INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Reference:	PIMS 4113/NCFE
Country:	Turkey
Description of the Assignment:	National (Local) Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of UNDP GEF Improving Energy Efficiency in Industry in Turkey
Project:	PIMS 4113: Improving Energy Efficiency in Industry in Turkey (EE Industry)
Period of Assignment/Services:	26 working days spread over a three-month period from 1st May 2017 to 31st August 2017.
Duty Station:	Home Based with one mission of estimated 10 working days in Ankara, Turkey (and possibly other locations in Turkey and Vienna-Austria)

*Proposal should be submitted by email to tr.icproposal@undp.org no later than **9 April 2017**, COB. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP 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.*

1. Background

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 Improving Energy Efficiency in Industry in Turkey (PIMS 4113).

For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

2. Scope of Work, Responsibilities and Description of the Proposed Analytical Work

For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

3. Requirements for Experience and Qualifications

For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference).

4. Documents to be included when submitting the Proposals

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

- Financial Proposal (please see section 5, below and Annex II)

- Personal CV, including experience in similar projects and at least 2 references with their contact details[1]

5. Financial Proposal

The interested individual consultants must submit their financial proposals by following the guidance and the standard template provided in Annex II. Any deviation from the standard text may lead to disqualification.

6. Evaluation

The evaluation will be based on cumulative analysis (i.e. technical qualifications and price proposal). The weight of the technical criteria is 70%; the weight of the financial proposal is 30%. Candidates that obtain a minimum of 70 pts out of a maximum 100 pts will be considered for the financial evaluation. Candidates that do not meet the minimum requirements will be disqualified. For further details, please see Annex I (Terms of Reference)

7. Annexes

The following annexes are an integral part of this procurement notice. In case of any conflict between the provisions of the Annex III and the procurement notice and/or Annex I and/or Annex II, the provisions of Annex III are applicable.

- Annex I: Terms of Reference
- Annex II: OFFEROR'S LETTER TO UNDP CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT
- Annex III: General Conditions of Contract for Individual Consultants

[1]UNDP will contact directly with the provided names for reference check purposes without any prior notification to the applicant.

ANNEX I – TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

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. This terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Improving Energy Efficiency in Industry in Turkey Project* (PIMS 4113).

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

2. PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<tr><td>Project Title:</td><td colspan="4">Improving Energy Efficiency in Industry in Turkey Project</td></tr>
<tr><td>GEF Project ID:</td><td>3747</td><td></td><td colspan="2"><u>at endorsement (US$)</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>UNDP Project ID:</td><td>00074019</td><td>GEF financing:</td><td colspan="2">5.900.000,00 USD</td></tr>
<tr><td>Country:</td><td>Turkey</td><td>IA/EA own:</td><td colspan="2">110.000,00 USD</td></tr>
<tr><td>Region:</td><td>Europe&Central Asia</td><td>Government:</td><td colspan="2">11.068,650,00 USD</td></tr>
<tr><td>Focal Area:</td><td>Climate Change</td><td>Other:</td><td colspan="2">17.904.750,00 USD</td></tr>
<tr><td>FA Objectives, (OP/SP):</td><td>CC-SP2</td><td>Total co-financing:</td><td colspan="2">29.083.400,00 USD</td></tr>
<tr><td>Executing Agency:</td><td>General Directoriate of Renewable Energy(YEGM)</td><td>Total Project Cost:</td><td colspan="2">34.983.200,00 USD</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Other Partners involved:</td><td rowspan="2">Small and Medium-Size Enterprises Development Organization (KOSGEB), Turkish Standards Institute (TSE)</td><td colspan="2">ProDoc Signature (date project began):</td><td>Oct 2010</td></tr>
<tr><td>(Operational) Closing Date:</td><td>Proposed:
Aug 2015</td><td>Actual:
Aug 2017</td></tr>
</table>

3. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Improving Energy Efficiency in Industry-IEEI project was designed to enhance the capacity of Turkey in industrial energy efficiency.

