



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

Date: **29 August 2014**

## INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

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

Country:	Viet Nam
Description of the assignment:	International Consultant (to team up with a national consultant) for Terminal Evaluation of Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots in Viet Nam
Project name:	Project ID 00057593/00071224: Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots in Viet Nam
Period of assignment:	Estimated 25-30 working days during September –October 2014

1. Submissions should be sent by email to: [le.tuyet.sinh@undp.org](mailto:le.tuyet.sinh@undp.org) no later than: **14 September 2014 (Hanoi time)**.

With subject line: **International Consultant-Terminal Evaluation of Project: Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots in Viet Nam.**

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

**Note:** Maximum size per email is **7 MB**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to [le.tuyet.sinh@undp.org](mailto:le.tuyet.sinh@undp.org) . 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 interested consultants and

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)

- [General Conditions](#)
- [Insurance Coverage Table](#) (Annex IV)
- [Vendor Form](#) (Annex V)
- [Confirmation of interest](#) (Annex VI)
- [Guidelines for CV preparation](#) (Annex VII)
- [Format of financial proposal.](#) (Annex VIII)

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

a. Technical Proposal:

- Confirmation of interest – Annex VI
- Technical proposal to describe how interested consultants will address/deliver the demands of the TOR; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics, reporting conditions and quality assurance mechanisms that will be put in place, while demonstrating that the proposed methodology will be appropriate to the local conditions and context of the work and proposed tentative work plan
- Signed Curriculum vitae with contact details of at least 03 clients for whom the consultants have rendered preferably the similar service
- One or two writing samples in English.

b. Financial proposal **(with your signature)**:

- The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in **US Dollar** including consultancy fees and all associated costs i.e. airfares, travel cost, meal, accommodation, tax, insurance etc. – see format of financial offer in Annex VIII.
- 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 **US Dollar** at UN Exchange Rate at the submission deadline.

**Please note:** Any individual employed by a company or institution who would like to submit an offer in response to a Procurement Notice for IC must do so in their individual capacity, even if they expect their employers to sign an RLA with UNDP

4. Evaluation:

The technical component will be evaluated using the following criteria:

No	Criteria	Maximum Point
<b><i>Consultant(s)' experiences/qualification related to the services</i></b>		<b>700</b>
<b>1</b>	Post graduate degree in development study, environmental engineering, environmental science, chemistry, biology, biological science, or environment related fields;	150

2	-At least 10 years of working experience or technical expertise in the field of hazardous waste management, POPs waste/dioxin or environmental and chemical management;	200
	-Experience with POP/dioxin contamination nature in Vietnam is desirable, knowledge on actual dioxin hotspots and the GEF/UNDP project is a strong asset;	
	Knowledge of POPs remediation technologies and POP/dioxin technical issues is an asset	
	Knowledge about Stockholm Convention and other related international conventions will be considered as an asset	
3	-Proven experience in project management and /or evaluation of ODA projects; (at least 5 years evaluation and management experience for international supported/donor funded projects);	300
	-Proven knowledge of M&E and experience with results-based management evaluation methodology;	
	-Proven knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and its strategies is responsible for summarizing expert inputs and finalizing the report.	
	-Proven previous experience of GEF/UN evaluation assignments would be preferable	
4	Proven past experience as team leader of project evaluation assignments and working in team	50
<b>Technical proposal:</b>		<b>300</b>
5	-Understanding the objective and task of the assignment	100
	-Proven knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and its strategies	
6	Logical and visible presentation of MTE approach/methodology to carry out the task and to obtain expected results	100
7	Feasibility to implement within the project context and budget	100
<b>Total</b>		<b>1000</b>

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).

Technically qualified consultants may be selected for an interview before financial evaluation.

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%.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative analysis, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

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

## 8. 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 form
- International consultant whose work involves travel is required to complete the course on Basic Security in the Field and submit certificate to UNDP before contract issuance.

Note: The Basic Security in the Field Certificate can be obtained from website:

<https://training.dss.un.org/consultants>. 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 when the selected consultant is government official.

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (FOR BOTH INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL CONSULTANT)

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support -GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project “Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots in Viet Nam” \_PIM 3685

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots in Viet Nam			
GEF Project ID:	PIM 3685		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Award/Project ID:	00057593/00071224	GEF financing:	4.977	
Country:	Vietnam	IA/EA own:	450	
Region:	Asia & Pacific	Government :	11.000	
Focal Area:	Chemicals/POPs	Other:	20.885	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	32.336	
Executing Agency:	Office 33/MONRE	Total Project Cost:	69.648	
Other Partners involved:	MOD	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		28/06/2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: January 2014	Actual: December 2014

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to minimize the disruption of ecosystems and health risks for people from environmental releases of TCDD (Tetra-chloro dibenzo-dioxin, aka dioxin) contaminated hotspots and contribute to the national broader goal, which is to overcome the consequences of toxic chemical used in the war in Vietnam.

The project has 3 following designed outcomes:

1. Dioxin in core hotspot areas (3 military airbase in Phu Cat, Bien Hoa, Da Nang) contained and remediated,
2. Land-use on and around hotspots eliminates risks and contributes to environmental recovery, and
3. Strengthened national regulations and institutional capacities.

