+ Network and its sub-technical working groups (STWGs).

Mid-Term Review 2014 and Annual Reviews 2015 and 2016

As indicated in the Programme Document, a comprehensive review of the UN-REDD Phase II Programme's implementation (from October 2013 until 30 September 2014) was carried out in 2014. As the review took place at the mid-point of the then three-year programme, it has been regarded and referred to as the "Mid Term Review" (MTR). The MTR noted limited progress and raised concerns on various critical issues. 12 major recommendations were provided. Overall, organizational restructuring and rationalizing roles and responsibilities on the part of Government as well as the UN was recommended. The MTR recommended that the Programme should be simplified and operationalized at all possible levels.

The 2015 Annual Review revealed a more positive progress of Programme implementation, as a result of better understandings on REDD+ concept and Programme guidelines, and also of the effective implementation of MTR's follow-up actions.

The 2016 Annual Review undertaken between September and November 2016 (covering programme's implementation from January to September 2016) noted that "the programme has recently entered a new stage of development. It was decided in January 2016 to grant programme implementation a three-year, no cost extension up to the end of 2018. The programme's logical framework was also revised in April 2016". The revision also moved beyond governance and arrangements, and took a stronger focus on the programme's content and quality, sustainability and impact. Programme's implementation was assessed to be strong, with very significant progress towards targets on 83% of outcomes and outputs. 22 recommendations were made, grouped into four themes that offer a relevant framework to run the 2017 and final review of the Programme:

- Programme management, including a sustainability and phase out plan
- Programme activities
- National REDD+ Action Programme and strategic positioning, including improvements of intersectoral coordination arrangements
- REDD+ Governance and coordination

The annual work plan and budget for 2017 (AWPB2017) was approved by the Programme Executive Board (PEB) in early November 2016 and subsequently by the Executive Group (EG) in December 2016. A formal revision of the 2017 AWPB and related result framework is expected to be completed by the end of September.

Basis/Justification

The Programme Document prescribes the need to undertake annual independent reviews and a final evaluation to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the activities and measures carried out by the Programme. The review should serve primarily as "stocktaking" but should also assess the impact of the results achieved to date and provide directions for further implementation. The review should focus on the strengths and shortfalls of the Programme's delivery and assess the capacity of the participating UN Agencies to deliver on administrative and technical aspects. The review should address the management and delivery capacity of the PMU (Programme Management Unit) and its main contractors, especially the CIPs (Co-implementing Partners).

At its 4th meeting held in December 2017, the EG requested the Programme to propose terms of reference for a two-stage external review and evaluation process to be initiated in 2017, encompassing (i) the 2017 Annual Review to be completed in 2017, and (ii) a final Programme Evaluation to be completed in 2018.

This assignment follows the EG's direction and covers the 4th review and final evaluation of the Programme. The annual review 2017 and final evaluation should also assess the progress of implementing past recommendations, and particularly those from PEB and EG meetings in November and December 2016. The annual review 2017 will build on the methodological framework used for the 2016 annual review:

- Assess responses to past recommendations
- Assess effectiveness (progress and delivery) on the four themes above
- Assess relevance, impact and sustainability

It must be noted that the 2017 review will not be limited to activities in 2017. It will review and evaluate the full Programme's implementation to date, besides a systematic review and discussion on the 2017-specific activities. Building on this overall evaluation and on specific attention to the 2017 results and trend, it will also provide recommendations for the last year of operations in 2018.

Considering that the 2017 Annual Review methodology and report complies with requirements and expectations from a programme's final evaluation, the same format will be used for the final evaluation in 2018, which will mainly consist in an updating exercise, run by the same team of national and international experts, during the last quarter of 2018. We refer to the two consultants as "the team", covering both the 2017 and 2018 parts of the annual review and Programme's final evaluation.

2. Scope and Objectives

The ultimate objective of these terms of reference consists in formulating the final evaluation of the UN-REDD Vietnam Phase 2 Programme. This objective will be achieved in two steps:

- From September to November 2017, the team of consultants will review the overall progress of the Programme since the beginning, with an emphasis on 2017 activities. They will produce a “2017 annual review report” in the format of the Programme’s final evaluation.
- During Quarter 4 2018, the team of consultants will review 2018’s specific progress and produce a “Programme’s final evaluation report” building on the structure and content of the 2017 review report.

