

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

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 two sister projects under the same CBPF-MSL (China Biodiversity Partnership Framework-Mainstream of Life) programme, they are: Project 1 (National Project, PIMS 4391), Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Sub-System of Wetland Protected Areas for Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity; Project 2 (Xinjiang Project, PIMS 4596), Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area Landscape in Altai Mountains and Wetlands.*

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project 1:

Project Title:	<i>Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Sub-System of Wetland Protected Areas for Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity</i>			
GEF Project ID:	4655		<u>at endorsement (US\$)</u>	<u>at completion (US\$)</u>
UNDP GEF Project ID:	4391			
Atlas award ID:	00069198	GEF financing:	2,654,771	2,654,771
Atlas project ID:	00083911			
Country:	China	IA/EA own:	N/A	N/A
Region:	Asia and Pacific	Government:	in-cash: 11,920,000 in-kind: 3,980,000	in-cash: 11,920,000 in-kind: 3,980,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	(UNDP) 900,000	(UNDP) 900,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD1	Total co-financing:	16,800,000	16,800,000
Executing Agency:	State Forest Administration (SFA) (Reformed as NFGA-- National Forestry and Grassland Administration in March 2018)	Total Project Cost:	19,454,771	19,454,771
Other Partners involved:	N/A	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		September 25, 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Original: September 24, 2018	Actual: September 24, 2019

Project 2: PIMS 4596

Project Title:	Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area Landscape in Altai Mountains and Wetlands			
GEF Project ID:	4653		<u>at endorsement</u>	<u>at completion</u>
UNDP GEF Project ID:	4596		<u>(US\$)</u>	<u>(US\$)</u>
Atlas award ID:	00070004	GEF financing:	3,544,679	3,544,679
Atlas project ID:	00084238			
Country:	China	IA/EA own:	N/A	N/A
Region:	Asia and Pacific	Government:	in-cash: 16,500,000 in-kind: 4,500,000	in-cash: 16,500,000 in-kind: 4,500,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	(UNDP) 1,000,000	(UNDP) 1,000,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD1	Total co-financing:	22,000,000	22,000,000
Executing Agency:	Xinjiang Forestry Department	Total Project Cost:	25,544,679	25,544,679
Other Partners involved:	Liangheyuan Provincial Nature Reserve Management Bureau, Altai Mountains Forestry Bureau	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		February. 27, 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Original: February 26, 2019	Actual: February 26, 2019

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to:

Project 1: The project goal is to deliver global biodiversity benefits by conserving China's wetlands through the strengthening of the sub-system of wetland PAs, thus enhancing conservation and management of these globally significant ecosystems. The project objective is to strengthen the sub-system of wetland protected areas to respond to the existing and accelerating threats to their globally significant biodiversity.

Three outcomes including:

Outcome 1: Wetland PA Sub-System Strengthened through Better Ecological Representation and Enhanced Management Capacity.

Outcome 2: External threats to Wetland PAs reduced through mainstreaming wetland PA considerations in sector planning.

Outcome 3: Increased knowledge management, lessons sharing, and awareness for wetland PAs.

Project 2:

The project Goal is to enhance the effectiveness of XUAR's PA system to conserve globally significant biodiversity and to maintain healthy and resilient ecosystems with strategic emphasis on the regional PA wetland sub-system.

The project objective is to strengthen the management effectiveness of PAs to respond to existing and emerging threats to the globally significant biodiversity and essential ecosystem services in AMWL in northern XUAR, People's Republic of China.

The objective will be achieved through three outcomes:

Outcome 1: The protection of wetland ecosystems with PA planning and management is enhanced in XUAR through systemic, legal and institutional capacity strengthening;

Outcome 2: The biodiversity of AMWL is effectively conserved with a strengthened PA network and enhanced operational budget through adoption of a landscape approach to conservation planning and environmental management;

Outcome 3: The adoption and development of a 'community co-management' approach to conservation in Liangheyuan NR demonstrates improved management effectiveness for a wetland PA in the Altai Mountains and Wetland Landscape.

As the national project played key role for coordinate programme level functions for umbrella impact to all the seven child projects, UNDP would like the team to provide a synthesis report at program level to capture the program successes and impact. It will provide an overview of the findings and recommendations from the six individual TE reports within 2 weeks of the finalization of all six TE reports, which may need some Skype interview meetings for clarifications with 7 PMOs staff and FAO China, as well as NPD from programme level. An example program synthesis report is available from the mid-term to provide guidance to the TE team.

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.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ 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 (*fill in 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 **China**, including the following project sites **including Beijing, Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region**. About 4 days for project 1, 12 days for project 2. All related travel expenses will be covered. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: **(UNDP, NFGA, Xinjiang Forestry Department and related sub-contractors and consultants, Skype with other 5 PMOs and FAO China)**.

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

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

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.

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](#).

