

## INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE



Date: 30 January 2018

**Country:** Bangkok, Thailand

**Description of the assignment:** National Consultant\_UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Term of Reference\_Tiger Project

**Duty Station:** Home-based with one mission to Bangkok and the project sites in Thailand

**Project name:** Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex

**Period of assignment/services (if applicable):** 11 June 2018 – 28 September 2018 with total of 25 working days.

Proposal should be submitted no later than **22 February 2018**

Please click on the link below to apply: [https://jobs.undp.org/cj\\_view\\_job.cfm?cur\\_job\\_id=76950](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=76950)

### 1. BACKGROUND

These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Mid-Term Review (MTR) for full-sized project titled Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex (PIMS#5436), implemented through Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP), Thailand, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on 15 July 2015 and is in third years of its implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<b>Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex</b>
----------------	--

GEF Project ID:	PIMS5436		at endorsement (US\$)	At MTR (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00090893	GEF financing:	7,339,450	
Country:	Thailand	UNDP:	500,000	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government (DNP):	22,864,427	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity, Climate Change and Multi-Focal Areas	Others: - Wildlife Conservation Society - Seub Nakasathien Foundation	500,000  370,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-1: Improve sustainability of protected area systems CCM-5: Promote Conservation and Enhancement of Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Management of Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry SFM/REDD-2	Total co-financing:	24,364,427	
		Total Project Cost:	31,573,877	
Executing Partner:	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)		31,573,877	
Other Partners involved:	- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) - Seub Nakasathien Foundation	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		15 July 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 14 June 2020	Revised Closing Date: N/A

### Project Background Information

Situated at the core of the Western Forest Complex (WEFCOM), the Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai Naresuan World Heritage Site (HKK-TY WHS) consists of three contiguous Wildlife Sanctuaries: the Huai Kha Khang (HKK); the Thung Yai Naresuan East (TYE); and the Thung Yai Naresuan West (TYW).

Totalling an area of 6,427 km<sup>2</sup>, the largely intact forest habitats of the HKK-TY WHS provide a protected refuge for approximately half of Thailand's tiger population.

There are no villages within the HKK, but there are 14 formally recognised enclave villages within the TYW (7 villages) and TYE (7 villages). There are further villages, together with mixed forest-agriculture, in a 5km buffer around the HKK-TY WHS with a particular concentration to the east of HKK where there is an estimated 29 villages. Many of the villagers living in the enclave and buffer villages are dependent on the use of forest resources

The most significant threats to tiger survival in and around the HKK-TY WHS includes: i) habitat degradation and fragmentation; ii) poaching of the prey that tiger depend on; and iii) poaching of the tigers themselves. These threats are further exacerbated by limited capacity and insufficient resources to effectively plan and administer the wildlife sanctuaries, and limited working relationships with enclave and buffer communities. The project has been organised into three components, and will be implemented over a period of five years.

The first component of the project is directed towards strengthening and scaling up existing best-practice management activities, and developing and testing innovative approaches to enforcement and compliance, in the HKK-TYN WHS. It will strive to reduce the direct threats to tigers and prey, improve effectiveness of wildlife sanctuary management, and enhance the use of data and information to support key management decision-making.

The second component of the project is focused on linking sustainable livelihood development in the enclave and buffer zone villages with specific conservation outcomes, and improving economic links between the buffer zone and enclave villages and the Wildlife Sanctuaries. It will seek to achieve these linkages by promoting incentives (including technical support and grant funding for sustainable livelihood initiatives, ecotourism development and piloting a REDD+ Wildlife Premium carbon project) for community-based sustainable forest management, environmentally-friendly agricultural practices, nature-based tourism and education and improved wildlife and habitat protection.

The third component of the project is directed towards raising the awareness in communities living in and around the WHS of the need to conserve, and the importance of protecting, the forest landscapes and associated wildlife. With the iterative recognition in these communities of the intrinsic value of the forest habitats and wildlife, work under this component will assist in strengthening the representation of the buffer and enclave communities in each of the Wildlife Sanctuary's Protected Area Committees (PACs). With improved community-based representation on the PAC, the project will assist in building the capacity (information, knowledge, skills) of each of the community representatives to assure a constructive and meaningful contribution to the co-management of the WSs. The total costs of investment in the project is estimated at US\$31,573,877, of which US\$7,339,450 constitutes grant funding from GEF and US\$24,234,427 comprises co-financing.

