



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

19 September 2019

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Country: | Viet Nam |
| Description of the assignment: | International Consultant/Team Leader and one National consultant/Team member for the UNDP-GCF Interim Evaluation |
| Period of assignment/services (if applicable): | (October – December 2019) |
| Duty Station: | Home based and Vietnam |
| Tender reference: | PN-N-190901 |

1. Submissions should be sent by email to: nguyen.thuy.nga@undp.org no later than:
23.59 hrs., Thursday 03 October 2019 (Hanoi time)

With subject line:

PN-N-190901: IC/Team leader for UNDP-GCF Interim Evaluation
PN-N-190901: NC/Team member for UNDP-GCF Interim Evaluation

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 **30 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.

- After submitting proposal, bidder should send notification by email (without attachment) to: procurement.vn@undp.org informing that the bidder has submitted proposal. UNDP will not be responsible for the missing of proposal if the bidder does not send notification email to above address.
- Female consultants are encouraged to bid for this required service. Preference will be given to equally technically qualified female consultants.

2. Please find attached the relevant documents:

- [Term of References](#).....
(Annex I)
- [Individual Contract & General Conditions](#).....
(Annex II)
- [Reimbursable Loan Agreement](#) (for a consultant assigned by a firm).....
(Annex III)
- [Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability](#)
(Annex IV)
- [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**
- **Signed Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability**
- **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- **Copy of 1-2 publications/writing samples** on relevant subject in English.
- Reference contacts of past 4 clients for whom you have rendered preferably the similar service (including name, title, email, telephone number, address...)

b. Financial proposal (with your signature):

- The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in **VND for national consultant and US dollar for International 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 V.
- 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 currency at UN Exchange Rate at the submission deadline.

4. Evaluation

The technical component will be evaluated using the following criteria:

| Criteria for the International Consultant | Points |
|---|---------------|
| • A Master’s degree in environmental sciences, development studies, international development, or other closely related field. | 100 |
| • Work experience in climate change adaptation and/or relevant technical areas for at least 7 years (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 250 |
| • Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; | 100 |
| • Experience working with the GCF, GEF or GCF/GEF-evaluations; • Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100 |
| • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; | 100 |
| • Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation | 100 |
| • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. | 50 |
| • Experience working in Viet Nam or in a similar context; | 50 |
| • Demonstrable analytical skills; (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 100 |
| • Excellent oral and written communications skills in English (1-2 report samples to be provided) (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 50 |
| Total | 1000 |

| Criteria for the National Consultant | Points |
|--|---------------|
| • Advanced university degree in social, environmental or development science, agronomy, forestry, M&E, or other relevant field relevant; | 100 |
| • Minimum 7 years of related, identical, or similar professional experience is required in ODA funded projects, including proven experience from forestry related sector(s); (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 150 |
| • In-depth knowledge of policy making process and/or ODA project management in Viet Nam; | 150 |
| • Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; | 100 |
| • Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100 |
| • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; | 100 |
| • Demonstrated experience from evaluations of similar types of | 150 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| programmes; | |
| • Proven excellent communication and analytical skills; <i>(to be assessed via interview)</i> | 100 |
| • Good English both written (by providing 1-2 report samples) and spoken skills <i>(to be assessed via interview)</i> | 50 |
| 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 subject to positive reference checks on the consultant's past performance.

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:

- International consultant whose work involves travel is required to complete the courses on BSAFE which is the new online security awareness training and submit certificate to UNDP before contract issuance.
- Note: In order to access the courses, please go to the following link: <https://training.dss.un.org>
The training course takes around 3-4 hours to complete.
- Full medical examination and Statement of Fitness to work for consultants from and above 65 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 upon acceptance by UNDP of the deliverables specified the TOR.

Payments are based upon outputs, i.e. upon delivery of the products specified in the TOR.

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.