The Project, which began in 2010 and will be completed in Dec 2014, achieved followings key results during its implementation:

1. Completion of the containment of high contaminated soil in Phu Cat airbase to a secured landfill, which eliminates impending risk of dioxin exposure to local residents in 2011;
2. Completion of a Master plan for dioxin remediation in Bien Hoa airbase and handed it over to Ministry of Defense (MOD), who is authorized for land use planning of Bien Hoa airbase in 2013;
3. Completion of Interim civil works to prevent the spreading of dioxin contamination in Bien Hoa Airbase to outside in 2014;
4. Completion of the demonstration of a dioxin remediation technology (MCD) in Bien Hoa, which examine the feasibility of the technology to unique conditions of local dioxin contaminated soil in 2012;
5. Completion of baseline surveys to support for the establishment of proper instruments (national standard and regulation) to control dioxin emission and exposure in 2013 & 2014;
6. Undertaken communication activities in surrounding areas of Bien Hoa airbase in 2013, which focusing on 4 communes living nearby Bien Hoa airbase, to raise awareness on dioxin exposure;
7. Undertaken the dissemination of Agent Orange/dioxin information in national events, international workshops and conferences, i.e. International Dioxin Conference in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014;
8. Undertaken further field contamination surveys :
  - Detailed soil survey for known contaminated sites were conducted to delineate the extent and depth of the contamination,
  - Dioxin contamination survey extended to other suspicious sites based on the local condition,
  - Co-contamination of soil with organic arsenic has been discovered that might affect the technology selection and final outcome of treated soil.

Several on-going activities at present will contribute further results at the end of the project such as (1)a guideline for principle technical steps/procedure for dioxin/Agent Orange treatment in Vietnam, which including principle guides for technology selection, evaluation, demonstration and practical application, (2)national report on industrial dioxin emission to environment, (3)report on further technology demonstration of 3 technologies, etc.

In addition to the GEF funded project, numbers of international assistances were developed and implemented on the Agent Orange/dioxin issues. The key development partners include United States,

Czech Republic, New Zealand, etc. These projects/contributions were implemented with close communication and collaboration to maximize the effectiveness of the intervention.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The main stakeholders in the evaluation process are UNDP Country Offices and relevant ministries involved in the project (Ministries of Natural Resources and Environment, Ministry of Defense) as well as the project implementing institutions and relevant parties.

The principal objective of the evaluation is to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Taking into account that a mid-term evaluation of the project was conducted in July-August 2013, one of the main focus of the terminal evaluation is to review the project's progress from mid to final project time and to assess whether the project have addressed and duly responded to the concerns of the mid-term evaluation accepted by the management team(s).

The second main focus, as a terminal evaluation is to take a final, technical and independent look at the project and its results, provide ratings in accordance with the guidelines, and provide recommendations for the project closure on ensuring sustainability and on the replication approach of the project (through a summary of what elements in the project could be replicated and shared with other countries and/or what products/lessons can be scaled-up due to their applicability and usefulness to other entities).

The results of the final/terminal evaluation will primarily be used by:

1. the UNDP CO and national project teams in addressing any final steps in securing sustainability of the project and a smooth transition for handover of the project-implemented expertise and knowledge to the national counterparts;
2. the national counterparts, to ensure that the facilities developed continue to contribute to the national goal, which is to overcome the consequences of toxic chemical used in the war in Vietnam upon completion of the project in December 2014;
3. the UNDP Montreal Protocol Unit, national & regional UNDP offices in dissemination of lessons learned from the project to other projects in the organizations related to POP/chemicals management and treatment under the Stockholm Convention.

The scope of evaluation includes 3 principal components:

- An analysis of the attainment of national environment objectives, outcomes, impacts, project objectives and delivery and completion of project outputs (based on indicators); and to what extent the overall global project has achieved;
- An evaluation of project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria:
  - Implementation approach;
  - Country ownership/driven;
  - Stakeholder participation/Public involvement;

- Sustainability;
- Replication approach;
- Financial planning;
- Cost-effectiveness;
- Monitoring and evaluation.

## **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**

---

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported -GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is required to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C). The evaluator is required to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of a draft evaluation report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluator shall consult with UNDP CO in the development of the methodology and evaluation approach. The methodology that will be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include detailed information on:

- Documentation review;
- Interview with related stakeholders;
- Field visits (if any);
- Questionnaires; and
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is required to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal points, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The assessment of progress and sustainability issues also need to be looked at least 2 hotspots (among 3 hotspot) of the project and field visit may be required and travel arrangement/cost for field visits will be made/covered separately by the project.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Project Report (APR) /Project Implementation Report (PIR), project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163



## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the revised Project Logical Framework/Results Framework of inception report (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
In-kind support								
Other								
Totals								

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was

successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

---

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Vietnam. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators (a team of 1 international and 1 national). The Project Team (PMU) will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, field visit arrangement (if any), coordinate with the Government etc.

