



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Date: 25 September 2015

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

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

Country:	Viet Nam
Description of the assignment:	01 international and 01 national consultant for Terminal Evaluation of NBSAP Project 80525
Project name:	NBSAP project 00080525
Period of assignment/services (if applicable):	October – December 2015

1. Submissions should be sent by email to: nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org no later than: **9 October 2015 (Hanoi time)**.

With subject line: 01 international consultant for terminal evaluation of NBSAP Project 80525
or
01 national consultant for terminal evaluation of NBSAP Project 80525

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

Note:

- Any individual employed by a company or institution who would like to submit an offer in response to this Procurement Notice must do so in their individual capacity, even if they expect their employers to sign a contract with UNDP.
- Maximum size per email is **7 MB**.
- Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. Procurement Unit – UNDP Viet Nam will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

2. Please find attached the relevant documents:

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

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

a. Technical component:

- Signed Curriculum vitae
- Copy of 1-3 publications/writing samples on relevant subject.
- Reference contacts of past 4 clients for whom you have rendered preferably the similar service

b. Financial proposal (with your signature):

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

4. Evaluation:

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

Consultant's experiences/qualification related to the services		
	Criteria	Maximum Points
1	Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience	200
2	Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of biodiversity conservation, NBSAP, land-use planning	250
3	Experience in environmental/biodiversity strategic/land use planning	200
4	Previous experience with results- based monitoring and evaluation methodologies	150
5	Knowledge of UNDP and GEF	200
	TOTAL	1000

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

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

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

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

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

Interview with the candidates may be held if deemed necessary.

5. Contract

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

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

Documents required before contract signing:

- Personal History
- 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 training course takes around 3-4 hours to complete. The certificate is valid for 3 years.

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

6. Payment

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

1st payment: 10% of total contract value will be paid upon submission and approval of inception report

2nd payment: 40% of total contract value will be paid upon submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report

3rd and final payment: 50% of total contract value will be paid upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report.

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

7. Your proposals are received on the basis that you fully understand and accept these terms and conditions.
8. Notification of selection result: UNDP will contact only successful bidder for contracting.

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

01 International consultant and 01 national consultant for Terminal Evaluation of NBSAP Project 80525

1. 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 “Developing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Provincial Planning”* (PIMS #.4811)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<i>Developing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Provincial Planning</i>			
GEF Project ID:	00063449		<i>at endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00080525	GEF financing:	909,091	909,091
Country:	Vietnam	IA/EA own:	300,000	300,000
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	Government:	200,000	(TBC)
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	-	-
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	4,300,000	(TBC)
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)	Total Project Cost:	5,459,091	(TBC)
Other Partners involved:	Son La and Lang Son DONRES	Pro Doc Signature (date project began):		August, 2012
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: August, 2015	Actual: August, 2015

2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: support Viet Nam's international obligations as a signatory to the CBD, and its national priorities for enhancing improved environmental management and biodiversity conservation for sustainable development. It has two components, under which specific outcomes and outputs are expected:

- **Component 1:** New NBSAP and 5th National Report prepared in compliance with Biodiversity Law and CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020.
- **Component 2:** Provincial commitment and capacity strengthened to implement NBSAP.

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 objectives of the evaluation are 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.

2.1. Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected 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 expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Hanoi, Lang Son and Son La. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- NBSAP Project Management Board
- Biodiversity Conservation Agency
- Vietnam Environment Administration
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)
- Son La DONRE
- Lang Son DONRE
- General Directorate of Land Administration (GDLA) : Land Planning Agency and Land Registration and Inventory Agency

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, 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.

2.2. Evaluation criteria & ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (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.

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

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

2.3. Project finance / co-finance

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	300,000	300,000	200,000	(TBC)	4,050,000	(TBC)	4,550,00	(TBC)
Loans/Concessions	-		-		-		-	-
• In-kind support								-
• Other	-		-		-		-	
Totals	300,000	300,000	200,000		4.050.000	(TBC)		(TBC)

2.4. 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.

2.5. 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.²

2.6. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

3. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Viet Nam. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

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

The total duration of the evaluation will be over a time period of 10 weeks (**30 day for International Consultant and 27 for National Consultant**) according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing		Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	3 days	20 October, 2015
Evaluation Mission	10 days	10 days	9 November, 2015
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	8 days	30 November, 2015
Final Report	7 days	6 days	14 December, 2015

Travel: The International and National Consultants are required to travel to the following city/provinces: 3 days in Hanoi, 3 days in Lang Son Province, 4 days in Son La Province.

The consultants must include the travel costs and per diem in his/her financial proposal.

5. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission.	To project management, UNDP CO

²A 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](#)

Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission.	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft.	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

6. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of **01 international consultant (team leader) for 30 days** and **01 national consultant for 27 days**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of biodiversity conservation, NBSAP, land-use planning
- Experience in environmental/biodiversity strategic/land use planning
- Experience with the IUCN Red List and plant and animal taxonomy in Viet Nam desired

7. 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'](#)

8. PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

The consultants will report to responsible staff of UNDP & MONRE.

