



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

### Terms of Reference

#### International Consultant to undertake an independent final evaluation of the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility REDD+ Readiness Project (Phase 1 and Phase 2)

<b>Location</b>	Home-based with travel to Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea
<b>Application deadline</b>	30 July 2020
<b>Type of Contract</b>	Individual Contractor
<b>Post Level</b>	International Consultant to undertake an independent final evaluation of the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility REDD+ Readiness Project (Phase 1 and Phase 2)
<b>Languages required:</b>	English
<b>Duration of Initial Contract:</b>	Up to 40 days from August to November 2020

## 1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Papua New Guinea (PNG) has a significant area of intact tropical forest covering 77.8% of the country's 46.9m ha of land. Together with the forest of West Papua (Island of New Guinea) they represent one of the largest areas of intact tropical forest in the world. These forests are critical to the livelihoods and economy of the country and a commercial logging industry has for a long period been a central part of the economy.

These forests, however, have been impacted by development activities linked to a rapidly growing population and efforts towards economic development. These impacts while unavoidable in some areas have been identified as being excessive in other areas and as result the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) has started efforts towards developing an approach to reducing those impacts through engagement in the mechanism for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, the Sustainable Management of Forests and the Conservation and Enhancement of Forest Carbon Stocks (REDD+) as laid out under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

With support from the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility's (FCPF) REDD+ Readiness Funds implemented by UNDP Country Office in PNG, the GoPNG developed key elements of the Warsaw Framework on REDD+ including a Forest Reference Level (submitted to the UNFCCC in 2017) and a National REDD+ Strategy, approved by National Executive Council (NEC) under Decision 126/2017 in 2017.

At the end of 2016 to beginning of 2017, an independent mid-term evaluation of the project was carried out and was presented to the World Bank, following the FCPF guidelines. Based on results of the independent mid-term review of the FCPF Project<sup>1</sup>, an additional USD 5 million for the period of 2018-2020 was endorsed

<sup>1</sup> An independent FCPF PNG Mid-term Review Report

[https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2017/Jan/FCPF%20PNG%20Additional%20Funding%20Request\\_Final.pdf](https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2017/Jan/FCPF%20PNG%20Additional%20Funding%20Request_Final.pdf)

by the FCPF Participants Committee to enable the continuation of support to PNG's REDD+ Readiness Phase, strengthen capacities for the efficient management of REDD+, develop the NRS, support the continuation of the country's considerable achievements on NFMS, FREL and safeguards, and increase engagement of diverse stakeholders (government, private sector, NGOs/CSOs and academia) in this process at the sub national level.

On this occasion, the services of an International Consultant are required to analyse the results of the first and second phases of the FCPF project and carry out the Final Evaluation and prepare the Final Report to the World Bank.

## 2. OBJECTIVE

**A final evaluation of the project is required to know about the contributions and / or results** of each of the interventions carried out, including gender equality and the empowerment of women and the generation of evidence, lessons learned, good practices and objective information to allow managers to make informed decisions that generate a more equitable and just society . This evaluation will inform the strategic partners and the beneficiaries of the results of this exercise, thus ensuring accountability.

The evaluation is carried out according to the 2016-2020 UNDP Evaluation Plan, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the UNDP Evaluation Policy that establishes a series of guiding principles, norms and evaluation criteria in the organization.

Among the standards that the Policy seeks to maintain, the most important is that the evaluation exercise must be independent, impartial and of appropriate quality, but it must also be intentional and must be designed with utility in mind. The evaluation should generate relevant and useful information to support evidence-based decision making.

The evaluation will assess progress towards the results to date (direct and indirect, intended or not) in progress for the REDD + preparation phase. The evaluation is expected to follow a forward-looking approach and provide useful and feasible recommendations for moving on to the next phase.

The findings, lessons learned, and recommendations generated by the final evaluation will be used by UNDP and its key national counterparts to improve this and future projects and programs in PNG.

## 3. SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of the final evaluation of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility REDD+ Readiness Project (Phase 1 and Phase 2), is at the national level and is limited to the period from March 2015 to December 2020 This is done based on the data available at the time of the evaluation and with key stakeholders.