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the above-mentioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

---

The number of working days estimated for the evaluation task is 25-30 days for each consultant according to the following tentative plan:

Activity	Timing
<b>Preparation</b> ( <i>including desk review, interview question and questionnaire if any</i> )	5-10 days
<b>Evaluation Mission + Debriefings</b>	7-10 days in Vietnam (depend on requirement of field visit)
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	5 days
<b>Final Report</b>	5 days

The exact number of working days should be proposed in the proposed tentative work plan attached to the Technical proposal.

---

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

The assignment is expected to be taken during **Sept-Oct 2014**. Submission of first draft report is expected in **Oct 15, 2014** tentatively.

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is required to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Indicative Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Work plan (or Inception Report)</b>	Evaluators provide clarifications on timing and method	-The tentative work plan submitted as a part of application -The final work plan submitted in 2 weeks after contract signing	Evaluators submit application to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation at debriefing</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission in Hanoi	To UNDP CO and PMU
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to UNDP, PMU and reviewed by RTA
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 -2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO, PMU and RTA for uploading.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluators are required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

A team of one independent international and one national experts will conduct the final/terminal evaluation. Experts should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict or interest with project related activities.

The International Consultant plays the role of a **Team Leader**, which has overall responsibility for the work and operation of the evaluation team, including the coordination of inputs from national team member. The Team Leader is responsible and overall accountable for the production of the agreed outputs. The specific duty of the international expert is described as below:

- Desk review of existing project plans, survey/ research/ evaluation reports and databases.
- Conduct fieldwork together with the national counterpart and interview stakeholders, and communities (if necessary) to generate authentic information and opinions.
- Write and compile the information and reports as needed.
- Make a presentation of key findings highlighting achievements, constraints, and make practical recommendations.
- Draft and finalize the Evaluation Report

The Local Consultant plays the role of **Team Member**, which assist and collaborate with the Team Leader in all the tasks mentioned above including fieldwork, mission schedule/logistic arrangement in

cooperation with PMU, desk-based translation, etc and assist with interpretation in meetings/discussions during the field mission. The national consultant will be mobilized several days before the Team Leader in an effort to collect data related to the project beforehand. Specific tasks as following:

- Desk review of project materials and databases in national language (Vietnamese) and process data from this documentation necessary for the purposes of the evaluation;
- Fieldwork participation together with international consultant and national counterpart. Carry out stakeholders interview and do interpretation work (if necessary)
- Write brief notes, or certain parts of the evaluation report as agreed with the Team Leader.
- Provide inputs either by written or verbally through discussions to international consultants for consolidating a presentation of key findings highlighting achievements, constraints at debriefing
- Contribute to draft and final Evaluation Report

**The Team Leader and Team Member must present the following qualifications:**

For Team Leader:

**International Consultant (Team Leader)** should have the following competencies and qualifications:

- Post graduate degree in development study, environmental engineering, environmental science, chemistry, biology, biological science, or environment related fields;
- At least 10 years of working experience or technical expertise in the field of hazardous waste management, POPs waste/dioxin or environmental and chemical management;
- Experience with POP/dioxin contamination nature in Vietnam is desirable, knowledge on actual dioxin hotspots is strong asset;
- Knowledge of POP waste remediation technology, POPs/dioxin technical issues and/or knowledge of Stockholm Convention and other related international conventions will be considered as an asset;
- Experience in project management and /or evaluation of ODA projects;
- Proven knowledge of UNDP/GEF policies and strategies and is responsible for summarizing expert inputs and finalizing the report. Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, especially proven previous experience GEF/UNDP monitoring and evaluation policy and approaches would be preferable;
- Strong conceptual thinking and analytical skill;
- Experience as team leader of project evaluations;
- Proven proficiency in the English language, especially competent in technical English writing (through writing sample and tentative work plan provided for assessment).

For Team Member

**National Consultant** should have following competencies and qualifications:

- Post graduate degree in development study, environmental engineering, environmental science, chemistry, biology, biological science, or environment related fields;

- At least 5 years experience in project implementation, management and evaluation or consultancy works for donor-funded development projects in Vietnam;
- Proven experience in the areas of environmental and chemical management. Certain knowledge or familiarity with POPs/dioxin issue or hazardous waste management will be an asset;
- Knowledge of M&E and evaluation methodology or previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies. Proven past experience in conducting evaluations GEF/UNDP projects, especially environment-related projects, will be an advantage;
- Proficient English writing and communication skills, with an ability to act as translator for international counterpart and to translate written documents from/ to Vietnamese are essential (*writing sample must be provided for assessment*);
- Proven team work experience through past assignments.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

Payment, inclusive of international travel costs (transportation and DSA), if any, will be affected accordingly to the milestones indicated below:

%	Milestone
20%	Final work plan agreed by UNDP CO in 2 weeks after contract signing
50%	Following submission of the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft terminal evaluation report with agreement of UNDP CO
30%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

*Note: Domestic travel during field mission (if any) will be arranged and provided separately by PMU*

Satisfactory Certification for Payment by the Team Leader will be required before payment is made to team member.