The project started on 31st August 2010 and was due to finish on 31st August 2015. However, the project was extended for 2 years until 31st August 2017 upon which date it is now due to finish and to close. At the mid-term review, certain recommendations were made to improve the overall quality and results of the project over the second half of the project lifetime. The final evaluation will review the extent to which these recommendations have been followed and the extent to which the project has been strengthened and improved.

The IEEI project has aimed to support the progress in industrial energy efficiency through a comprehensive and integrated approach that focuses on: (1) Contributing to the implementation of the EE Law by strengthening the institutional-regulatory framework and promoting the national Energy Management Standard; (2) Enhancing capacity and creating awareness in Turkish industrial companies as well as financial service and energy service providers; (3)

Implementation of energy audits in large industry and SMEs; (4) Demonstration of state-of-the-art management practices, EE measures and technologies and appropriate business and financing models.

The IEEI project is implemented through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), with the financial support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and is under the execution of the General Directorate of Renewable Energy (YEGM) of the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources. Project partners include the Small and Medium-Size Enterprises Development Organization (KOSGEB), Turkish Standards Institute (TSE), and the Technological Development Foundation of Turkey (TTGV).

The project objective is "to improve energy efficiency of the Turkish industry by enabling and encouraging companies in the industrial sector for efficient management of energy use by different energy efficiency measures and energy efficient technologies". In this regard, the project mainly focuses on:

- Improving the institutional and legislative framework which will contribute to the enhanced implementation of the existing Energy Efficiency Law and the promotion of the new Energy Management System (EnMS);
- Improving the database of energy consumption data for industry, updating the current information on sectoral energy consumption and savings opportunities;
- Introducing sectoral energy consumption benchmarking regarding the energy performance in the various processes of the industrial subsectors;
- Promoting the dissemination of TS-EN-ISO 50001 Standard throughout the country by meetings, trainings and certification supports;
- Establishing "Energy Management Units" in organized industrial zones, supporting them to disseminate energy management activities in their regions;
- Improving the existing financial mechanisms for energy efficiency and developing new and integrated financial models;
- Improving the capacity of Turkish industry and energy service companies; raising the awareness of senior managers and decision makers and employees of industrial enterprises and financial institutions for energy efficiency and energy system optimization;
- Providing sectoral training for energy service companies, updating existing energy efficiency training documents, and developing and standardizing energy audit methodologies;
- Implementing and supporting energy auditing programs; performing energy audits in large industrial enterprises and SMEs; improving the auditing and evaluation capacity and experience of energy service companies;
- Introducing the most developed energy management applications and energy efficiency approaches, trade and financing models; energy efficiency improvement projects, energy system optimization opportunities, energy efficient processes and technologies.

Within the summarized framework above, the terminal evaluation (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, to assess how the project undertook adaptive management to improve the project following the mid-term review, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The terminal evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant supported by a national consultant.

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has 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.

According to the project document, the TE report will:

- focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place).
- look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals,
- also provide recommendations for follow-up activities

The TE 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 Turkey (İstanbul and Ankara) and Austria (Vienna-UNIDO HQ). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. UNDP Country Office
2. UNIDO Headquarter or UNIDO Country Office
3. YEGM (General Directorate of Renewable Energy)
4. KOSGEB (Small and Medium-Size Enterprises Development Organization)
5. TSE (Turkish Standard Institution)
6. OSBUK (Supreme Board of Organized Industrial Zones-OIZ)
7. EYODER (Energy Managers Association)
8. At least two related OIZs
9. At least two Energy Management System (EnMS) experts
10. At least two EnMS trainers
11. At least two EVD (energy efficiency consultancy) companies

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

5. 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 TE 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:	

6. PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The TE 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	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

7. 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.

8. IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts with the key impact being whether or not the project has led to the reduction in the tones of CO2 that it set out to achieve. The project aims to save at least 190 GWh per year (energy and fuel). The project aims to achieve direct emission reduction (associated with demo projects) of 60.9 ktCO2 p.a. and (assuming an average 10-year lifetime of energy investment) 609 ktCO2 cumulatively. Cumulative indirect emission reduction due to projects capacity building activities ranging from 1.8 MtCO2 (bottom-up approach) to 32.7 MtCO2 (top-down)

9. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Turkey, in consultation with the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor at Istanbul Regional Hub. The UNDP CO will contract the national consultant to work with and support the international consultant and to provide him/her with relevant data/inputs and a stock taking report which provides a short 1-2 paragraphs summary (in English) of all the main points of all the main project reports prepared by the project and their pertinence.