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

--

### **Objectives of This Midterm Review**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability

### **MTR Approach and Methodology**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field mission to Thailand, including the following project sites: Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai (HKK-TY) World Heritage Site (WHS) and its buffer areas.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project Director and Co-Manager
- Project Manager
- Field Coordinators
- Representatives from pilot areas
- Project Administrative/Financial Officer
- Members of Project Board
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok
- Wildlife Conservation Society
- Seub Nakasathien Foundation

### **Detailed Scope of the MTR**

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For*

*Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

## **i. Project Strategy**

### Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

### Results Framework/Logframe:

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

## **ii. Progress Towards Results**

### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked

as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

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

### **Indicator Assessment Key**

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

### **iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

#### **Management Arrangements:**

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

<sup>1</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>2</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>3</sup> If available

<sup>4</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>5</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

#### Work Planning:

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

#### Finance and co-finance:

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

#### Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

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

#### Stakeholder Engagement:

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

#### Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.

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

#### Communications:

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

#### **iv. Sustainability**

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

#### Financial risks to sustainability:

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

#### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

#### Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

#### Environmental risks to sustainability:



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

## Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>6</sup>

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

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

## Ratings

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

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Project Title)**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

## 3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

<sup>6</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

## Qualification

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team local expert, from Thailand. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

### NATIONAL CONSULTANT

#### Profile

- At least a Master's degree in social development, public policy, environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of five (5) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management (20%).
- Proven communication, facilitation, and writing skills.
- Evaluation skills, including conducting interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, qualitative and quantitative analysis.
- Excellent command of English both writing and speaking (20%)
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects (20%)
- Some project management experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation would be an advantage (10%).
- Some knowledge of UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy would be an advantage (10%)

#### Responsibilities

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

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

### Duration of the Assignment

The total duration of the contract will be approximately **25 working days** over a 10-week timeframe from **11 June 2018 to 28 September 2018**.

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
11 June 2018	Contract begins

	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
11-13 June 2018 (3 working days)	Project Document Review Submit MTR Inception Report to UNDP for review
2 July 2017 (1 working day)	Finalization of the MTR Inception Report and re-submit to UNDP.
30 July 2017	Arrival in Bangkok of International Evaluation Team Lead
31 July 2018 (1 working days)	Inception meeting at UNDP Country Office Meeting with DNP Team and other stakeholders in Bangkok.
1-10 August 2018 (8 working days for field mission)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews and field visits
13-14 August 2018 (2 working days)	Preparation of presentations for wrap-up meeting.
15 August 2018 (1 working days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
20-23 August 2018 (4 working days)	Preparing draft report
23 August 2018 (0 working days for consultant)	Circulation of draft report for comments
10-14 September 2018 (max: 5 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report Preparation & Issue of Management Response
28 September 2018	Expected date of contract closure

#### **Duty Station**

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to Bangkok and the project sites in Thailand.

## **5. FINAL PRODUCTS**

#### **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The consultant is expected to deliver the followings:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	14 June 2018	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	14 August 2018	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	<b>Draft Final MTR Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content	23 August 2018	Sent to the Commissioning Unit,

		outlined in Annex B) with annexes		reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	<b>Final MTR Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	14 September 2018 (or within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

## 6. PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

### Institutional Arrangement

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

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of the travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 7. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document:

- a) **a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability and Financial Proposal** using the template provided by UNDP
- b) **b) CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form)** indicating all past experiences from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- c) **Brief description** of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer

to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to UNDP **by 22 February 2018**. Incomplete proposals may not be considered. The short listed candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified.

## 8. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

### Price Proposal and Schedule of Payment :

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the draft MTR report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final MTR report

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. The provided living allowance will not be exceeding UNDP DSA rates. Repatriation travel cost from home to duty station in Bangkok and return shall not be covered by UNDP.

## 9. EVALUATION

### Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and

experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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

## **ANNEXES**

Annex I - TOR\_ National Consultant\_UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Term of Reference\_Tiger Project

Annex II- General Condition of Contract

Annex III - Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual IC, including Financial Proposal Template

All documents can be downloaded at : [http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view\\_notice.cfm?notice\\_id=43830](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=43830)