Two separate Individual contracts will be issued to each consultant

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
Goal: To overcome the consequences of toxic chemicals used in the war in Viet Nam					
Objective: To minimise disruption of ecosystems and health risks for people from environmental releases of TCDD (Dioxin) contaminated hotspots	· (1) Estimated volume of dioxin in hotspots that could potentially be released to the environment	· At least 1,736 g I-TEQ identified in 3 hot spot sites. · Landfill Z1 area at Bien Hoa completed (approx. 500 g I-TEQ contained).	· Amount of dioxin with potential release to the environment is negligible as the result of proper treatment (containment, destruction, extraction and isolation) of at least 1,700 g I-TEQ of dioxins (2013)	· Progress reports; on-site monitoring	· Future remediation activities achieve appropriate risk and land use based cleanup standards
	· (2) Percentage of people in local communities who know government actions to address dioxin issues in hotspots	· 44% of local people in or near areas affected by dioxin do not know any agency undertaking the treatment activities at hotspots and their surroundings.	· Significant percentage improvement of surveyed population can at least name one specific action by the Government to address dioxin issues in hotspots (2013)	· Field surveys/interviews	
-					
Outcome 1: Dioxin in core hotspot areas contained and remediated	· (1) Volume of contaminated soil and sediment properly treated by selected technologies at Phu Cat, Bien Hoa and Da Nang	· At Bien Hoa: at least 195,500 m3 has been identified for dioxin contamination of which 94,000 m3 has been securely contained in a landfill, 41,500 m3 remains to be contained in three previously identified areas and at least 40,000 m3 in a newly identified area requires isolation and future containment. · At Phu Cat at least 7,000 m3 has been identified for dioxin contamination and immediate containment including that in previously identified areas and in	· All pre-identified sub-sites in Phu Cat and Bien Hoa (29,000 m3 of contaminated soil and sediment under latest estimate) will be securely contained (2013) · Newly identified contaminated sub-sites (additional 60,000 m3 under latest estimation) will have exposure reduction measures taken at Phu Cat and Bien Hoa (2013) · All identified sub-sites (61,600 m3 under latest	· Project reports; On-site monitoring	· Office 33 effectively coordinates GEF funded activities with MOD and relations with bi-lateral donors. · Commitment of MOD to host and provide land owner/client support at the hotspot sites remains firm. · Operation of containment and site monitoring is sustained by the GVN. · Availability of international and/or GVN financing to proceed with remediation following containment at Bien

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
		a newly identified area. · At Da Nang: at least 61,600 m3 has been identified for dioxin contamination.	estimation) will be remediated at Da Nang to concentrations less than 1,000ppt and sediment at concentrations less than 150ppt (2013)		Hoa and Phu Cat.
	· (2) Number of demonstration of remediation technologies implemented successfully	· Pilot scale testing of bioremediation technology initiated in Bien Hoa and small scale research conducted in Da Nang by VAST. · Potential remediation/destruction technologies short listed for on-site demonstration. · No destruction technology tested in pilot scale.	· At least two remediation technology is demonstrated successfully at either Phu Cat or Bien Hoa (2013)	· Evaluation reports on demonstrated remediation technology	· GVN/MOD defines requirements respecting transfer/acquisition of remediation technology.
Outputs for Outcome 1:					
1.1. Containment/remediation targets and remediation action plans for each hotspot completed.	Number of action plans approved by 2012	· GEF Project work plan developed and agreed during the Inception Phase for Bien Hoa and Phu Cat containment. · Remediation technology selection, EA, and preliminary technical design completed for Da Nang Airbase. · Remediation action/clean up standard/targets established.	· Action plans with detailed design, EIA including contracting arrangement for 3 hotspots approved by MONRE and MOD (2012)	· Progress reports; approved action plan; EIA report	· Key stakeholders endorse and support the selected technologies. · Selection and application of containment and remediation technology meets specified environmental performance standards in a cost effective manner.
1.2. Government personnel trained in selected containment and remediation technologies.	· Number of government personnel trained	· No training except in landfill construction. · Remediation technology workshops.	· At least 50 personnel trained (2013)	· Progress reports; training reports	· Personnel turnover does not negate benefits of training. · USAID-funded Da Nang project provides remediation trainings.
1.3. Spatial delineation of heavily contaminated	· Completed spatial delineation of	· Spatial delineation uncertain in some areas at SW runway in	· Additional samples collected and analyzed at Phu Cat and	· Progress reports; laboratory report;	· All contaminated sub-sites (areas) accurately identified and