The purpose of this is to assess: (i) the performance of the project in terms of its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency (results, products); (ii) sustainability and expansion of results; (iii) the potential impact; as well as the fulfillment of the UNDP evaluation policy mandate on the contributions of development results in the area of human development.

The evaluation must provide information on the status of the project implementation, from March 2015 to date with evidence and objective information to allow managers to make informed decisions and reposition the project strategically. For the final evaluation, the quality standards established in the "UNDP Evaluation Policy" must be met<sup>2</sup>; i) independent, ii) intentional, iii) transparent, iv) Ethical, v) Impartial, vi) High quality, vii) Timely, and viii) useful.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>

#### 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

The evaluation should apply the following criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of development efforts.

**Relevance:** degree to which a development initiative and its products and expected effects are in accordance with national and local policies and priorities, as well as with the needs of the beneficiaries. Likewise, it considers to what extent the initiative responds to the priorities of human development and the UNDP corporate plan on the issues of women's empowerment and gender equality.

**Effectiveness:** it is a measure of the degree to which the initiative has achieved the expected results (products and effects) and the degree to which progress has been made to achieve those products and effects.

**Efficiency:** measures whether the inputs or resources have been converted into results economically. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to generate the desired products.

**Sustainability:** It measures the degree to which the benefits of the initiatives continue after external development assistance has ended.

Impact as an evaluation criterion will not be used in this evaluation. The impact results - changes in people's lives and development conditions - are considered outside the scope of this evaluation. Results at the impact level would have to control for the wide variety of factors that may have influenced the development of this area and it would not be feasible or profitable to discern the contribution of the project and UNDP to such change.

Each evaluation criterion used must implement an evaluation system with assigned ranges, namely:

To assess relevance:

- Relevant (P)
- Not relevant (NP)

To assess effectiveness:

- Highly satisfactory (AS): The project had no deficiencies in achieving its objectives
- Satisfactory (S): There were only minor deficiencies
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate deficiencies
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (I) the project had significant deficiencies
- Unsatisfactory (I): The project had significant deficiencies in achieving its objectives
- Highly Unsatisfactory (AI): The project had severe deficiencies

To assess efficiency:

- Highly satisfactory (AS): The project had no deficiencies in achieving its objectives
- Satisfactory (S): There were only minor deficiencies
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate deficiencies
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (I) the project had significant deficiencies
- Unsatisfactory (I): The project had significant deficiencies in achieving its objectives

- Highly Unsatisfactory (AI): The project had severe deficiencies

To value sustainability:

- Likely (P): Negligible risks to sustainability
- Moderately Likely (PM): Moderate risks
- Moderately Unlikely (MI): significant risks
- Unlikely (I): serious risks

## 5. EVALUATION Key QUESTIONS

Assessment questions can give your users the information they wanted to make decisions, take action, or feed the knowledge base. The evaluation questions improve the focus of the evaluation by making explicit the aspects of each of the initiatives considered when judging their performance.

Here are some questions to know:

### **Project design:**

- Does the project strategy offer the most effective way to achieve results? Were the lessons learned from other relevant projects or the early phases of the different interventions incorporated into the project design appropriately?
- Are the recommendations, lessons learned from the intermediate and final evaluations of the previous phase incorporated?
- How are the country's priorities reflected in the project?
- Is there national ownership of the project?
- Was the project concept aligned with national sector development priorities and national plans?
- The gender perspective was included in the design phase of the project and its first interventions with key stakeholders.
- Was the perspective of those who would be affected by decisions related to the project, who could influence its results, and who could contribute information or other resources during the project design processes taken into account during the project design processes?
- Are there important areas that require attention, what actions are recommended to implement for their improvements?

### **A. Relevance:**

- Does the project approach match national priorities?
- Does the project incorporate the perspective of those who would be affected / benefited by the decisions related to the project, who could influence its results and who could contribute information or other resources during the project design processes?
- Do national and local government partners support the project's objectives? Do they have an active role in project decision making that supports the efficient and effective implementation of the project?
- Is communication regular and effective?
- To what extent does the participation of partners and public awareness contribute towards the progress and achievement of project objectives.