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	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
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:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind support 								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other 								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in **China**. 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.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 55 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	5 days	February 1, 2019
Evaluation Mission	16 days	March 25, 2019
Draft Evaluation Report	24 days	April 25, 2019
Final Report	10 days	May 15, 2019

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

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

Presentation	Initial Findings by PPT	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.
Synthesis Report	Only one synthesis report will be created, which will provide an overview of the findings from the six individual MTR reports	Within 2 weeks of the finalization of all six TE reports	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of **1 international and 1 national evaluator**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. **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.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

Competencies

- Strategic technical and intellectual skills in the substantive area with global dynamic perspectives;
- Leadership, innovation, facilitation, advocacy and coordination skills;
- Ability to manage technical teams and engage in long term strategic partnership;
- Entrepreneurial abilities and ability to work in an independent manner;
- Ability to work effectively in a team, with good relationship management skills
- Strong managerial and coordination skills, including ability to coordinate the development of large, complex projects;
- Demonstrated ability to operate effectively in a highly complex organizational context;
- Ability to maintain high standards despite pressing deadlines;
- Excellent communication (both oral and written) and partnership building skills with multi-dimension partners and people, skill for conflict resolution and negotiation;
- Excellent writing skills, especially in the preparation of official documents and reports;
- Good knowledge of China's environmental and socio-economic context.

Required Skills and Experience

Education

- An advanced degree in conservation, natural resources management, environmental science or related fields, preferably in PA conservation and management.

Experience

- Minimum 3 years of relevant professional experience including Project development, implementation and evaluation
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, such as GEF policy and practices, GEF project requirements;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) including biodiversity conservation, agriculture, natural resources co-management, integrated planning, etc.
- Expertise in economic and social development issues
- Good communications and writing skills in English
- Professional experiences in working in China and with Chinese counterparts would be an advantage.
- Working experiences in high altitude areas

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English is required;
- Good knowledge of Chinese is an asset.

IT Skills:

- Good IT skills.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org> etc.) by **Oct. 8, 2018**. 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 cost of the assignment (mainly the daily fee).

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

(will be provided after contract signed)

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

A list of suggested key documents to include is as follows:

1. Project documents

- 1) GEF Project Identification Form (PIF), Project Document and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
- 2) Project Inception report
- 3) Implementing/executing partner arrangements
- 4) List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
- 5) Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- 6) Midterm evaluation (MTE) and other relevant evaluations and assessments
- 7) Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR), APR, QPR
- 8) Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs
- 9) Project GEF BD-1 Tracking Tool
- 10) Financial Data including Combined Delivery Reports (CDR)
- 11) Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries, etc.
- 12) Comprehensive report of subcontracts (even in Chinese for national evaluator's reference).

2. UNDP documents

- 1) Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- 2) Country Programme Document (CPD)
- 3) Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

3. GEF documents

- 1) GEF focal area strategic Programme Objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

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?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) 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 Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 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)

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

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ 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: _____

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

Date _____

United Nations Development Programme
No.2, LiangMaHe NanLu, Beijing, China, 100600

Dear Sir/Madam:

I hereby declare that:

I have read, understood and hereby accept the Terms of Reference describing the duties and responsibilities of the **Provision of Consultancy as _____ for _____ programme in China;**

- a) I have also read, understood and hereby accept UNDP's General Conditions of Contract for the Services of the Individual Contractors;
- b) I hereby propose my services and I confirm my interest in performing the assignment through the submission of my CV which I have duly signed and attached;
- c) In compliance with the requirements of the Terms of Reference, I hereby confirm that I am available for the entire duration of the assignment, and I shall perform the services in the manner described in my proposed approach/methodology which I have attached in the technical proposal;
- d) For your evaluation, the cost quotation has been provided in the financial proposal along with this letter;
- e) I recognize that the payment of the abovementioned amounts due to me shall be based on my delivery of outputs within the timeframe specified in the TOR, which shall be subject to UNDP's review, acceptance and payment certification procedures;
- f) This offer shall remain valid for a total period of ____ **days** [*minimum of 90 days*] after the submission deadline;
- g) I confirm that I have no first degree relative (mother, father, son, daughter, spouse/partner, brother or sister) currently employed with any UN agency or office [*disclose the name of the relative, the UN office employing the relative, and the relationship if, any such relationship exists*];
- h) If I am selected for this assignment, I shall [*pls. check the appropriate box*]:

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

i) I hereby confirm that [check all that applies]:

- At the time of this submission, I have no active Individual Contract or any form of engagement with any Business Unit of UNDP;
- I am currently engaged with UNDP and/or other entities for the following work :

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

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

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

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

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

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

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

PART I Please state briefly the reasons you think you are the most suitable candidate for the assignment. (maximum 1000 words-long)

PART II Please provide a brief methodology on how you will approach the assignment. (maximum 1000 words-long)



FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

Please Note:

- **The cost of official field travel and join duty station/repatriation travel during the contract period will be borne by UNDP and should not be part of this financial proposal;**
- In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources;
- In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Cost Components	Unit Cost (USD)	Unit Quantity	Sub-total (USD)
Professional fee		_____ Working days	
Any other cost			
Total (USD)			

Full Name and Signature:

Date Signed:

Note:

Final selection criteria:

- **Technical evaluation (including written test, interview, desk review of technical proposal, if any): 70%**
- **Financial Evaluation:30%.**