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
areas, based on supplementary sample analysis including newly identified areas at Phu Cat and Bien Hoa	contaminated areas at each hot spot	<p>Bien Hoa and storage area in Phu Cat including newly identified areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contamination delineation generally defined for Z1, drains/wetlands and south runway in Bien Hoa and Z3 in Phu Cat.</li> <li>Spatial delineation at Da Nang now defined for design and remediation purposes.</li> </ul>	Bien Hoa sufficient to support delineation of contaminated areas, (2011)	maps; dioxin database	captured.
1.4. Pilot scale demonstration of remediation technology for potential use at Bien Hoa and/or Phu Cat.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Completion of thermal/ mechano-chemical remediation demonstration at hot spots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selection of ISTD/ISPD technology for Da Nang by USAID and completing GVN approvals.</li> <li>Technology for remediation demonstration at Bien Hoa or Phu Cat short list finalized with two top priority technologies including ball milling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot technology demonstration undertaken and evaluated on one short listed remediation technology at either Bien Hoa or Phu Cat (2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports; remediation demonstration evaluation report; external evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient co-financing from vendors and donors is identified to support/sustain remediation technology demonstrations.</li> <li>Evaluation of on-going bioremediation results at Bien Hoa.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(2) Completion of Bioremediation demonstration at hot spots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bioremediation pilot test cell on 3,000 m3 by VAST established at Bien Hoa.</li> <li>Laboratory-scale bioremediation research is undertaken in Da Nang.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot bioremediation demonstration undertaken and evaluated at either Bien Hoa or Phu Cat (2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports; remediation demonstration evaluation report; external evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuation of bioremediation pilot work is supported.</li> </ul>
1.5. Full containment and/or isolation completed at Phu Cat and Bien Hoa and funding for full scale remediation identified while coordination mechanism functioning at Da Nang based USAID financing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Percentage of pre-identified contaminated soil contained or remediated in all 3 hotspots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financing assurance in the form of a MOU of US\$16.9 million committed by USAID with assurance that a total of US\$41 million will be available for remediation at Da Nang.</li> <li>No financing yet identified for remediation at Bien Hoa and Phu Cat.</li> <li>Containment of 94,000 m3 in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% of pre-identified contaminated soil and sediment that exceed Vietnamese standard either contained or remediated (2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports; external evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>USAID will secure sufficient funding to complete Da Nang as proposed (by 2013).</li> <li>GVN will backstop any additional costs and streamline its approval process to complete containment as proposed (by 2013).</li> </ul>



Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
		a secure landfill for future remediation at Bien Hoa. · Hydraulic isolation of previously identified areas at all sites.			
	· (2) Percentage of newly identified contaminated soil contained or remediated in all 3 hotspots	· Spatial delineation uncertain in some areas at Bien Hoa and Phu Cat including newly identified areas.	· 100% of newly identified contamination hydraulically isolated, contained or remediated (2013)	· Progress reports	
1.6. Monitoring systems operational at all hot spots to ensure performance measurement against containment and remediation goals as applicable.	· Long-term monitoring plan and enabling environment of the institution in charge of the monitoring	· Rudimentary monitoring in place at all hot spots including containment to date (Bien Hoa) and isolation works. · Initial financial commitment to design/training/initial operation for funding from the Czech Republic.	· Site specific detailed long term monitoring plans are completed following the design and EIA processes for each site and implemented upon completion of containment and/or remediation works in Da Nang (2011), Phu Cat (2011), Bien Hoa (2012)	· Progress reports; monitoring plan/design documents; operational monitoring reports	· Monitoring design, equipment supply and training included in the scope of the USAID financed project at Da Nang. · GVN (MOD, MONRE) undertake to sustain monitoring operation in the long term. · Realization of Czech funding.
<u>Outcome 2:</u> Land use on and around hotspots eliminates risks and contributes to environmental recovery	· (1) Percentage area of land where after excavation, containment and/or remediation appropriate land use is introduced based on the level of residual contamination.	· Only measures are prohibition on some land uses, e.g., fishing and cultivation, provision of barriers on contaminated areas, and informal restrictions on any new development on them	· Appropriate land uses have been introduced to 70% of land area in land use plan (2013)	· Progress reports	· Office 33 effectively coordinates GEF funded activities with MOD and relations with bi-lateral donors. · Cooperation between MOD and local authorities remains positive. · Macro-economic trends do not undermine local economic development initiatives.
	· (2) Percentage of stakeholders and local communities on and around contaminated sites	· No baseline data available.	· Majority of stakeholder population in surrounding communities expresses support to the land use plan (2013)	· Surveys and interviews.	

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
	that support proposed land use plan				
Outputs for Outcome 2:					
2.1. Overall land use plan (including zoning) and an action plan for environmental recovery in each of the affected areas, based on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) recommendations completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal approved land use plans for each hotspot and adjacent areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conceptual land use plans for all sites.</li> <li>Future investment/land use plan/conceptual clean up design scope drafted by MOD.</li> <li>No formal EIA work linked to land use planning undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use plans for each site completed for Phu Cat (2012), Da Nang (2012) and for Bien Hoa (2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project report; land use plan; EIA reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land uses are appropriate to substantially eliminate health risks.</li> <li>MOD willing to address potentially land within and outside airbases in coordinated fashion.</li> </ul>
2.2. Environmental recovery action plans and other land use measures in and around each of the three hotspots implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of pilot scale post-treatment redevelopment and appropriate land use at sub-sites in line with site specific land use plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited activities only at Bien Hoa.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one sub-site activities completed and more prepared in association with secured external funding during the life of the project (2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GVN funding of off-site recovery measures as required.</li> <li>Remediation measures proceed in a timely manner.</li> <li>Demand for access to potentially contaminated land is constrained until containment and/or remediation is completed.</li> </ul>
2.3. Public environmental awareness /information and education programs implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of local residents having dioxin related knowledge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.4% do not know about dioxin; 38% receive information through multiple sources.</li> <li>Substantive publications of information on the dioxin issue by Office 33.</li> <li>Initial financial commitment to site specific public awareness for funding from the Czech Republic.</li> <li>General public awareness initiatives undertaken locally.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The percentage of local adult surrounding hotspots who do not know about dioxin is negligible, while the percentage who receive information from multiple sources is over 60% (2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surveys/interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No major immigration of new residents which could distort results.</li> </ul>