ANNEX I



UNDP-GCF Interim Evaluation 01 International and 01 National Consultant Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for an International Consultant/Team Leader and one National consultant/Team member for the Interim Evaluation (IE) of the UNDP supported GCF-financed project titled “*Improving the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities to climate change related impacts in Viet Nam*” (Reference No. FP013) implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, which is to be undertaken in 2019. The project started on 11 July 2017 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation (IE).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Implementing Partner: Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)

Accredited Entity: UNDP

Budget:

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| GCF (grant): | US\$ 29,523,000 |
| UNDP co-financing: | US\$ 1,600,000 |
| Government co-financing: | US\$ 10,861,578 |
| Total: | US\$ 41,984,578 |

Poor communities living in coastal regions of Viet Nam are adversely impacted by frequent flooding. Each year approximately 60,000 houses are destroyed or damaged by floods and storms in coastal provinces. This is likely to worsen given climate change scenarios for Viet Nam. Resultant economic impacts make it increasingly difficult for vulnerable families to escape the cycle of poverty.

The GCF Improving the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to Climate Change-related Impacts in Viet Nam (The GCF project) seeks to scale up interventions that are already tested to increase the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities. Building on ongoing social protection programmes related to housing for the poor and marginalized, the project will incorporate storm and flood resilient design features in new houses benefiting 20,000 poor and highly disaster-exposed people. As part of an integrated response to managing flood risks, 4000 hectares of mangroves will be rehabilitated and/or planted to

function not only as storm surge buffers, but also to provide ecosystem resources that can support coastal livelihoods. Moreover, to support and sustain both the impact of this project as well as future requisite government policy adjustments that strengthen the resilience of coastal and other communities, resources will be used to systematize climate and economic risk assessments for private and public sector application in all 28 coastal provinces of Viet Nam.

The GCF project relies on grant finance as (a) the proposed interventions will benefit vulnerable families identified as poor by the government, (b) strengthens natural defences proving public value, and (c) does not generate revenue that lends itself to providing reflows to the GCF. The project is fully aligned with the Government of Viet Nam (GoV)'s strategies and was designed following extensive stakeholder consultations.

The project is based on national priorities and has been endorsed by the National Designated Authority (NDA) for Viet Nam.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE IE

The Interim Evaluation team will assess implementation of the project and its alignment with FAA obligations and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. The evaluation will assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal **of identifying the necessary changes** to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The IE will also assess the following:

- Implementation and adaptive management
- Risks to sustainability
- Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programmes;
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities;
- Gender equity;
- Country ownership of projects and programmes;
- Innovativeness in results areas (extent to which interventions may lead to paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development pathways);
- Replication and scalability – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporated in independent evaluations); and
- Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

4. IE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The Interim Evaluation team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports,

Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The team will review the baseline Funding Proposal submitted to the GCF.

The Interim Evaluation team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Interim Evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the IE team is expected to conduct field missions to project sites in at least 3 project provinces in the north, centre and southern areas of Viet Nam, to be decided in consultation with the project team.

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The evaluation team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the project’s M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?

- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

| Project Strategy | Indicator ² | Baseline Level ³ | Level in 1 st APR (self-reported) | Level in 2 nd APR (self-reported) | Midterm Target ⁴ | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵ | Achievement Rating ⁶ | Justification for Rating |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Objective: | Indicator (if applicable): | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: | Indicator 1: | | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2: | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: | Indicator 3: | | | | | | | | |

² Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

³ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴ If available

⁵ Colour code this column only

⁶ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Indicator 4: | | | | | | | | |
| | Etc. | | | | | | | | |
| Etc. | | | | | | | | | |

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

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

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Review project cost norms to assess their appropriateness to current situation in different localities.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?

- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board/Project Steering Committee (Project Board).
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated APRs, if applicable?)

- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

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

iv. Sustainability

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

vi. Country Ownership

- To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- What level and types of involvement for all Is the project as implemented responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

vii. Gender equity

- Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

- What role has the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the project’s ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

x. Replication and Scalability

- What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁷

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

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

Ratings

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

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

| Measure | Interim Evaluation Rating | Achievement Description |
|---------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
|---------|---------------------------|-------------------------|

⁷ Alternatively, IE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Project Strategy | N/A | |
| Progress Towards Results | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Etc. | |
| Project Implementation & Adaptive Management | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Sustainability | (rate 4 pt. scale) | |

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the interim evaluation team will be approximately 28 working days for International Team Leader and 21 working days for National Team Member over a time period of 12 weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired . The tentative evaluation timeframe is as follows:

| NO. | ACTIVITY | NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS | EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Document review and preparing Interim Evaluation Inception Report (Interim Evaluation Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission) | TL: 04 days and TM: 02 days | 01 week from the contract signing date |
| 2 | Evaluation mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | TL: 12 days and TM: 12 days | 31 st October 2019 |
| 3 | Meeting with PMU, internal presentation on preliminary findings, preparation presentation | TL: 01 day and TM: 01 day | 22 nd November 2019 |

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 4 | Workshop presentation – debriefing/handout key findings presented to stakeholders | TL: 01 day and TM: 01 day | 29 th November 2019 |
| 5 | Preparing draft report (due no later than 3 weeks of the Evaluation mission) | TL: 06 days and TM: 04 days | 7 th December 2019 |
| 6 | Finalization of evaluation report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) (<i>note: 2 weeks' time delay accommodated for circulation and review of the draft report</i>) | TL: 04 days and TM: 01 day | 20 th December 2019 |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | Interim Evaluation Inception Report | Interim Evaluation team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission (by 15 th October 2019) | The evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission (by 29 th November 2019) | The evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| 3 | Draft Final Report | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | No later than 3 weeks from the evaluation mission (by 9 th December 2019) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point |
| 4 | Final Report* | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (by 24 th December 2019) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

*The final evaluation report must be in English and Vietnamese. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. INTERIM EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this Evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s interim evaluation is the UNDP Viet Nam Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants 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 evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the evaluation - one International Consultant/Team Leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National Consultant/Team Expert. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

Responsibility of Team leader: TL is responsible for the progress and quality of all products produced through the assignment.

- (S)he leads the development of a joint work-plan for the review and evaluation.
- Further, the TL develops the tools and methodology for the assignment.
- The Mission conducts solitary and team interviews and dialogues as deemed necessary. However, desk reviews are likely to be the main source of information and will always be required to provide validation, precision, clarity, and context for information captured verbally.
- The TL will report and present with inputs from the TM.

Responsibility of Team member:

As for the Team Member (TM), apart from joint activities,

- (s)he is responsible for facilitating the consultation processes with national and provincial partners; and
- to provide inputs and conduct all tasks as assigned or agreed on by the TL.

More details on the work division should be developed by the selected consultants through their work-plan. Both consultants must not be working as staff of the Gov. and UNDP.

Evaluation criteria:

| Criteria for the International Consultant | Points |
|--|--------|
| • A Master’s degree in environmental sciences, development studies, international development, or other closely related field. | 100 |
| • Work experience in climate change adaptation and/or relevant | 250 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| technical areas for at least 7 years (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | |
| • Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; | 100 |
| • Experience working with the GCF, GEF or GCF/GEF-evaluations; • Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100 |
| • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; | 100 |
| • Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation | 100 |
| • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. | 50 |
| • Experience working in Viet Nam or in a similar context; | 50 |
| • Demonstrable analytical skills; (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 100 |
| • Excellent oral and written communications skills in English (1-2 report samples to be provided) (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 50 |
| Total | 1000 |

| Criteria for the National Consultant | Points |
|--|---------------|
| • Advanced university degree in social, environmental or development science, agronomy, forestry, M&E, or other relevant field relevant; | 100 |
| • Minimum 7 years of related, identical, or similar professional experience is required in ODA funded projects, including proven experience from forestry related sector(s); (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 150 |
| • In-depth knowledge of policy making process and/or ODA project management in Viet Nam; | 150 |
| • Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; | 100 |
| • Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100 |
| • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; | 100 |
| • Demonstrated experience from evaluations of similar types of programmes; | 150 |
| • Proven excellent communication and analytical skills; (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 100 |
| • Good English both written (by providing 1-2 report samples) and spoken skills (<i>to be assessed via interview</i>) | 50 |
| Total | 1000 |