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.

11. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 26 days during the calendar period over a period of 4 months (May– August 2017), which includes on mission of at least 10 working days (not including travel days or weekends). The duration will include one mission of 10 working days (not including travel days or weekend to Ankara, Turkey.) The following tentative timetable is recommended for the evaluation, however, the final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of the assignment:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	04 days	31.05.2017
Travel Days (for mission)	02 days	15.07.2017
Evaluation Mission	10 days	15.07.2017
Draft Evaluation Report	08 days	01.08.2017
Final Report	02 days	18.08.2017

12. 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	International Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Stock taking report	National Consultant provides a stock taking report providing summary and analysis (in English) of all major reports produced by project	No later than 2 weeks after evaluation mission	To International Evaluator and to UNDP CO and RTA
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 terminal 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.

13. TEAM COMPOSITION

1) General Information:

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluator. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. 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.

2) Required Qualifications:

Corporate competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards,
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional competencies:

- Strong interpersonal skills, communication skills and ability to work in a team,
- Ability to plan and organize work, efficiency in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results,
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback,

- Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations,
- Strong analytical, research, reporting and writing abilities.

Relevant knowledge and experience:

- Proven knowledge in climate change mitigation, energy or energy efficiency (EE) is a minimum requirement,
- At least 10 years of relevant professional experience is a minimum requirement,
- Proven knowledge and experience on Turkish energy legislation, national energy efficiency (EE) policies is a minimum requirement,
- Proven knowledge and experience on energy or EE polices of international institutions is a minimum requirement,
- More than 15 years of relevant professional experience is an asset,
- Experience in results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies is an asset,
- Work experience in Turkey on energy efficiency related issues is an asset
- Experience gained in an international organization is an asset.

Language skills:

- Excellent English is required,
- Turkish is required.

3) Evaluation Procedure:

3.1. General Information

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive, compliant, acceptable,
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

3.2. Technical Criteria

Technical criteria represent the 70% of the total evaluation (max 70 points).

Only candidates passing the 70% threshold (totally 49 points) of the technical competency part will be considered eligible for financial evaluation. In the event that qualifications of the consultant do not meet one of the relevant minimum requirements, he/she shall not able to pass the 70% threshold in technical competency part.

The breakdown of the 70 points designed for international and national consultant is shown in the below table:

Qualifications	Minimum Requirement		Asset	
	International	Local	International	Local
Proven knowledge in climate change mitigation, energy or energy efficiency (EE)	20	20	-	-
At least 10 years of relevant professional experience	20	20	-	-
Completed at least 10 similar tasks	10	-	-	-
Proven knowledge and experience on Turkish energy legislation and national EE policies	-	5	-	-
Proven knowledge and experience on energy or EE polices of international institutions	-	5	-	-
More than 15 years of relevant professional experience	-	-	5	5
Experience in results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies	-	-	5	5
Work experience in Turkey on energy or energy efficiency related issues	-	-	5	5
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation procedures	-	-	5	-
Experience gained in an international organization	-	-	-	5

3.3. Financial Criteria:

Financial criteria represent the 30% of total evaluation (max 30 points).

The candidates who were found eligible in the technical part will be evaluated with respect to their financial offers. Their financial offers will be ranked. The ranking will be carried out according to formula presented below:

FP Rating = (Lowest Priced Offer / Price of the Offer Being Reviewed) x 100

3.4. Final Evaluation

The candidate with the highest score from "technical criteria + financial criteria" will be selected. For final evaluation, following formulas will be used:

Rating the Technical Part (TP) = (Technical Score Obtained out of 70 Points) + (FP Rating) x (Weight of FP, i.e. 30%)

14. 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'

15. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Following the Inception Report and prior to the mission to Turkey
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report and after the mission to Turkey
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report at the end of the assignment.

16. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online via http://www.tr.undp.org/content/turkey/en/home/operations/jobs.html by 09.04.2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Program Outcome (as defined in the CP)
Outcome: Strengthened management and protection of ecosystems for environmental sustainability (CP, Outcome 3)
Output: Increased productivity and competitiveness through improved energy efficiency and conservation (CP, output 1.3.5)
Output indicators: Level of energy utilized in different sectors; assessment of clean development technology implemented in production; level of renewable energy applied to fulfil the energy demand of the nation; level of greenhouse gas emission; cost of implementing cleaner technology and its effect on the overall GDP

CPAP Outcomes and indicators:
Outcome: Access to sustainable energy services is increased
Indicator: Number of new technologies for energy efficiency introduced

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):
Mainstreaming environment and energy

The project falls under the Environment and Energy Thematic Priority of UNIDO, and its RBM code C13, Industrial Energy Efficiency. It will contribute to the successful implementation of the cooperation programme between UNIDO and Turkey as agreed by the last bilateral consultation.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: To promote energy-efficient technologies and practices in industrial production and manufacturing processes

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Improved energy efficiency of industrial production

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Efficiency of industrial energy use (energy use / $ GDP); GHG emissions from industry (tons CO2 eq/ $ GDP); and $/ t CO2eq

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective To improve energy efficiency of the Turkish industry by enabling and encouraging companies in the industrial sector for efficient management of energy use by different energy conservation measures and energy efficient technologies	A) Energy savings from EE investments in industrial sector compared to baseline	• Technical energy savings potential in industry estimated at around 20%	• At least 46.5 GWh per year (energy and fuel)	• As given under the various Outcomes	• Willingness of industry to invest
	B) Direct and indirect emission reductions	• GHG emissions from manufacturing industry were around 118.1 $MtCO_2$-eq. in 2012 and are projected to grow to 221.3 $MtCO_2$ by 2023	• Direct emission reduction (associated with demo projects) of 15$MtCO_2$ p.a. and (assuming an average 10-year lifetime of energy investment) 150 $MtCO_2$ cumulatively • Cumulative indirect	• As given under the various outcomes	• Willingness of industry during and after the project

			emission reduction due to project's capacity building activities ranging from 0.45 $MtCO_2$ (bottom-up approach) to 8 $MtCO_2$ (top-down)		
Outcome 1 Strengthened institutional-regulatory framework and a national Energy Management Standard contributing to the implementation of the EE Law	C) The content and status of new policies and programs supporting their implementation	• Insufficient implementation of policies and programs	• New provisions available (EnMS) • Institutions strengthened and cooperation increased between YEGM, KOSGEB, TTGV and OIZs	• Government statements • Other verifiers as given below	• See below
Output indicators:	1) Comprehensiveness of energy-related databases in YEGM and KOSGEB *(output 1.1)*	• Basic energy consumption data gathering by Statistics and YEGM	• Information on energy use of about 1,500 industries is updated and expanded and put in the databases	• Data input format • Database output and statistical reports • Progress report	• Willingness of industries to provide such data (which sometimes can be considered confidential)
	2) Availability of benchmark data for industrial sectors *(output 1.2)*	• Benchmark data are available for some sectors	• Benchmark data for all sectors and size of industry are available	• Progress report • Seminar presentations	• Sufficient sectoral and technology data can be gathered to be able to define benchmarks
	3) The concept of Energy Management System (EnMS) introduced and promoted *(output 1.3)*	• No EnMS defined	• Widely promoted EnMS approach throughout the county	• Official publication • EnMS user guide • Progress report	• Government-level support to define and promulgate EnMS