9. ADMIN SUPPORT

The project will help with logistic arrangements for field trips including transportation, hotel booking, organizing meetings with concerned parties at the provinces.

UNDP can help with visa application if required by the international consultant.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Amount	Milestone
<i>10% of contract value</i>	At submission and approval of inception report
<i>40% of contract value</i>	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
<i>50% of contract value</i>	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Hierarchy of Objectives/Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	End of project target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective: Strengthen biodiversity conservation in Viet Nam by increasing the supply of policy relevant, actionable information through preparation of a revised NBSAP that complies with CBD guidelines and Biodiversity Law; and by increasing the demand for this information by building provincial level capacity to integrate NBSAP results into land use plans.					

Hierarchy of Objectives/Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	End of project target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective: Strengthen biodiversity conservation in Viet Nam by increasing the supply of policy relevant, actionable information through preparation of a revised NBSAP that complies with CBD guidelines and Biodiversity Law; and by increasing the demand for this information by building provincial level capacity to integrate NBSAP results into land use plans.					
Outcomes 1.1-1.2: NBSAP and 5 th National Report to CBD prepared in compliance with Biodiversity Law and CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020.	NBSAP with clear implementation plan	NBSAP prepared in 1995 , with an addendum in 2007 is out of date and do not reflect changes in national and international context, such as new CBD guidelines and 2008 Biodiversity Law.	New 10-year NBSAP with clear institutional design and financing plan approved by government by 12/2012 and thereafter submitted to the CBD. To include: Prioritizing biodiversity through economic valuation of goods and services. Restoring and safeguarding ecosystems that provide essential services. Assessment of protected area design and management effectiveness. Conservation status of selected species (re)assessed based on international criteria, e.g., Red List. Assessment of rules and procedures for species reintroductions. plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation. Technology needs assessment communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP. plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation assessment of opportunities of mainstreaming into selected sectoral plans such as development, poverty reduction and climate change plans through sectoral consultations Clearing House mechanism	New NBSAP.	Key national stakeholders and NGOs share essential data and information, and actively participate in NBSAP development process.
	National reports on biodiversity status, trends, causes and consequences; and actions.	1 st to 4 th National Reports submitted to CBD.	5 th National Report submitted to CBD by 2014.	5 th National Report.	Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation. International organizations and NGOs actively support government in building capacity for biodiversity conservation.
		Annual SOE reports to national assembly do not contain up-to-date data on biodiversity status and trends.	By 2014, at least two SOE reports submitted to National Assembly to reflect latest biodiversity data.	Annual SOE reports.	
		Report on Critical Biodiversity Issues	Report on critical biodiversity issues to reflect critical and emerging issues related to biodiversity	Report Critical Biodiversity Issues	

Hierarchy of Objectives/Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	End of project target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	National GIS based map of key biodiversity information	Comprehensive national database that is geo referenced on maps are not available	GIS map that has key biodiversity information (hotspots, PAs, ongoing projects etc.) available for wider use and dissemination	Project report	
Outcomes 2.1-2.2: Provincial commitment and capacity strengthened to implement NBSAP.	Provincial capacity for NBSAP implementation.	Provincial staffs have very limited capacity and skills to implement NBSAP and connect land use with ecosystem functions, and biodiversity.	Provincial capacity for NBSAP implementation, including biodiversity financing, enhanced for up to 20 provinces through: Guidelines developed to support to NBSAP realization at provincial level. Up to 150 provincial staffs trained.	Training materials and training reports. Guidelines for NBSAP implementation.	Provinces effectively participate in training.
	Biodiversity reporting mechanism.	No guidelines or legal requirements or procedures exist to support provinces to report to central government.	Mechanism in place to report on biodiversity status and good practice from provincial to national levels.	Guidelines and legal procedures.	Provinces commit to NBSAP implementation.
	Provincial implementation of NBSAP priorities.	Land use plans do not explicitly incorporate biodiversity conservation priorities.	NBSAP priorities implemented in 2 provinces through: Land use plans updated to incorporate NBSAP priorities. Biodiversity criteria tested and proposed for inclusion in provincial performance assessment systems.	Updated land-use plans. Set of biodiversity criteria.	Selected provinces commit and actively mainstream their biodiversity priorities into land use plans.
	Spatial Biodiversity Assessment	Currently maps that highlight key biodiversity information at provincial levels do not exist	Biodiversity spatial assessment for two provinces prepared	Maps	Provinces have adequate data available

Hierarchy of Objectives/Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	End of project target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Experience and lessons learned from 2 pilot provinces documented and shared nationally.	Little cross-provincial learning on biodiversity planning takes place.	Results from piloted provinces considered for replication to other provinces	List of project documents, lessons learned disseminated. Workshop reports.	Good results achieved from pilot mainstreaming.