The 2017 AR covers the full period of the Programme, paving the way for consolidating the final evaluation in 2018. with special attention to the period from October 1, 2016 up to September 30, 2017. However, considering that the Programme’s implementation is organized around annual work plans, the review will focus on the first three quarters of 2017. It shall provide the 2017 annual review report for an EG meeting in December 2017, and a draft and synthetic report to inform the PEB meeting in November 2017.

The Final Evaluation to be conducted in 2018 will cover the full period of the Programme until September 30, 2018. In practice, it will focus on progress since October 2017, since the previous period shall be already covered in the 2017 annual review report.

The 2017 AR and Final Evaluation will assess the Programme’s performance in terms of accomplished and ongoing activities, including (1) the effectiveness of the Programme to achieve the outputs and outcomes; (2) its efficiency; (3) its relevance against broader REDD+, forestry and development processes; (4) its impacts (5) its sustainability and 6), the degree of readiness for RBPs and other relevant funding sources.

Throughout this review and evaluation process, key factors of success and challenges possibly undermining the Programme’s implementation and performance will be identified and consolidated. It should also identify measures for improvement, to be considered for the implementation in 2018 and to guide Vietnam’s REDD+ process beyond 2018. The review will answer questions like: Is Programme implementation improving? Is coordination between sectors of importance for success in REDD+ improving? Are activities on track and are there crucial issues to be addressed? Are there realistic solutions to such issues and can they get the political/government support needed to improve? Is the technical backstopping sufficient, relevant, manageable, and consistent? Are the communication and management lines, responsibilities and authorities, content, and issues optimal or could they be improved? Are monitoring system/quality assurance mechanisms working well to track performance of outcomes/outputs/activities against its expected results, and from national to local level? Has a process of developing a sustainability and phase out plan made progress? What are the prospects for continuation of programme activities in a post-programme setting? Is regional coordination in forest governance improving? What synergies have been developed between the REDD+ programme and other forest sector programmes including FLEGT?

The main objectives of the 2017 Annual Review are:

- Assess Programme performance in 2017 and since the beginning of the Programme
- Assess the level, sufficiency and implementation of the Programme’s responses to the previous mid-term and annual reviews’ recommendations, as well as the directions provided by EG meetings
- Identify and prioritize measures to improve performance for the Programme in 2018, and for the REDD+ national process beyond 2018, with a particular focus on readiness for RBPs and other relevant funding sources.

The main objectives of the Final Evaluation are:

- Assess Programme performance since the beginning of the Programme
- Assess the level, sufficiency and implementation of the Programme’s responses to previous mid-term and annual reviews’ recommendations, as well as the directions provided by EG meetings
- Identify and prioritize measures to improve performance of the REDD+ national process beyond 2018, with a particular focus on readiness for RBPs and other relevant funding sources.

In order to achieve these objectives, the annual review and final evaluation will assess:

- Progress towards targets specified in the most updated results framework;

- Progress towards annual targets and budget;
- Quality assurance mechanisms and enforcement; and
- Management arrangements of the Programme.

The annual review will be disseminated to the GoVN (NRSC, VRO, and VNFOREST/MARD), the 3 UN-Agencies, the donor, the UN-REDD Global Programme, and other Programme main stakeholders.

3. Methodology

The Review and Evaluation should develop and adopt the most effective method to carry out the above tasks and reach the above objectives, whilst ensuring constant and high-level quality standards. Overall guidance and adherence to the UNEG Norms & Standards¹ is used as a reference. A tentative *Table of Content* is outlined in Annex B.

By reviewing past and present activities and practices, the Team will analyze their success and efficiency and provide recommendations for their improvement in 2018, and for informing the national REDD+ process beyond 2018.

Findings should be based on facts, sound evidence and analysis, they should be crosschecked and the evidence should be clearly documented in final reports. Analysis leading to judgments should always be clearly reasoned. The limitations of conclusions based on methods applied shall be addressed in final reports.