			• Guidelines issued for implementation of EnMS		
	4) Regional EE support centers established *(output 1.4)*	• No energy-efficiency dedicated regional support centers	• 12 Energy Management Units in OIZs with sufficient operating budgets	• Business plan • Annual reports • Project progress report	• Willingness of OIZ managements to operate such centers
	5) Financial mechanisms for EE reviewed and upgraded *(output 1.5)*	• Existing mechanisms (YEGM, KOSGEB, TTGV) leave gaps and do not reach all potential beneficiaries	• The three existing mechanisms are improved and new mechanisms are proposed	• Official publications on financial mechanisms	• Top management of the institutions involved approve proposed changes in the existing mechanisms
Outcome 2 Enhanced capacity and awareness of Turkish industry and energy service providers	D) Additional number of EE projects investment made by industrial companies	• N/A	• About 100 EE investment directly (demos) or indirectly (outcome 2; capacity building)	• Reports by industry associations; publications • Other verifiers as given below	• See below
		•	•		
Output indicators:	6) Information dissemination services improved *(output 2.1)*	• Websites of YEGM, KOSGEB, TTGV, TSE	• Upgraded and linked websites to provide integrated info on EE • Number of case studies, lessons learned from (inter-) national sources and number of brochures and booklets on EE	• Web sites • Reports, booklets, brochures on EE • Project newsletter • Progress report	• Implementing agencies coordinate the content of their websites on EE aspects

			Project newsletter; Documentaries		
	7) Awareness and capacity amongst owners and managers from industry and financial institutions is enhanced *(output 2.2)*	• Limited number of decision makers are aware of EE options	• At least 900 decision makers are aware of EE options	• Presentation at events • Project progress report • Project website	• Willingness of the targeted public to benefit from the training and supporting materials
	8) Capacity enhancement on sectoral energy and energy system optimization for energy managers and other technical staff on EE in industrial companies. *(output s 2.3)*	• Insufficient technical capacity	• Energy managers, energy service providers and other technical staff are trained at 40 events (workshops, seminars, courses) attended by 1,200 people at various places in Turkey on systems optimization, energy engineering and EE technologies and processes, business planning and EE investments	• Training needs assessment and action plan • Presentation at events • Project progress report • Project website	• Willingness of the targeted public to benefit from the training and supporting materials
	9) Capacity of energy service providers enhanced (*output 2.4*)	• Insufficient technical capacity	• Engineers and energy managers of ESCOs/EVD companies are trained in terms of EnMS, undertaking	• Guides, checklists, reports on EE	• Slowly growing EE market in private enterprises

			audits and reporting		
Outcome 3 Energy audit program for large industry and SMEs implemented	E) Share of energy audits in Turkey leading to actual investments in EE in industry	• Less than 10%	• At least 50%	• See below	• See below
	F) Additional energy saving investment opportunities identified as part of energy audits	• Zero	• At least 46.5 GWh/year in new EE investments identified		
	10) Energy audits skills and capacity upgraded *(output 3.1)*	• Basic audit capacity exists in consulting firms	• Standardized audit procedures in line with ISO 50001 • 5 training on audit techniques supported by the project	• Audit assessment report • Training reports and presentations • Project progress report • Project website	Willingness of the targeted public to benefit from the training and supporting materials
	11) Implementation of EnMS in selected enterprises *(output 3.2)*	• Zero company certified	• At least 20 companies certified	• Presentations at training events • Project progress report • Project website	• Selected companies are willing to have EnMS implemented
	12) Selected companies have been audited through pre-audits (walk-through audits) *(output 3.3)*	• YEGM has conducted 100 energy audits in energy-intensive subsectors	• 50 walk-through energy audits Info dissemination on 'walk-through' audits at 2 events (supported by the project)	• Case studies • Audit reports • Project progress report	• Selected companies are willing to have a walk-through audit
	13) Detailed energy audits conducted *(output 3.4)*		• 50 detailed energy audits • Info disseminatio	• Case studies • Audit reports and	• Selected companies are willing to have a

			n on 'walk-through' audits at 2 events (supported by the project) attended by 70 people	feasibility studies • Project progress report • Project website	detailed audit
Outcome 4 State-of-the-art energy management practices and EE measures, business and financing models are demonstrated	G) Improved specific energy consumption by demonstration projects	• SEC in demonstration projects is at country-average level	• SEC in demonstration projects improved on average by at least 10%	• As given below	• As given below
Output indicators:	14) Demonstrated energy systems optimization and EE processes and technologies *(outputs 4.1 and 4.2)*	• EE technologies are implemented in some sectors, but needs to expanded and extended to more subsectors	• Demo activities designed and implemented, targeting 65 enterprises	• Case studies • Design and financial plans • Monitoring reports • Project progress report • Project website	• Selected companies are willing to investment in EE improvements, based on the feasibility analysis • Macro-economic environment is conducive for investments by private sector
	15) Information exchanges (*output 4.2*)	• N/A	• At least 3 formal meetings for presenting the actual implementation results	• Case studies report	• Industrial companies are willing to share the information to the public
Outcome 5 Monitoring and evaluation; knowledge sharing and	16) Monitoring and evaluation; baseline study and impact assessment *(output 5.1)*	• N/A	• Monitoring (quarterly and annually) • Mid-term and final evaluation	• Project progress reports • APR-PIR	• Adequate documentation, reporting and filing of documents