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
Outcome 3: National regulations and institutional capacities strengthened	· (1) Percentage of relevant government officials at national and provincial levels who acquired basic knowledge on dioxin issues	· 38% of officials in relevant government agencies have not received training or awareness raising on dioxin, while 29% do not have access to information on policies and laws related to dioxin	· Majority of officials in relevant government agencies have received training or awareness raising on dioxin and officials who are unable to access information on policies and laws related to dioxin are negligible (2013)	· Surveys/interviews	· Office 33 remains well-staffed and develops cooperative arrangement with other stakeholders, particularly MOD for effectively dealing with international funding opportunities.
	· (2) Percentage of local communities who know national/provincial agencies responsible for dioxin issues	· Over 50% of respondents are unable to name agencies responsible for management of contaminated areas	· Most respondents are able to name agencies responsible for management of contaminated areas (2013)	· Surveys/interviews	
Outputs for Outcome 3:					
3.1. National regulatory standards for maximum permissible dioxin discharges and contamination into/of soil, water and air and or human dioxin TDI applicable to general population and vulnerable populations developed and adopted.	· National standards adopted for soil, water, air and human receptors	· Provisional standards based on international norms in place for soil, sediment, water and air for application to hot spot remediation	· National standards be in place consistent with international practice for soil, water, air and human receptors (2012)	· Project reports; Government regulatory promulgation documents	· Office 33 assigns a priority to proactive institutional dissemination of the results at both national and local levels.
3.2. Capacities of Office 33 for coordination, fund mobilisation, dioxin contaminated site identification/inventories, dioxin data base	· (1) Number of regular publications from Office 33 covering wide range of dioxin issues	· Office 33 is publishing 'Toxicology Magazine' ISSN1859-1140. · Office 33 is regularly updating web site <a href="http://www.office33.gov.vn">www.office33.gov.vn</a>	· At least one newsletter on dioxin published regularly (2013)	· Progress report	· Personnel turnover does not negate impacts of dissemination.
	· (2) International	· Initial coordination of USAID	· US funding of Da Nang	· Reports by Office 33	· Willingness exists to commit

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
operation, and experience sharing at all levels including international cooperation strengthened.	and national funds for remediation leveraged in addition to baseline	EA and technology proposal.	remediation secured (2011) · At least 2 bilateral/multilateral donor commits additional resources for AO/Dioxin issues (2012) · Amount of required funding for completion of remediation against international standards identified (2013)	· Funding commitment documentation for future remediation	funding from remediation funding from national and international organizations.
	· (3) Operational centralized data base and inventory of AO related dioxin contamination	· Inception phase consolidated data base report and system design	· National dioxin data base system operational in Office 33 (2011) · National dioxin contaminated site inventory updated (2013)	· Activity reports; database	
3.3. Institutional and individual capacities for site investigation, risk assessment, contaminated site land use planning and monitoring, and planning and management of cost-effective remediation strengthened.	· (1) Establishment/full operation of international-standard high resolution dioxin/POPs laboratory	· One laboratory (VRTC) able to conduct low resolution dioxin analyses. · New international standard laboratory within MONRE established and equipped but not certified or with fully trained staff. · Substantial local expertise base on dioxin contaminated site identification/inventories, dioxin data base operation and remediation technology that can serve as a trainer base.	· A new laboratory under the auspices of MONRE undertakes state-of-the-art analysis of dioxin contamination and is used by national and international clients (2013)	· Progress reports	· Roles and responsibilities of VRTC and VEA Dioxin laboratory clearly determined. · Capacity development activities address actual capacity needs.
	· (2) Number of people received various types of trainings	· Some government officials have basic knowledge on dioxin.	· At least 100 officers are trained (2013)	· Progress report	
3.4. A communication strategy vis-à-vis national and international industries, consumers and	· (1) Number of domestic communication events	· Informal communication activities undertaken by Office 33	· 30 domestic communication campaigns and events (2013)	· Progress Reports; event reports	· Mass media do not practice negative campaign against the project.