The Review and Evaluation will assess the Programme with respect to a minimum set of criteria, see Annex A and Annex C.

In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the programme, the evaluators should consider the difference between what has happened with and what would have happened without the programme. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended programme outcomes and impacts. This also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the Programme. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about Programme's performance.

As this is a final evaluation, particular attention should be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the "why?" question should be at the front of the consultants' minds throughout the evaluation exercise. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of "what" the programme performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of "why" the performance turned out the way it did, i.e. of processes affecting attainment of programme results. This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the programme. In fact, the usefulness of the evaluation will be determined to a large extent by the capacity of the consultant to explain "why things happened" as they happened and are likely to evolve in this or that direction, which goes well beyond the mere assessment of "where things stand" today. The consultants are also expected to provide recommendations for the way forward.

Tools

- Desk review of all relevant background documentation, including the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document, project reports (Programme Document, annual workplans, budgets, revisions to the logical framework and project financing), and other relevant documents (e.g. new national policies, sector plans, UNFCCC papers, COPs, Policy Boards Minutes, etc.);
- Surveys in 2 pilot provinces (to be determined) for the 2017 Annual Review;
- Semi-structured interviews (face-to-face or through any other appropriate means of communications) with key informants, stakeholders and participants, including:
 - Government stakeholders including ministries participating in coordinating bodies or steering committees;
 - Civil Society Organizations;
 - Ethnic Minorities Organizations;
 - Country and regional personnel from the three UN Agencies involved including Country Office staff, Resident Coordinator and Regional Technical Advisers (RTA); and

¹ (<http://uneval.org/normsandstandards>)

- Representatives from other relevant bi-lateral or multi-lateral initiatives and partners.
An extensive series of interviews will be carried out in 2017 for the Annual Review serving as pre-final evaluation. In 2018, a second round of interviews, mainly with the same interlocutors, will allow to assess changes, update and complete the evaluation of the Programme.
- Consultation workshops at provincial and national level as agreed with PMU and UNDP.

A list of key stakeholders and individuals to be consulted will be shared with the Team.

Consultation process

The Review and Evaluation should apply a transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders. Throughout the process the Team will maintain close liaison with the country office and the regional advisors of the three UN Agencies, and the PMU. The Team is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government of Viet Nam, the donor or the participating UN Agencies.

The draft annual review and final evaluation reports will be circulated among the three Participating UN Agencies and PMU for comment before finalization; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the Team.

4. Deliverables

Inception report

Before proceeding with data collection and analysis, the Team should prepare an inception report including work plan and methodology to demonstrate understanding of the ToRs. The inception report will detail schedules of tasks, activities and deliverables to be achieved, including the 2017 Review and the Final Evaluation reports.

Any gaps in information should be identified, and methods for additional data collection, verification and analysis should be specified. A review and evaluation framework will present in detail the questions under each criterion with their respective indicators and data sources. A list of important documents and web pages that the Team should read at the outset will be provided. The inception report will be shared with the PMU, with UNDP (for further sharing among the three participating UN Organizations), and other relevant stakeholders.

2017 Review Report

The Team shall prepare a *draft 2017 review report* to ensure that the review meets the required criteria described in the Terms of Reference. The Team Leader bears responsibility for submitting the draft report within two weeks from the conclusion of the review to UNDP for further sharing to three participating UN Organizations and the PMU. Comments and suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the Team.

To present and discuss the findings of the Review, a *seminar or hearing* (organized by UNDP and the PMU) will be held prior to the end of the mission.