info dissemination *(outputs indicators)*	17) Knowledge sharing and post-project recommendation plan *(output 5.2)*	• N/A	• Baseline study and end-of-project impact assessment • Project reports and publications for promotion of EE in industry in Turkey • Final project report consolidating the results and lesson learnt from the implementation of the project	• Baseline and end-of-project study with impacts, lessons learned • Project reports and publications • Progress reports	• Adequate info and knowledge capture, data gathering, reporting and filing of documents
		•	•	•	•

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

1. Baseline Report

2. Inception Report

3. Mid-term Evaluation Report

4. Project Strategy Revision

5. Project Study Reports

- *5.1. Developed Financial Mechanism for Energy Efficiency Reports*
- *5.2. Need Assessment Study Report for Portal Study*
- *5.3. Walk-Through Energy Audit Methodology*
- *5.4. Draft Detailed Energy Audit Guides*
- *5.5. Documents Regarding EnMS Trainings (Plant Reports, Presentations, etc.)*
- *5.6. Reports for ESCO Gap Analysis*
- *5.7. Energy Managers Training Materials*
- *5.8. Books Printed (Optimization in i) Compressed Air, ii) Pump, iii) Fan, iv) Steam Systems)*
- *5.9. OIZ Training Materials*

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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?			
1. How did the project support the GEF focal area and strategic priorities? Please, fill out the GEF Climate Change Mitigation Tracking Tool below.	•	•	•
2. How did the project support the energy efficiency/energy saving and climate objectives of Turkey?	•	•	•
3. How did the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders and has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?	•	•	•
4. Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources, etc.)?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
1. Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? **Outcome 1**: Strengthened institutional-regulatory framework and a national Energy Management Standard contributing to the implementation of the EE Law. **Outcome 2**: Enhanced capacity and awareness of Turkish industry and energy service providers. **Outcome 3**: Energy audit program for large industry and SMEs implemented. **Outcome 4**: State-of-the-art energy management practices and EE measures, business and financing models are demonstrated. **Outcome 5**: Monitoring and evaluation; knowledge sharing and info dissemination.	•	•	•

	2. What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?	•	•	•
	3. What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
	1. Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements?	•	•	•
	2. Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
	3. Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?	•	•	•
	4. Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?	•	•	•
	5. To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported? What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?	•	•	•
	6. Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
	1. How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers for financial, institutional, social and economic changes managed?	•	•	•
	2. Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?	•	•	•
	3. What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?	•	•	•

	4. What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?				
	5. Has the project adequately taken into account the national/international realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework towards the improving energy efficiency in industry in Turkey?	•	•	•
	6. Are there any indicators that the project has contributed towards the improving energy efficiency in industry in Turkey?	•	•	•

GEF Climate Change Mitigation Tracking Tool

Please complete the cells with white background colour only.

Is this the mid-term APR/PIR or the FINAL APR/PIR? Please refer to CCM tracking tool instruction tab for details	

Special Notes: reporting on lifetime emissions avoided

Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided: Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided are the emissions reductions attributable to the investments made during the project's supervised implementation period, totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.
Lifetime direct post-project emissions avoided: Lifetime direct post-project emissions avoided are the emissions reductions attributable to the investments made outside the project's supervised implementation period, but supported by financial facilities put in place by the GEF project, totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments. These financial facilities will still be operational after the project ends, such as partial credit guarantee facilities, risk mitigation facilities, or revolving funds.
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (top-down and bottom-up): indirect emissions reductions are those attributable to the long-term outcomes of the GEF activities that remove barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, catalytic action for replication.
Please refer to the previous CCM instruction tab for special notes.