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
others implemented.	· (2) Number of reports produced for international dissemination	· Basic reports on the dioxin issue issued	· Several thematic reports and fact sheets produced for international dissemination (2013)	· Progress reports and publications	· Office 33 assigns a priority to proactive institutional dissemination of project information, results and lessons-learned at both national and local levels.
<u>Outcome 4:</u> Project management, monitoring and evaluation done in accordance to agreed rules	· Percentage of deviation between approved budget and expenditure	· NA	· At least 80% of approved work plan budget disbursed (2013)	· Annual progress reports	· Project issues escalated to higher authority addressed in timely manner.
Outputs for Outcome 4:					
4.1. Programme management and implementation	· Percentage of periodical reports received/prepared on time	· NA	· More than 80% of periodical reports are developed on time (2011, 2012, 2013)	· Progress reports	· Any gaps and shortcoming of HPPMG properly and timely addressed in collaboration with UNDP CO.
4.2. Programme monitoring and evaluation undertaken according to guidelines	· Percentage of audit management responses addressed	· NA	· At least 90% of auditor's recommendation addressed in management responses (2011, 2012, 2013)	· Audit reports	· Rules, procedures and reporting requirements to GEF remain unchanged.

## ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

Document	Description	Note
Project document	-Signed UNDP Prodoc -Project identification form (PIF) -CEO endorsement document	-Attached to the TOR
Project reports	-Inception report -Mid-term evaluation report	-Attached to the TOR
Work plans & Budget	-Annual PIRs reports -Project tracking tool -Quarterly work plans & report -Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs	-will be provided after contract signing and during field mission
Minutes	-Technical discussion minutes with experts, team staff etc. -Technical Conferences /workshops/meetings	-will be provided after contract signing and during field mission
Other relevant materials	-As identified during the document review, including relevant legislation and policy documents -Partners and stakeholders 's agreements during project implementation where appropriate to the evaluation	-will be provided after contract signing and during field mission
Communication materials /reports produced by the project activities	-Communication campaign , leaflets, guidebooks, brochures, Press release, reports, films/documentaries, etc -Communication evaluation report -Project impact report -Further technology demonstration report -Draft technical guideline for technology selection and demonstration -National report on dioxin emission of industries and its existence in environment -Any other relevant documents on the project website	-will be provided after contract signing and during field mission
UNDP/GEF documents	-As relevant and requested by the evaluation team	-will be provided after contract signing and during field mission

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed once the contract is signed.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## **SUSGETED DETAIL QUESTIONS (NOT AN OBLIGATION TO APPLY ALL)**

---

### **1) Review of the project design, planning and implementation**

- Do the project problems to be solved still stand, project responses strategies and project adaptive management measures remain relevant to national priorities and GEF strategies, considering possible changes in context?
- Are the project specific outputs and their corresponding indicators as defined in the project logical framework and design and its modification in the inception report and mid-term evaluation still relevant in the light of the project experience?
- How is level of coherence an inter-link between and amongst project outcomes in terms of supporting each other towards achievement of the project objectives?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement/non-achievement of the project objectives/results?
- Whether the designed institutional arrangement for the dioxin remediation Project has been performing effectively during the project implementation and allocated responsibilities among key stakeholders were relevant;
- How the subjects fit into the partner Government's strategies and priorities; international and country development goals and priorities; and UNDP global, regional or country programmes as appropriate.

### **2) Review of project performance**

- To what extent the project objectives have been met, taking into consideration the "achievement indicators" specified in the project document/inception report and logical framework
- To what extent have project results (outcomes and outputs) been achieved? And how have they been achieved in terms of inputs, timeliness, and cost-effectiveness?
- Do the outcomes/outputs complement and enhance one another, and if yes, to what extent?
- What are factors that have facilitated or deterred the achievement of project objectives;
- How effective is the project monitoring and evaluation process to ensure the relevance and effectiveness of the activities and expected results in relation to TORs (RFP) issues, different level of work plans (AWPs and QWPs), and the required outputs?
- How has APR/PIR process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?
- Does the project take into consideration the likely risks in preparing AWP and QWP with the aim of mitigating negative impacts that could result from unexpected situation or change in the project environment?
- Is the project management arrangement appropriate to the extent of management functions, processes and procedure, in accordance with the staff capacity and reasonable workload?
- Is the project organization chart efficient for conducting and managing the whole project on the technical and administrative perspective?
- Financial accountability – extent to which the financial management has been an integral part of achieving project results, with particular reference to adequate reporting, identification of problems and adjustment of activities, budgets and inputs; and
- What is level of co-financing mobilized to the project?

### **3) Project impact**

- To determine short-term and long-term impacts of the project, including efficiency of the project and cost-effectiveness of the project on dioxin hotspot remediation in Vietnam; land-use plan to eliminate risks and contribute to environmental recovery; strengthened national regulations and institutional capacities.



- Has the project management strategy exploited all opportunities for strengthening collaboration and substantive partnerships with other government bodies, institutes, different associations, other donors, financial sectors with aim to maximizing achievement of projects' immediate results, and extending the project impacts in the long run beyond the end of the project timeframe?
- To determine how the intervention seeks to mainstream gender in development efforts.
- To determine synergies with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.

#### **4) Risk to sustainability of project outcomes**

- Risks and assumptions that likely affect the persistence of the project outcomes, including financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks.
- How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the government?
- Availability of financial and economic mechanism to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits after the assistance ends;
- Policy and regulatory framework that will support continuation of benefits;
- Level of commitment from the government to ensure sustainability of the results achieved? and
- How to secure changes observed in the improvement of the situation?