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

30% of payment upon approval of the final interim evaluation Inception Report
30% upon submission of the draft interim evaluation report
40% upon finalization and acceptance of the interim evaluation report

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team

1. Funding Proposal
2. UNDP Project Document
3. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
4. Project Inception Report
5. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
6. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Audit reports
8. Mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

11. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
12. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
13. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
14. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report⁸

- i.** Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GCF financed project
 - UNDP Evaluation time frame and date of report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 -
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Table of Contents
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1.** Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
- 2.** Introduction (*2-3 pages*)

⁸ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, approach and data collection methods, limitations to the Evaluation
 - Structure of the Interim Evaluation report
- 3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)**
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Steering Committee, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4. Findings (12-14 pages)**
- 4.1 Project Strategy**
- Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
- 4.2 Progress Towards Results**
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
- 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**
- Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability**
- Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)**
- Conclusions
- 5.1**
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Evaluation's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
- Recommendations
- 5.2**
- 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

6. Annexes

- The Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- Evaluation mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim evaluation report.

ToR ANNEX C: The Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the Interim Evaluation inception report and as an Annex to the Interim Evaluation report.

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|--|--|
| Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the Interim Evaluation mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
| | | | |
| Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| project communications supporting the project's implementation? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Interim Evaluation Consultants⁹

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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: _____

⁹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: Evaluation Ratings

| Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

| Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating) | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

| Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating) | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX IV

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

Date _____

(Name of Resident Representative/Bureau Director)
United Nations Development Programme
(Specify complete office address)

Dear Sir/Madam:

I hereby declare that:

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

G) I recognize that the payment of the abovementioned amounts due to me shall be based on my delivery of outputs within the timeframe specified in the TOR, which shall be subject to UNDP's review, acceptance and payment certification procedures;

H) This offer shall remain valid for a total period of _____ days [*minimum of 90 days*] after the submission deadline;

I) I confirm that I have no first degree relative (mother, father, son, daughter, spouse/partner, brother or sister) currently employed with any UN agency or office [*disclose the name of the relative, the UN office employing the relative, and the relationship if, any such relationship exists*];

J) If I am selected for this assignment, I shall [*please check the appropriate box*]:

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

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

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

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

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

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

L) I fully understand and recognize that UNDP is not bound to accept this proposal, and I also understand and accept that I shall bear all costs associated with its preparation and submission and that UNDP will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the selection process.

M) **If you are a former staff member of the United Nations recently separated, please add this section to your letter:** I hereby confirm that I have complied with the minimum break in service required before I can be eligible for an Individual Contract.

N) I also fully understand that, if I am engaged as an Individual Contractor, I have no expectations nor entitlements whatsoever to be re-instated or re-employed as a staff member.

O) Are any of your relatives employed by UNDP, any other UN organization or any other public international organization?

YES NO If the answer is "yes", give the following information:

| Name | Relationship | Name of International Organization |
|------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

P) Do you have any objections to our making enquiries of your present employer?

YES NO

Q) Are you now, or have you ever been a permanent civil servant in your government's employ?

YES NO If answer is "yes", WHEN?

R) REFERENCES: List three persons, not related to you, who are familiar with your character and qualifications.

| Full Name | Full Address | Business or Occupation |
|-----------|--------------|------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

S) Have you been arrested, indicted, or summoned into court as a defendant in a criminal proceeding, or convicted, fined or imprisoned for the violation of any law (excluding minor traffic violations)?

YES NO If "yes", give full particulars of each case in an attached statement.

I certify that the statements made by me in answer to the foregoing questions are true, complete and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that any misrepresentation or material omission made on a Personal History form or other document requested by the Organization may result in the termination of the service contract or special services agreement without notice.

DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

NB. You will be requested to supply documentary evidence which support the statements you have made above. Do not, however, send any documentary evidence until you have been asked to do so and, in any event, do not submit the original texts of references or testimonials unless they have been obtained for the sole use of UNDP.

Annexes *[please check all that applies]:*

- CV shall include Education/Qualification, Professional Certification, Employment Records /Experience
- Breakdown of Costs Supporting the Final All-Inclusive Price as per Template

GUIDELINES FOR CV PREPARATION

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.