- To what extent does the project contribute to the progress and achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?
- Are the established media appropriate to express the progress of the project and intended for public impact? (Is there a website? Or did the project implement appropriate public awareness and outreach campaigns?)
- Is the inclusion of a gender perspective contemplated in the planning of results and activities?
- To what extent does the project respond to international treaties signed by the Government in the framework of environmental policies?

## **B. Effectiveness**

- What has been the degree of progress towards achieving the products and expected results of the project?
- Do the results framework indicators have a SMART approach?
- What has been the progress towards the expected results?
- Are the mid-term and end-of-project goals achievable?
- What are the main barriers to achieving the objective of the Project?
- What are the specific recommendations / reviews of targets and indicators?
- Has the progress made so far led or will it allow for future beneficial effects for development (such as income generation, gender equality and empowerment of women, improved governance, legal certainty for key actors), among others) that can be included in the results framework and monitored annually?
- Have the resources been used properly?
- To what extent were the project's products achieved with these resources?
- Have the budgets and schedules initially established in the project document been respected?
- Has project management been effective as outlined in the project document? Have changes been made? Have they been effective? Are reporting responsibilities clear? Is decision making transparent and timely?
- How is the execution of the partners in the implementation assessed and what would be the recommendations to improve their execution?
- Is there inclusive participation of beneficiaries with a gender perspective?
- How have changes and adaptive management been reported by the Project Coordinator and shared with the Project Board?
- What has been the role of the General Project Coordination to establish relationships with sectoral institutions at the central and local levels?
- Has the progress made so far led or will it allow for future beneficial effects for development (such as influencing public policies focused on priority groups, gender equality and the empowerment of women, improving governance, among others) that may be included in the results framework and monitored annually?
- How have the lessons learned from the adaptive management process been documented and shared with partners?
- Has the project been affected by COVID-19 pandemic and how was it impacted on project activities?

### **C. Efficiency:**

- Have resources been used appropriately and economically to achieve progress toward desired outcomes and products?
- Has the availability of inputs and actions been timely?
- Is the technical implementation unit designed appropriate for achieving the results?
- Has the political, technical and administrative support provided by UNDP been timely? What are the challenges to overcome in the future?
- To what extent did the project results framework work as a management tool? What adjustments or changes should be incorporated, in the new national and particular context from the beginning of the project?
- Was there a delay in the start and implementation of the project? What were the causes of these and have they been resolved?
- Does the work plan have a focus on results-based management? If not, how could planning be reoriented to focus on results?
- Does the project have appropriate financial control? Including reporting and planning of expenses that allow management to make informed decisions related to the budget and allow a timely financial flow?
- Do the monitoring and evaluation tools currently used provide the necessary information in the semi-annual and annual reports? Do they involve the key actors / partners? Are they aligned and incorporated with or incorporated into national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient?
- Are they cost / effective? How can these tools be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Are additional tools required? How can they be made more participatory and inclusive?

### **D. Sustainability:**

- What has been the support and participation of the institutions involved? Has there been strengthening institutional?
- Is a strategy for developing the capacities of strategic partners and key actors to maintain, manage and secure products in the future implemented?
- Has the Project agreed with the sector and municipal institutions on financial and economic mechanisms that ensure product continuity once it is finished?
- Is the use of public and private financing sources that guarantee the financing of local demands promoted?
- To what extent do civil society, community organizations, the private sector, direct forest users, key actors, local governments and sector institutions use the knowledge and experiences gained through the project?
- Are there social or political risks that could jeopardize the sustainability of the project results?
- What is the risk that the level of partner ownership (including the ownership of national / local governments and other key stakeholders) was insufficient to achieve the project results / benefits to be sustained over time?

- Is there sufficient public awareness of strategic partners and key actors to support the long-term objectives of the project?
- Are the lessons learned documented and shared by the project team on an ongoing basis / transferred to partners so they can learn from the project and potentially replicate and / or expand in the future?
- Are the key actors committed to continuing to work on the project's objectives once it ends?
- Can the political, legal, financial frameworks and governance structures jeopardize the basis for reaping the benefits of the project?