Please use the following GEF manual and calculator for EE and RE projects:

Manual for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects

Please use the following GEF manual and calculator for transport projects:

Manual for Transportation Projects

For LULUCF projects, the definitions of "lifetime direct and indirect" apply. Lifetime length is defined to be 20 years, unless a different number of years are deemed appropriate. For emission or removal factors (tones of CO2eq per hectare per year), use IPCC defaults or country specific factors.

General Data	Results at mid-point, or result at project closing depending at whether this is the mid-term APR/PIR or final APR/PIR
Project Title	
GEF ID	
Agency Project ID	
Country	
Region	
GEF Agency	
Date of Council/CEO Approval	
GEF Grant (US$)	
Date of submission of the tracking tool	
Is the project consistent with the priorities identified in National Communications, Technology Needs Assessment, or other Enabling Activities under the UNFCCC?	
Is the project linked to carbon finance?	
Co-financing expected (US$)	
Objective 1: Transfer of Innovative Technologies (Please refer to the CCM instruction tab for important guidance) **Please specify the type of enabling environment created for technology transfer through this project**	Yes =1, No =0
National innovation and technology transfer policy	
Innovation and technology center and network	
Applied R&D support	
South-South technology cooperation	
North-South technology cooperation	
Intellectual property rights (IPR)	
Information dissemination	
Institutional and technical capacity building	
Other (please specify)	

Number of innovative technologies demonstrated or deployed	
Please specify three key technologies for demonstration or deployment	
Area of technology 1	
Type of technology 1	
Area of technology 2	
Type of technology 2	
Area of technology 3	
Type of technology 3	
Status of technology demonstration/deployment	
Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime direct post-project GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (bottom-up) (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (top-down)) (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Objective 2: Energy Efficiency **Please specify if the project targets any of the following areas**	
Lighting	
Appliances (white goods)	
Equipment	
Cook stoves	
Existing building	
New building	
Industrial processes	
Synergy with phase-out of ozone depleting substances	
Other (please specify)	
Policy and regulatory framework	

Establishment of financial facilities (e.g., credit lines, risk guarantees, revolving funds)	
Capacity building	
Lifetime energy saved (to be reported in MJ, Million Joule). Please use IEA unit converter (Link below). Please see special notes on calculating energy saved in the CCM instruction tab	
http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp	
Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime direct post-project GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (bottom-up) (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (top-down)) (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Objective 3: Renewable Energy **Please specify if the project includes any of the following areas**	
Heat/thermal energy production	
On-grid electricity production	
Off-grid electricity production	
Policy and regulatory framework	
Establishment of financial facilities (e.g., credit lines, risk guarantees, revolving funds)	
Capacity building	
Installed capacity per technology directly resulting from the project	
Wind	
Biomass	
Biomass	
Geothermal	
Geothermal	
Hydro	
Photovoltaic (solar lighting included)	

Solar thermal heat (heating, water, cooling, process)	
Solar thermal power	
Marine power (wave, tidal, marine current, osmotic, ocean thermal)	
Lifetime energy production per technology directly resulting from the project (IEA unit converter: http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp)	
Wind	
Biomass	
Biomass	
Geothermal	
Geothermal	
Hydro	
Photovoltaic (solar lighting included)	
Solar thermal heat (heating, water, cooling, process)	
Solar thermal power	
Marine energy (wave, tidal, marine current, osmotic, ocean thermal)	
Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2)	
Lifetime direct post-project GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2)	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (bottom-up) (Tonnes of CO2)	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (top-down) (Tonnes of CO2)	
Objective 4: Transport and Urban Systems **Please specify if the project targets any of the following areas**	
Bus rapid transit	
Other mass transit (e.g., light rail, heavy rail, water or other mass transit; excluding regular bus or minibus)	
Logistics management	
Transport efficiency (e.g., vehicle, fuel, network efficiency)	
Non-motorized transport (NMT)	
Travel demand management	
Comprehensive transport initiatives (Involving the coordination of multiple strategies from different transportation sub-sectors)	