The *final 2017 review report* will entail conclusions, recommendations, discussions etc. In order to avoid subjective and personalized views penetrating the analysis excessively, the report shall refer to and link to evidence and/or solid indications found to substantiate findings and analysis. The length of the final report should be 6-7,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when relevant. The recommendations will be directed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

The Team shall propose the outline of the report early in the process (example in Annex B, to serve as a basis for finalization), to be agreed by PMU in UNDP (in consultation with other participating UN agencies). The report shall be prepared in English, and translated into Vietnamese. Annexes to the final report will include at least the following:

- Terms of reference for the annual review;
- Additional methodology-related documentation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the team;

- List of programme outputs/Programme results framework;
- Evaluation tools

The final 2017 Review Report should be submitted to the PMU and UNDP for further sharing among the three participating UN organizations for comments before it is finalized. The Team is fully responsible for its independent report and for applying international quality and standards towards Programme Reviews.

Final Evaluation Report

The *Programme's final evaluation report* will significantly build on the 2017 review report, in the sense that it will have the same structure and criteria, the scope will only be expanded to include the year 2018, and most of the analytics will have been developed already in the 2017 review report.

The Programme Evaluation Report will be developed in two steps.

Step 1: A draft version will be developed based on:

- Structure and methodology from the 2017 review report
- Content as already summarized and consolidated from previous annual review reports in the 2017 review report
- Identification of any additional evaluation elements to be reviewed based on the 2017 review and recent developments in the programme
- Content and analysis updated based on additional desk review and interviews conducted in Q4, 2018

Step 2: This draft Programme's final evaluation report should be submitted to the PMU and UNDP for further sharing among the three participating UN organizations for comments before it is finalized. The Team is fully responsible for its independent report and for applying international quality and standards towards Programme Reviews.

5. The Team

The Team should work under the supervision of Head of Unit at UNDP Viet Nam Office and the National Programme Director of the PMU. In 2017, both consultants are requested to work in Hanoi for 23 working days at least to prepare for and carry out the interviews with national stakeholders, and also to travel to the two selected provinces (3-4 days for each) to gather information from the provinces. In 2018, the team leader will also be requested to spend at least 8 days in Hanoi to run interviews and work together with the national consultant.

Responsibilities

Team leader: TL is responsible for the progress and quality of all products produced through the assignment.

- (S)he leads the development of a joint work-plan for the review and evaluation.
- Further, the TL develops the tools and methodology for the assignment.
- The Mission conducts solitary and team interviews and dialogues as deemed necessary. However, desk reviews are likely to be the main source of information and will always be required to provide validation, precision, clarity, and context for information captured verbally.
- The TL will report and present with inputs from the TM.

Team member:

As for the Team Member (TM), apart from joint activities,

- (s)he is responsible for facilitating the consultation processes with national and provincial partners; and
- to provide inputs and conduct all tasks as assigned or agreed on by the TL.

More details on the work division should be developed by the selected consultants through their work-plan.

Both consultants must not be working as staff of the Gov., FAO, UNDP or UNEP.

Team Leader's Profile

Competency:

- Good technical understanding of REDD+; and

- Having in-depth knowledge of Viet Nam, ODA management regulations and operational modalities of UN/Gov. projects.
- Demonstrated experience in evaluations of similar types of programmes.
- Excellent writing and editing skills.
- Attention to detail and respect for timelines.

Qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in social, environmental or development science, agronomy, forestry, M&E, or other relevant field.
- Minimum 10 years of related, identical, or similar professional experience is required in development projects, including proven experience from developing and middle income countries;
- Fluency in English language, both written and spoken is a requirement. Knowledge of Vietnamese would be a distinctive advantage

Team Member's Profile

Competency:

- In-depth knowledge of policy making process and/or ODA project management in Viet Nam;
- Demonstrated experience from evaluations of similar types of programmes;
- Attention to detail and respect for timelines

Qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in social, environmental or development science, agronomy, forestry, M&E, or other relevant field relevant;
- Minimum 7 years of related, identical, or similar professional experience is required in ODA funded projects, including proven experience from forestry related sector(s);
- Fluency in Vietnamese and English languages, both written and spoken is a requirement.