## **6. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY OF THE FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT**

The final evaluation of the project will be carried out by an external evaluator and will include the participation of a wide range of interested people and beneficiaries, including civil servants from the national and local government, civil society organizations, academic people and experts on the issues, representatives of the private sector and members of the community.

The evaluation is expected to adopt a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determine the causal links between interventions that UNDP has supported and noted progress in achieving expected results at the national and local levels. The evaluator will develop a logical model of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to the expected changes.

The evidence obtained and used to evaluate the results generated by UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on the achievement of indicators, existing reports, evaluations and technical documents, interviews with stakeholders, focus groups, surveys and visits.

The evaluation should also adopt other approaches and methods that can provide a more reliable and valid answer to the evaluation's questions and scope. In consultation with Programme units, evaluation managers, and key stakeholders, the evaluator should select the most appropriate, objective, and feasible methods of addressing the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The assessment is expected to take into account both qualitative and quantitative approaches and will therefore cover a number of methods, including:

- Documentary review of relevant documents, such as studies related to the country's context and situation, project documents, progress reports and other evaluation reports.
- Discussions with senior management and staff from CCDA and UNDP.
- Interviews and focus group discussions with partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders, including landholders.
- Field visits to selected areas, if applicable.
- Participatory questionnaires and techniques for data collection and analysis.
- Consultation meetings and reporting.

The data provided by this final evaluation should be based on credible, reliable and useful information. The evaluator will examine all relevant sources of information, including the documents prepared during the execution of the initiatives / projects (e.g. project documents (Proposal of R-PP of PNG, Prodoc), diagnoses, mid-term evaluation of the project, submitted to the FCFP, knowledge products, roadmaps, action plans, REDD + PNG awareness / training process reports, semi-annual and annual project reports, lessons learned reports, and policies and any other material that the evaluator considers useful for this mentioned exam.

It is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory methodology<sup>3</sup> that guarantees a close relationship with CCDA, UNDP, public and private entities and interested parties.

It should be noted that knowledge of the gender and human rights approach is required for this Final Evaluation to the FCPF.

*As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since April 2020 and travel within the country is changing subject to COVID-19 cases identified and the Controller decision. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.*

*If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.*

*If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.*

*A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.*

## **7. EXPECTED AND DELIVERABLE RESULTS / PRODUCTS**

For the planning, monitoring and execution of this consultancy, a Reference Committee will be set up, made up of the Climate Change and Development Authority and UNDP Papua New Guinea.

The functions of this Evaluation Reference Committee are as follows:

- Provide planning, management and logistics coordination for the development of the final evaluation to the FCPF.
- Facilitate and coordinate the interview schedule and provide the relevant information to the evaluator.
- Receive, comment and make available the reports of the consultancy from the evaluator to Management and subsequently to interested parties.
- Collate the suggestions and comments of the reports produced by the evaluator, attending to any discrepancy between the parties that present comments and deliver them to the evaluator.
- Inform interested parties of the Final Project Evaluation Report.

---

3

[https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiG3Jqzv7nqAhVoyaYKHWQjB98QFjABegQIBBAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.undp.org%2Fcontent%2Fdam%2Ffundp%2Flibrary%2Fcapacity-development%2FEnglish%2FDiscussion%2520Paper-%2520Innovations%2520in%2520Monitoring%2520%26%2520Evaluating%2520Results%2520%2520\(5\).pdf&usg=AOvVawLi9S9r0\\_Btxjpd-c-4ikK](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiG3Jqzv7nqAhVoyaYKHWQjB98QFjABegQIBBAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.undp.org%2Fcontent%2Fdam%2Ffundp%2Flibrary%2Fcapacity-development%2FEnglish%2FDiscussion%2520Paper-%2520Innovations%2520in%2520Monitoring%2520%26%2520Evaluating%2520Results%2520%2520(5).pdf&usg=AOvVawLi9S9r0_Btxjpd-c-4ikK)



- Analyze and respond to the recommendations of the final evaluation of the project and follow up on the action plan.