#### **5) Monitoring and evaluation systems**

- Soundness of M&E plan/design to monitor results and track progress toward achieving the objectives;
- How the M&E system was in place timely to track the progress by collecting information on chosen indicators continually;
- Completeness and accuracy of project reports;
- Effectiveness of feed-back management reflecting M&E findings;
- Appropriate financial and time allocation for conducting M&E activities;

#### **6) Recommendations and lessons learned**

- Success stories, replicability;
- Country ownership and drivenness, stakeholder involvement, project steering and decision-making system, financial control including co-financing;
- Long-term monitoring of project impacts;
- Follow-on action recommendations.

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks  2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

More detail requirements for the evaluation are presented in the GEF “Guidelines for Terminal Evaluations” which is posted on the following website: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Policies-TEguidelines7-31.pdf>

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

---

### Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</sup>

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>5</sup>)
1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>6</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance(\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## **ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP CO

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Annex VI

**OFFEROR'S LETTER TO UNDP  
CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY  
FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT**

Date \_\_\_\_\_

*(Name of Resident Representative/Bureau Director)*

United Nations Development Programme

*(Specify complete office address)*

Dear Sir/Madam :

I hereby declare that:

- a) I have read, understood and hereby accept the Terms of Reference describing the duties and responsibilities of [*indicate title of assignment*] under the [*state project title*];
- b) I have also read, understood and hereby accept UNDP's General Conditions of Contract for the Services of the Individual Contractors;
- c) I hereby propose my services and I confirm my interest in performing the assignment through the submission of my CV or Personal History Form (P11) which I have duly signed and attached hereto as Annex 1;
- d) In compliance with the requirements of the Terms of Reference, I hereby confirm that I am available for the entire duration of the assignment, and I shall perform the services in the manner described in my proposed approach/methodology which I have attached hereto as Annex 3 [*delete this item if the TOR does not require submission of this document*];
- e) I hereby propose to complete the services based on the following payment rate : [*pls. check the box corresponding to the preferred option*]:
  - ☐ An all-inclusive daily fee of [*state amount in words and in numbers indicating currency*]
  - ☐ A total lump sum of [*state amount in words and in numbers, indicating exact currency*], payable in the manner described in the Terms of Reference.
- f) For your evaluation, the breakdown of the abovementioned all-inclusive amount is attached hereto as Annex 2;

- g) I recognize that the payment of the abovementioned amounts due to me shall be based on my delivery of outputs within the timeframe specified in the TOR, which shall be subject to UNDP's review, acceptance and payment certification procedures;
- h) This offer shall remain valid for a total period of \_\_\_\_\_ days [*minimum of 90 days*] after the submission deadline;
- i) I confirm that I have no first degree relative (mother, father, son, daughter, spouse/partner, brother or sister) currently employed with any UN agency or office [*disclose the name of the relative, the UN office employing the relative, and the relationship if, any such relationship exists*];
- j) If I am selected for this assignment, I shall [*pls. check the appropriate box*]:

☐

Sign an Individual Contract with UNDP;

☐

Request my employer [*state name of company/organization/institution*] to sign with UNDP a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), for and on my behalf. The contact person and details of my employer for this purpose are as follows:

\_\_\_\_\_

- k) I hereby confirm that [*check all that applies*]:

☐

At the time of this submission, I have no active Individual Contract or any form of engagement with any Business Unit of UNDP;

☐

I am currently engaged with UNDP and/or other entities for the following work :

Assignment	Contract Type	UNDP Business Unit / Name of Institution/Company	Contract Duration	Contract Amount

☐

I am also anticipating conclusion of the following work from UNDP and/or other entities for which I have submitted a proposal :

Assignment	Contract Type	Name of Institution/ Company	Contract Duration	Contract Amount

- l) I fully understand and recognize that UNDP is not bound to accept this proposal, and I also understand and accept that I shall bear all costs associated with its preparation and submission



and that UNDP will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the selection process.

- m) **If you are a former staff member of the United Nations recently separated, pls. add this section to your letter:** I hereby confirm that I have complied with the minimum break in service required before I can be eligible for an Individual Contract.
- n) I also fully understand that, if I am engaged as an Individual Contractor, I have no expectations nor entitlements whatsoever to be re-instated or re-employed as a staff member.

Full Name and Signature:

Date Signed :

---

---

**Annexes***[pls. check all that applies]:*

- ☐ CV or Duly signed P11 Form
- ☐ Breakdown of Costs Supporting the Final All-Inclusive Price as per Template
- ☐ Brief Description of Approach to Work (if required by the TOR)

## **Annex VII**

### **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 VIII

### FINANCIAL OFFER

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

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

#### Cost breakdown:

No.	Description	Number of days	Rate (USD)	Total
1	Remuneration			
1.1	Services in Home office			
1.2	Services in field			
2	Out of pocket expenses			
2.1	Travel cost			
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). *			
2.4	Others (pls. specify).....			
	<b>TOTAL</b>			

*\* 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