6. Timing and payments

The assignment is designed with 60 working days for team leader and 50 working days for the team member. Both consultants are requested to work in Hanoi for a minimum of 23 working days in 2017, 8 days in 2018, and travel to 2 pilot provinces for an estimated 3 days per province in 2017. The consultants should factor all travel costs into their financial proposal. Final financial agreement will be adjusted considering actual selection of Provinces to be visited. Provinces will be selected before the team finalizes its methodology and detailed work plan, based on the following criteria:

- Degree of progress in implementing activities, and prospects for significant results by the end of 2018
- Relevance of activities and local challenges compared to national challenges and priorities (cross-sector coordination, regional collaboration, stakeholders' engagement...)"

Activities, time budget, deliverables and payments in 2017:

Activity	Team Leader	Team Member	Deliverables	Payment*
Preparation of inception report	4 days	3 days	Inception report	20%
Review mission and desk review	20 days	18 days		
Missions to provinces	8 days	8 days		
Present preliminary findings and recommendations to stakeholders	2 days	2 days		
Draft review report - Draft 1	5 days	3 days	Draft 1 - 2017 Review Report	40%
Revise review report - Draft 2	4 days	2 days		
Final 2017 annual review report	2 days	2 days	Final 2017 Review Report	15%
Total	45 days	38 days		

*** Payment for each team member upon acceptance of deliverables**

Activities, time budget, deliverables and payments in 2018:

Activity	Team Leader	Team Member	Deliverables	Payment*
Build on comments to the 2017 Review report and possible changing circumstances to update the scope of the report and work plan.	2 days	2 days	Detailed work plan and final table of content of the Final Evaluation report	
Update mission, desk review and consultations	11 days	10 days		
Draft and finalize Programme's final evaluation report	4 days	2 days	Programme's Final Evaluation Report	25%
Total	15 days	12 days		

Tentative timetable

Dates	Activity	Responsibility / Notes
11-15 Sept. 2017	Preparation of Inception report	The Team (consultants). Inception report reviewed by three UN organizations, PMU, and CTA
18 th Sept. – 20 th Oct. 2017	Desk work, consultations in Hanoi and provinces	The Team (consultants). Logistical support provided by the PMU and UNDP
Between 23-25 Oct. 2017	Workshop presentation/ handout	Half-day debriefing workshop with stakeholders to be held by the Team. Assistance by PMU secretariat
27 th Oct. 2017	Draft Report 1 submitted	TL
30 th Oct. – 10 th Nov. 2017	Review draft Report 1 (including translation into VN)	PMU, 3 UN agencies, VNFOREST and others - review draft and share comments to the Team
16 th Nov. 2017	Draft 2 Report submitted	TL
17-21 Nov. 2017	Review draft Report 2	PMU, 3 UN agencies, VNFOREST and others - review draft and share comments to the Team
24 th Nov. 2017	Submit the final 2017 review report	TL
12 th Oct. 2018	Prepare detailed work plan and possibly update the table of the content of the Final Evaluation report	TL
2 nd Nov. 2018	Draft Report on Programme's Final Evaluation	TL
5-9 Nov. 2018	Review draft report	PMU, 3 UN agencies, VNFOREST and others - review draft and share comments to the Team
16 th Nov. 2018	Submit the Programme's Final Evaluation report	TL

Annex A. Review Criteria and Elements

The following list includes standard questions and issues that Annual Review and Final Evaluation should address:

Effectiveness

Assess, to which extent:

- Progress towards outputs or outcomes has been achieved:
 - Assess qualitatively and quantitatively factors that enabled or affected attaining project results. Look at stakeholder involvement, financial planning, effectiveness of national and local implementing agencies and supervising agencies, coordination with donors and other projects. List, prioritize, and analyze reasons for any delays in delivery of project outputs, outcomes, as well as outstanding factors for success
 - Implementation approach – including an analysis of the project's result framework, performance indicators, adaptive management to changing conditions, overall project management and mechanisms applied in project management in delivering project outcomes and outputs. Analyze and suggest necessary revisions of the Programme's log frame (when relevant, for 2018)
 - Assess and evaluate the set-up at present as compared to earlier years
- Expected outputs have been produced, their quality and timeliness.
- Gender has been mainstreamed in the Programme. This will cover:
 - Analysis of how gender issues are reflected in the Programme objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries, and implementation
 - Extent of gender issues taken into account in Programme management
- The Programme contributed towards the “Delivering as One” initiative and lessons learned were incorporated into broader organizational strategies
- The Programme contributed to the overall rationale of readiness for RBPs and other relevant funding sources

Efficiency

The review will assess factors and processes that affected project results with particular attention to preparation and readiness of the project's inputs, country ownership, stakeholders' involvement, effectiveness of the UN agencies, national and local implementers, financial planning and management and coordination mechanisms.