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

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document
Annual Workplans of 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015
Implementing/Executing partner arrangements

Project reports:

1. Current issues on policies, institutions and management in biodiversity conservation and development in Vietnam
2. Ecosystems and Protected areas
3. Assessment on status and conservation management of species and genetic resources in Vietnam for the development of national biodiversity strategy
4. Viet Nam National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to 2020 (NBSAP full text)
5. Fifth National Report
6. Guidelines for the NBSAP implementation
7. NBSAP training documents
8. An overview of land regulations relating to biodiversity conservation and proposed solutions
9. Methodology and Guidelines to integrate biodiversity into land use planning
10. Report on assessment of spatial biodiversity in Lang Son
11. Report on assessment of spatial biodiversity Son La
12. Report on "Proposals for integrating biodiversity conservation into land use planning of Lang Son province"
13. Report on "Proposals for integrating biodiversity conservation into land use planning of Son La province"
14. Report on Biodiversity criteria set for performance assessment and testing results in two pilot provinces
15. Report on overview of international experience and approach/methodology for mainstreaming biodiversity into sectors
16. Report on Assessment of Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Land use Planning and Lesson learnt
17. Report on Critical Biodiversity Issues
18. Review of current financing for biodiversity, Accessing financial needs and proposing mobilization plan for the implementation of prioritized programs of NBS

List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted

NBSAP Project Board:

- Mr. Pham Anh Cuong, National Project Director, Phone: 0912.179.360 , Email: pacuong@yahoo.com
- Ms. Hoang Thi Thanh Nhan, Deputy Project Director, Phone: 0902.282.326, Email: hoangnhan.bca@gmail.com
- Ms. Nguyen Dang Thu Cuc, Project Coordinator, Phone: 0942.636.868, Email: cucnguyen.bca@gmail.com
- Ms. Tran Thi Hoa, Project Manager, Phone: 0943.621.757, Email: tranthihoa@agi.vaas.vn
- Ms. Ha Huong Giang, Project Accountant, Phone: 0983.343.818, Email: gianghahuong2003@gmail.com

Stakeholders:

- Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA)
- Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA)
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)
- Son La DONRE
- Lang Son DONRE
- Land Administration

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
Project budget and financial data

Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term
One UN Plan II 2011-2016
UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed by the consultant and included as an Annex to the TE report.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the principle of the project in line with the national priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of participation of the concerned agencies in project activities Consistency with national strategies and policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents National policies and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the Project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF focal area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency with GEF strategic objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents GEF focal areas strategies and documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review GEF website Interviews with project team and UNDP
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Project team and stakeholder Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project team and relevant stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? 		Data collected throughout evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the accounting and financial system in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? • Was the Project efficient with respect to incremental cost criteria? • Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? • Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? • Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability and quality of financial and progress reports • Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided • Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures • Planned vs. actual funds leveraged • Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and evaluations • UNDP • Project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Key interview
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported? • What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners • Examples of supported partnerships • Evidence that particular partnership/linkages will be sustained • Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and evaluations • Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interviews
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project support financial mobilization for the NBSAP implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of national budget allocation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal regulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project support personnel allocation for the NBSAP implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel allocation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal regulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is biodiversity conservation consideration mainstreamed into land use planning? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation Legislation, planning documents show evidence of mainstreaming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal regulation Project documents/reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interview with stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any political risks that may threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project strengthened local capacity in the NBSAP implementation ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness and understanding of the NBSAP at the provincial level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Provincial level plans/strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project made improvement for provincial biodiversity planning of two pilot provinces? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness and understanding of biodiversity planning at the provincial level Evidence of incorporation of biodiversity conservation objectives in provincial level planning documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Provincial level plans/strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project supported the revised land use planning of two pilot provinces to meet for biodiversity conservation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that biodiversity has been mainstreamed into land use planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Provincial level plans/strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Document analysis

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

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 Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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)
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)
- 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

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

- 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
 - 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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

Annex VI

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 VII

FINANCIAL OFFER

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

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

Note: The number of work-days in the TOR is estimated only. The bidder should make his/her own estimate of the time taken to complete the assignment in line with this TOR and his/her proposal, and use this estimate as the basis for financial proposal.

Cost breakdown:

No.	Description	Number of days	Rate (USD/VND)	Total
1	Remuneration			
1.1	Services in Home office			
1.2	Services in field			
2	Out of pocket expenses			
2.1	Travel			
2.2	Per diem			
2.3	Full medical examination and Statement of Fitness to work for consultants from and above 62 years of age and involve travel – (required before issuing contract). *			
2.5	Others (pls. specify).....			
	TOTAL			

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

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

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

Dated this day /month of year

Signature