*In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, for any deliverable or service that cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.*

**UNDP will pay according to the percentages established in these terms of reference. Said payments will be made against received in accordance with the following products:**

<b>Deliverables/ Outputs</b>	<b>Estimated Duration to Complete assignment</b>	<b>Target Due Dates</b>	<b>Payment Percentage</b>	<b>Certifying/ Authorizing officer</b>
Inception report including clarification on timing and method and work plan	10	31 August 2020	25%	CTA
Evaluation mission (15-30 September) including presentation of initial findings at the end of the mission	10	15 October 2020	25%	CTA
Draft Final Report: Full report (per template provided in TE Guidance) with annexes, Audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed	10	15 November 2020	25%	CTA
Final Evaluation Report for the FCPF Project. and other knowledge products "if produced"	10	30 November 2020	25%	CTA

*Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.*

## **8. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**

Deliverables and products should be entirely to the satisfaction of the CCD A REDD+ General Manager, FCPF Chief Technical Advisor and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor.

There will be a maximum of five (5) business days to review the documentation and request adjustments or extensions to the delivered product, and the consultant will have a maximum of five (5) calendar days to incorporate the requested changes. Payments will be made within ten (10) business days after the approval of each delivered product.

## **9. PROFILE OF THE EVALUATOR**

The independent evaluator who will carry out the evaluation must have the record of not having participated in the preparation of the projects / initiatives, their formulation and / or implementation (including the writing of the project document) and must not have a conflict of interest with related project activities or with any of its strategic partners.

The selection of the evaluator will be oriented to maximize general qualities in the following areas:

- Higher university studies at the master's level in social sciences, environmental sciences, political science, research or other related specialties related to international cooperation and development.
- Experience in design, formulation and implementation of development programs and projects in the environment area.
- Extensive experience in strategic planning, results-based management (special domain of theory of change formulation).
- Experience in public policy analysis and sustainable development, including experience on the ground.
- Specific experience in similar evaluations (minimum 3 project evaluation processes), and at least (2) Mid-term reports submitted to the FCPF. Demonstrated experience of at least (10) years in job consulting with the United Nations System.
- Experience and verifiable knowledge about REDD + and its components.
- Knowledge of the mainstreaming of the gender, human rights, and intercultural approach in programs and projects.
- Excellent analytical capabilities.
- Excellent teamwork management skills.
- Fluent in English

## 10. EVALUATION ETHICS

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct "See Annex 3" upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG): [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](#).

The evaluation must be designed and carried out in a way that respects and protects the rights and well-being of the people and communities benefiting from the project, in accordance with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions.

The evaluator should respect the dignity and diversity of evaluation participants when planning, conducting, and reporting on the evaluation, using evaluation tools appropriate to the cultural setting in which it occurs. Evaluation participants should be treated autonomously, given time and information to decide whether or not they want to participate, and able to make a decision independently, without pressure.

All evaluators recruited by UNDP program units should agree and sign the Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations System<sup>4</sup>.

## 11. RESOURCES PROVIDED

UNDP PNG Country Office and the Climate Change and Development Authority will provide space for the International Consultant during the missions to Port Moresby.

In the case of travel beyond initial deployment and final repatriation, 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.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

## **12. DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

The work will be undertaken up to 40 days over a period of July towards end of November 2020.

In accordance with expected outputs and deliverables, the International Consultant submits reports to FCPF REDD+ Project Chief Technical Advisor for reviewing outputs, comments, and certifying approval/acceptance of works afterwards.

In case of any delays to achieve the expected outputs, the International Consultant should notify the FCPF REDD+ Chief Technical Advisor in advance to take necessary steps.

## **13. DUTY STATION**

The duty station for this assignment is Home-based, with mission to Port Moresby, PNG.

## **14. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE**

### **Education**

- Higher university studies at master's level in social sciences, environmental sciences, sciences policies, research or other related specialties related to international cooperation and development.

### **Work experience**

- At least 5 years of Experience in design, formulation and implementation of development programs and projects in the area of environment. Extensive planning experience strategic, results-based management (special domain of formulation of the theory of change).
- At least (2) mid-term or final evaluation reports submitted to FCPF, UN-REDD or equivalent;
- Experience and verifiable knowledge about REDD + and its components and on the mainstreaming of gender approach, human rights, and interculturality in programs and projects.

### **Competencies**

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Strong inter-personal skills, in particular, demonstrated team leadership qualities and excellent oral communication skills.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- High level planning, organizational and time management skills, including flexibility, attention to detail and the ability to work under pressure to meet challenging deadlines;
- Ability to quickly adapt to change, and to remain calm under pressure;

## **15. EVALUATION**

### Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract.

Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

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

\* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%

\* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Qualification</b>		<b>10%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Higher university studies at master's level in social sciences, environmental sciences, sciences policies, research or other related specialties related to international cooperation and development</li> </ul>	10	
<b>Experience</b>		<b>55%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 5 years of Experience in design, formulation and implementation of development programs and projects in the area of environment. Extensive planning experience strategic, results-based management (special domain of formulation of the theory of change).</li> </ul>	20	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least (2) mid-term or final evaluation reports submitted to FCPF, UN-REDD or equivalent</li> </ul>	20	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience and verifiable knowledge about REDD+ and its components and on the mainstreaming of</li> <li>• Gender approach, human rights, and interculturality in programs and projects</li> </ul>	15	
<b>Competencies</b>		<b>5%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fluency in written and spoken English.</li> </ul>	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong inter-personal skills, in particular, demonstrated team leadership qualities and excellent oral communication skills.</li> </ul>	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;</li> </ul>	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level planning, organizational and time management skills, including flexibility, attention to detail and the ability to work under pressure to meet challenging deadlines;</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to quickly adapt to change, and to remain calm under pressure;</li> </ul>	1	

<b>Technical Criteria</b>		70%
**If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.		
<b>Financial Criteria – Lowest Price</b>		30%
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>

### Documents to be included when submitting Consultancy Proposals

The following documents may be requested:

- a) Duly executed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP.
- b) **Signed P11/CV**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must stipulate that arrangement at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

### Lump-sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump-sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump-sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

### Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. 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, they 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 or covered by UNDP.

### Submission Instructions

Proposals may be submitted on or before the deadline as indicated below. Proposals must be submitted using this generic email [procurement.png@undp.org](mailto:procurement.png@undp.org) address only.

Incomplete proposals and failure to comply with proposal submission instruction may not be considered or may result in disqualification of proposal.

Completed proposals should be submitted using no later **than 30 July 2020**.

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to Tirnesh Prasad on [procurement.pg@undp.org](mailto:procurement.pg@undp.org)

UNDP looks forward to receiving your Proposal and thank you in advance for your interest in UNDP procurement opportunities.

Prepared by:



Mirzohaydar Isoev, FCPF REDD+ CTA 15-Jul-2020

Endorsed by:



Andrew Rylance, Acting Head of Environment and Energy Portfolio  
16-Jul-2020

## **Annex 1. List of minimum documents to consult**

- Proposal for the REDD + PNG preparation phase before the World Bank;
- Mid-Term Evaluation Report of the FCPF REDD+ Project
- PRODOC and Results Framework of the FCPF REDD+ Readiness Project (Phase 1 and 2)
- Project progress and annual reports.
- Minutes of Project Boards, meetings, events, follow-up visits.
- National REDD+ Strategy and REDD+ Finance and Investment Plan
- PNG Forest Reference Level;
- PNG's Summary of Information and SIS;
- List and details of key actors related to the FCPF REDD+ project.
- All assessment reports supported by the FCPF REDD+ Project.

## **Annex 2. Proposed structure of the Final Evaluation Report**

- Purpose and scope of the evaluation - A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
- Criteria and questions to which the evaluation must respond - The criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to evaluate performance and its logic.
- Assessment methodology—A description of the data collection methods and sources of information that will be used, including the reason for their selection (how they will assist in the evaluation) and their limitations; the tools, instruments and protocols for data collection, and an exchange on their reliability and validity for the evaluation;
- Evaluation matrix - Identify the key questions for the evaluation and how the answers will be obtained with the selected methods.
- Key stages schedule - Preliminary agenda of mission in PNG, deliverables.
- Detailed resource requirements linked to evaluation activities and detailed deliverables in the work plan.

## **Draft Final Evaluation Report**

The evaluation report template is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by- section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible.

The table of contents will be provided by UNDP Country Office.

### Annex 3: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

---

Evaluators:

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

#### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>5</sup>

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

---

<sup>5</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)