Financial resources management of the National Programme, including:

- How efficient are resources (funds, expertise and time) converted to achieve outcomes outputs?
- Coherence and soundness of budget revisions in matching implementation needs and programme objectives;
- Rate of delivery against annual work plan at the time of the review; and
- Gaps and delays if any between planned and achieved outputs, the causes and consequences of delays and assessment of any remedial measures taken.
- Management and implementation of the National Programme, including:
 - Efficiency in producing outputs; and
 - Efficiency of fund-management arrangements

Relevance

The 2017 review and Programme's final evaluation are also expected to discuss the relevance of the Programme's design from the perspective of national development priorities, climate change and forest agenda, and the national REDD+ process in general. Are initial outputs and outcomes still relevant in the changing context? How did they evolve to ensure continued relevance?

Relevance concerns the extent to which the National Programme and its intended outcomes or outputs are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of the intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is aligned with the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015,

and the corporate plans of the three participating UN Organizations. Relevance vis-a-vis other REDD+ or REDD+-related programmes implemented in the country will be examined in terms of synergies, complementarities and absence of duplication of efforts.

Impacts

The review and assessment will measure to what extent the National Programme has contributed to, or is likely to contribute to intermediate states towards impact, such as changes in the governance systems and stakeholder behaviour, and to impact on people's lives and the environment. The evaluation will assess the likelihood of impact by critically reviewing the programmes intervention strategy (Theory of Change) and the presence of the required drivers and assumptions for outcomes to lead to intermediate states and impact.

Considering initial goals and objectives of the Programme, and evolving context and expectations in 2017, in 2018 and throughout the life of the Programme, what is the potential of impact of the programme – including but not focusing on emissions reductions? What are the key factors of success and challenges to maximize such impacts in the current context and in future developments of the REDD+ national process, particularly through the implementation of the National REDD+ Action Programme and access to result-based payments, readiness for and access to result-based payments and other relevant funding mechanisms.

Sustainability

The Review shall include assessment and analysis of sustainability in a broad sense which includes institutional, technical, economic, environmental, governance, financial, and social sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes in/by the Programme.

Assess investment by GoVN and institutional capacity mainstreaming REDD+ into national climate change mitigation strategies and into national and provincial socio-economic development plans (SEDPs), forest protection and development plans (FPDPs)/Target Program on Sustainable Forest Management (TPSFM), and land use planning (LUP) processes.

Factors affecting performance

- Assessment of coordination and decisions taken among the 3 UN Agencies
- Assessment of coordination and decisions between UN and GoVN
- Assessment coordination of Programme within GoVN
- Assessment coordination between the Programme and other REDD+ initiatives.
- Governance and management and implementation of the Programme, including:
 - Design and implementation of Programme governance;
 - Efficiency of management, including quality and realism of work plans;
 - Efficiency of coordination and steering bodies;
 - Quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by the three UN's
 - Timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and support by GoVN and partners.

Annex B: Suggested Table of Content (to be adapted to 2017 AR and Final Evaluation)

- 1 Executive Summary
 - 1.1 Background
 - 1.2 Highlights and Innovations
 - 1.3 Summary of Findings
 - 1.4 Recommendations
- 2 Introduction
 - 2.1 Background to the Project
 - 2.2 Project Review Methodology
- 3 Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs
 - 3.1 Critical Success Factors
 - 3.2 Outcomes and Target Outcomes
 - 3.3 Outputs
- 4 Project Documentation
 - 4.1 Project Management Plans
 - 4.1.1 Project Proposal/Brief
 - 4.1.2 Project Execution Plan
 - 4.1.3 Outcome/Benefits Realizations
 - 4.2 Maintenance of Project Records
- 5 Project Management
 - 5.1 Planning and Scoping
 - 5.2 Governance
 - 5.3 Organizational Change Management
 - 5.4 Stakeholder Engagement
 - 5.5 Risk Management
 - 5.6 Issues Management
 - 5.7 Resource Management
 - 5.7.1 Budget
 - 5.7.2 Human Resources
 - 5.7.3 Information
 - 5.8 Quality Management
 - 5.9 Status Reporting
- 6 Project Performance
 - 6.1 Performance against Objectives and Outcomes
 - 6.2 Performance against Critical Success Factors
 - 6.3 Performance against Outputs
 - 6.4 Performance against Budgets and Schedule
 - 6.5 Response to past annual reviews
 - 6.6 Other Findings
- 7 Discussion
- 8 Lessons Learned
 - 8.1 What Worked Well?
 - 8.2 What could be improved?
- 9 Conclusions
- 10 Recommendations (what could be improved? And how?)
- 11 Appendices

Annex C: Suggested evaluation questions

The following list includes standard questions and issues that the UN-REDD National Programme evaluation should address. It is based on the internationally accepted evaluation criteria mentioned above, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as an additional category of questions regarding factors affecting programme performance. This list will be reviewed and completed by consultants and included in the work plan.

i) **Relevance**

- a) The National Programme's relevance to:
 - Country needs;
 - National development priorities as expressed in national policies and plans as well as in sector development frameworks;
 - UN Country Programme or other donor assistance framework approved by the government;
 - The UNDAF and the UN Joint Programme on Climate Change;
 - The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document;
 - Other REDD+ related programmes in the country, in particular the National REDD+ Action Programme;
- b) Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the Programme, including logic of causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impacts against the specific and development objectives and validity of indicators, assumptions and risks.
- c) Quality and realism of the Programme design, including:
 - Duration;
 - Stakeholder and beneficiary identification;
 - Institutional set-up and management arrangements;
 - Overall programme results' framework
 - Approach and methodology.
- d) Evolution of Programme objectives since initial formulation.

ii) **Effectiveness**

- e) Extent to which the expected outputs have been produced, their quality and timeliness.
- f) Extent to which the expected outcomes have been achieved.
- g) Assessment of gender mainstreaming in the Programme. This will cover:
 - Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in Programme objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
 - Analysis of how gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the initiative;
 - Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in Programme management.
 - Assessment of likely distribution of benefits and costs between stakeholders.
- h) Use made by the Programme of the UN-REDD Programme's normative products, guidelines and safeguards, e.g. the UN-REDD Programme Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and the UN-REDD / FCPF Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness, and the extent of which they have contributed towards national safeguards.
- i) Actual and potential contribution of the Programme to the normative work of the three participating UN Organizations, e.g. contribution towards the "Delivering as One" initiative and lessons learned incorporated into broader organizational strategies.

iii) **Efficiency**

- j) Cost and timeliness of key outputs delivered compared to national and regional benchmarks
- k) Administrative costs (including costs for supervision and coordination between participating UN agencies) compared to operational costs
- l) Any time and cost-saving measures taken by the programme
- m) Any significant delays or cost-overruns incurred, reason why and appropriateness of any remedial measures taken

iv) **Sustainability**

- n) Major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme.
- o) The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the Programme's results by the beneficiaries after the termination of the initiative. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
 - Institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
 - Perspectives for institutional uptake, support and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the Programme.

v) Impact

- p) Extent to which the initiative has attained, or is expected to attain, its social and environmental objectives; this will also include the identification of actual and potential positive and negative impacts produced by the initiative, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended
- q) Presence of the required drivers and assumptions for outcomes to lead to intermediate states and impact.

vi) Factors affecting performance

- r) The evaluation will assess factors and processes that affected project results with particular attention to preparation and readiness of the project, country ownership, and stakeholder involvement, effectiveness of national and local implementing agencies, financial planning and management and coordination mechanisms.
- s) Management and implementation of the National Programme, including:
 - Quality and realism of work plans;
 - Quality of operational management;
 - Performance of coordination and steering bodies;
 - Quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by the three participating UN Organizations; and
 - Timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and support by the Government and partners.
- t) Financial resources management of the Programme, including:
 - Adequacy of budget allocations to achieve outputs;
 - Coherence and soundness of budget revisions in matching implementation needs and programme objectives;
 - Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation.
 - Efficiency of fund-management arrangements.
- u) Assessment of coordination mechanisms :
 - Between the three participating UN organizations to ensure joint delivery.
 - Between the Government and the three participating UN organizations to ensure programme outcomes are achieved.
 - Within and between Government ministries in order to ensure programme outcomes is achieved.
 - Between the Programme and other bilateral and multilateral REDD+ initiatives.

In addition, the evaluation will review crucial questions, including:

- What is the status of REDD+ readiness in the country, looking at the typical REDD+ readiness components, and to which extent the programme contributed to each.
- What are the prospects for follow-up and scaling-up REDD+ in Vietnam, and for the country to access Result-Based Payments and leverage other sources of finance.

Annex IV

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING CV

WE REQUEST THAT YOU USE THE FOLLOWING CHECKLIST WHEN PREPARING YOUR CV:

Limit the CV to 3 or 4 pages

NAME (First, Middle Initial, Family Name)

Address:

City, Region/State, Province, Postal Code

Country:

Telephone, Facsimile and other numbers

Internet Address:

Sex, Date of Birth, Nationality, Other Citizenship, Marital Status

Company associated with (if applicable, include company name, contact person and phone number)

SUMMARY OF EXPERTISE

Field(s) of expertise (be as specific as possible)

Particular development competencies-thematic (e.g. Women in Development, NGOs, Privatization, Sustainable Development) or technical (e.g. project design/evaluation)

Credentials/education/training, relevant to the expertise

LANGUAGES

Mother Tongue:

Indicate written and verbal proficiency of your English:

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE

Provide an overview of work history in reverse chronological order. Provide dates, your function/title, the area of work and the major accomplishments include honorarium/salary. References (name and contact email address) must be provided for each assignment undertaken by the consultant that UNDP may contact.

UN SYSTEM EXPERIENCE

If applicable, provide details of work done for the UN System including WB. Provide names and email address of UN staff who were your main contacts. Include honorarium/salary.

UNIVERSITY DEGREES

List the degree(s) and major area of study. Indicate the date (in reverse chronological order) and the name of the institution where the degree was obtained.

PUBLICATIONS

Provide total number of Publications and list the titles of 5 major publications (if any)

MISCELLANEOUS

Indicate the minimum and maximum time you would be available for consultancies and any other factors, including impediments or restrictions that should be taken into account in connection with your work with this assignment.

Please ensure the following statement is included in the resume and that it is signed and dated:

I CERTIFY THAT ALL INFORMATION STATED IN THIS RESUME IS TRUE AND COMPLETE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE. I AUTHORIZE UNDP/UNOPS OR ITS AGENT TO VERIFY THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THIS RESUME.

(Signature)

Annex V

FINANCIAL OFFER

Having examined the Solicitation Documents, I, the undersigned, offer to provide all the services in the TOR for the sum of USD for IC, VND for NC

This is a lump sum offer covering all associated costs for the required service (fee, meal, accommodation, travel, taxes etc).

Cost breakdown:

No.	Description	Quantity	Unit rate (VND/USD)	Total
1	Consultancy fee			
2	Out of pocket expenses			
2.1	Travel			
2.2	Per diem			
2.3	Full medical examination and Statement of Fitness to work for consultants from and above 62 years of age and involve travel – (required before issuing contract). *			
2.5	Others (pls. specify).....			
	TOTAL			

** Individual Consultants/Contractors who are over 62 years of age with assignments that require travel and are required, at their own cost, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from **an UN-approved doctor** prior to taking up their assignment.*

I undertake, if my proposal is accepted, to commence and complete delivery of all services specified in the contract within the time frame stipulated.

I agree to abide by this proposal for a period of 120 days from the submission deadline of the proposals.

Dated this day /month

of year

Signature