Sustainable urban initiatives	
Policy and regulatory framework	
Establishment of financial facilities (e.g., credit lines, risk guarantees, revolving funds)	
Capacity building	
Length of public rapid transit (PRT)	
Length of non-motorized transport (NMT)	
Number of lower GHG emission vehicles	
Number of people benefiting from the improved transport and urban systems	
Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime direct post-project GHG emissions avoided (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (bottom-up) (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (top-down)) (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Objective 5: LULUCF **Area of activity directly resulting from the project**	
Conservation and enhancement of carbon in forests, including agroforestry	
Conservation and enhancement of carbon in nonforest lands, including peat land	
Avoided deforestation and forest degradation	
Afforestation/reforestation	
Good management practices developed and adopted	
Carbon stock monitoring system established	
Lifetime direct GHG emission avoided (Tonnes of CO2)	
Lifetime indirect GHG emission avoided (Tonnes of CO2)	
Lifetime direct carbon sequestered (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in the CCM instruction tab	
Lifetime indirect carbon sequestered (Tonnes of CO2 eq). Please see special notes in CCM instruction tab	
Objective 6: Enabling Activities	

Please specify the number of Enabling Activities for the project (for a multiple country project, please put the number of countries/assessments)	
National Communication	
Technology Needs Assessment	
Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions	
Other	
Does the project include Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) activities?	

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<table>
<tr><th>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</th><th>Sustainability ratings</th><th>Relevance ratings</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">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</td><td rowspan="2">4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability
3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks
2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks
1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</td><td>2. Relevant (R)
1. Not relevant (NR)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Impact Ratings:

3. Significant (S)
2. Minimal (M)
1. Negligible (N)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Additional ratings where relevant:
Not Applicable (N/A)
Unable to Assess (U/A</td></tr>
</table>

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[2]

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: _____

[2] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[3]

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[4])

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[5])

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)

[3] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[4] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[5] 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.

- 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

(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 Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

- ☐ Cover Letter and Approach to Work (as required by the TOR)
- ☐ CV or Duly signed P11 Form
- ☐ Breakdown of costs

ANNEX II – PRICE PROPOSAL GUIDELINE and TEMPLATE

The prospective Consultants should take the following explanations into account during submission of his/her price proposal.

- The lump sum price proposal should be indicated in US Dollars (USD).
- The price proposal should be indicated in gross terms and hence should be inclusive of costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa (if needed) etc.
- Assignment related travel and accommodation costs will be borne by the UNDP and should not be included within the price proposal.
- The cost and terms of reimbursement of all travel authorized by UNDP for Individual Contractors must be negotiated prior to travel.
- The cost of travels of the consultant may either be;
    - Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
    - Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following ***constraints/conditions*** provided in below table;
    - covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

- UNDP will not make any further clarification on costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa etc. It is the applicants' responsibility to make necessary inquiries on these matters.
- Please (a) copy the below text into a word processor, (b) indicate your price proposal as explained above, (c) do not change any part of the standard text (changing the standard text may lead to disqualification), (d) sign the document, (e) scan the signed version of the price proposal, and (f) send it as an attachment back to UNDP.

Price Proposal Submission Form

To: United Nations Development Programme

Ref: International Terminal Evaluation Consultant

Dear Sir / Madam,

I, the undersigned, offer to provide Professional Consulting Services as an Individual Contractor, to carry out the duties spelled out in the attached Terms of Reference for the lump sum of …… US$ for 26 working days, of which I understand that the minimum number of working days to be spent in Turkey during the assignment is 10 full working days. Having examined, understood and agreed to the Procurement Notice and its annexes, the receipt of which are hereby duly acknowledged, I, the undersigned, offer to deliver professional services, in conformity with Annex I (Terms of Reference) of the Procurement Notice.

My ***lump sum price proposal*** for the Assignment is: USD _____

I confirm that my financial proposal will remain unchanged. I also confirm that the price that I quote is **gross**, and is inclusive of all legal expenses, including but not limited to social security, income tax, pension, visa etc., which shall be required applicable laws.

I agree that my proposal shall remain binding upon me for 60 days.

I understand that you are not bound to accept any proposal you may receive.

[Signature]
Date:
Name:
Address:
Telephone/Fax:
Email: