

TERMS OF REFERENCE

For the procurement of a Consultant for Midterm Review of Poverty Environment Action for SDGs (PEA) Project

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location:	Home based with field visits (If situation permits)
Application Deadline:	24 th July 2020
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Assignment Type:	International Consultant
Reports to:	PEA Co-managers
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date:	August 2020
Expected Duration of Assignment:	60 working days

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title

Poverty Environment Action for Sustainable Development Goals (PEA)

B. Project Description

Poverty-Environment Action for the Sustainable Development Goals (PEA) is a global project jointly implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as strategic actors within the UN system to advance the environmental dimension of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. PEA's emphasis on sustainable investments makes it a key UN country level intervention in support of the Addis Ababa Financing for Development agenda to mobilize and align public and private finance for the SDGs. UNDP serves as the Managing Agent (MA) for the USD 20 million project financed by the European Union (EU), Austrian Development Agency (ADA), Norway and Sweden (through UNEP), as well as (in-kind) core resources from UN agencies. The project implementation period runs from 1 September 2018 to 31 August 2022.

By building on Poverty Environment Initiative's (PEI) strong legacy, PEA, as a hub of expertise and knowledge on the integration of environment and poverty considerations in development policies, plans and investments, is uniquely placed to ensure that the environmental dimension is not left behind when addressing poverty and promoting development. PEA also provides opportunities to improve the quality of private sector investments to support poverty-environment objectives. This represents the new focus of Poverty-Environment Action—aligning finance and investment with poverty, environment and climate objectives to accelerate SDG implementation.

PEA aims to strengthen integration of poverty-environment-climate objectives into policies, plans, regulations and investments of partner countries to accelerate delivery of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs through development planning, budgeting and monitoring systems that integrate environmental sustainability and climate objectives for poverty eradication; public finance and investment frameworks that incentivize shifts in public and private investments towards environmental sustainability and climate objectives for poverty eradication; and SDG implementation and acceleration processes leveraged to scale up the use of integrated poverty environment mainstreaming approaches and tools.

A total of eight full-fledged countries are being supported through the initiative with four in Africa (Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique and Rwanda) and four in Asia (Bangladesh, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Nepal) with different implementation arrangement modalities. Tanzania and Indonesia are two countries that are also being supported with technical assistance but are not full-fledged countries. Projects' key stakeholders and partners, among others include local Governments, Donors, public and private institutions etc. Project implementation started in September 2018 with a four months inception period from September to December 2018. This being the second year of implementation, a Mid-Term Review (MTR) is scheduled to commence during the last quarter of 2020 to assess progress and inform any adjustments as part of adaptive management, including measures to minimize risks and the negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemics on PEA implementation.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

C. Objective and Scope of Work (Key Tasks)

The main objective of the MTR is to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and 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 MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability. Field visits are expected to be undertaken by the consultant to two full-fledged countries i.e. Malawi and Myanmar, and to one technical assistance country i.e. Indonesia (countries were selected with due consideration of geographical distribution and implementation duration). In the event that field visits of the consultant is not feasible due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, alternatives will have to be proposed by the consultant for Co-Managers' approval.

The scope of the MTR includes the entirety of PEA's activities at the outcome and output levels covering from 2018 to date. The MTR covers interventions funded by all sources. By reviewing the framework indicators against progress made towards the project outputs targets, using a Results Matrix with color code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved, the MTR consultant assigns a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome and make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red). The MTR will also examine the PEA's contribution toward cross-cutting issues, e.g. human rights, gender, leaving no one behind, and capacity development. The MTR should be forward-looking by drawing lessons from the last years' project implementation and propose recommendations for the coming years.

The MTR will answer three broad questions as follows:

- What did the PEA project intend to achieve during the period under review?

- To what extent has the project achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives at the output level, and what contribution has it made at the outcome level?
- What factors contributed to or hindered the project's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

In addition to the above questions, the MTR is expected to produce answers surrounding the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Below are guiding questions and areas for review:

1. Relevance

- To what extent has the project responded to the priorities and the needs of target beneficiaries as defined in the project document?
- To what extent did the project promote SSC/Triangular cooperation?
- Has the project been able to effectively adapt its areas of work to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in projects' implementation countries?
- Review the Theory of Change of the project if it is still relevant.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most appropriate route towards expected results, building on PEI's legacy and strengths.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities and if it is aligned with the national development, UNDAF and strategic plan.
- Review the functionality of project governance structure which includes but not limited to technical committees, steering committees, project board et al.
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's framework indicators and targets, baseline data, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timebound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Review how the project is contributing to vulnerable groups, gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach

2. Effectiveness

- By reviewing the results and resources framework, is the project on track to achieve intended results at the outcome and output levels? What are the key achievements and what factors contributed to the achievements or non-achievement of those results?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- Identify challenges encountered and remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- Has the project been effective in addressing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic? Does it have strategies and approaches to mitigate the impact and protect stakeholders?

3. Efficiency

- To what extent is the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results
- Review the support provided by Managing agent and Technical support and recommend areas for improvement.
- Examine how the COVID 19 pandemics has contributed/could further contribute to additional delays and the risk of not achieving the project objectives and targets and propose measures to sail through and cope with the situation.
- Assess whether the combined expertise of the project team is adequate to deliver against the project objectives and targets.
- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions. Examine possible funding shortfalls and their likely impact; assess the effectiveness of the fund mobilization strategy to fill the gap.
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- 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?
- 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?
- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? What feedback mechanisms are in place?
- 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?) and ensuring donors' visibility.

4. Sustainability

- What outcomes and outputs have the most likelihood of sustainability and being adopted by partners and why?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have national partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?
- What is the possible impact of Covid-19 on project's sustainability?

Human rights:

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from project's interventions in contributing to enhance fulfillment of people's economic and social right
- What barriers have been seen to the inclusion of vulnerable groups in the project's work and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?

Gender equity:

- To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to the project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
- In what way could the project enhance gender equality in the coming years?

D. Methodology and Approaches:

The MTR methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The MTR will be carried out by an independent consultant who will adopt an integrated approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis tools to generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of project's support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits where/when possible. It is expected that the evaluation methodology will comprise of the following elements:

- Review documents (Desk Review): the MTR consultant will conduct a desk review of all relevant sources of information i.e. the Project Document, progress reports, inception report, M&E Framework, roles and responsibilities, management arrangements, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, internal M&E data, legal documents and any other materials that the PEA team considers useful for the evidence-based review, including the PEI Final Evaluation Report
- Interview with key stakeholders including in-person and through social media platforms, skype and or zoom meetings, online surveys interview et al, ensuring close engagement with the Global PEA Project Team, UNDP and UNEP Headquarters, donors and other members of the Project Board, the UNDP Country Offices, government counterparts and other key stakeholders.
- Consultations with beneficiaries through interviews and/ or focus group discussions;
- Survey and/ or questionnaires where appropriate;
- Triangulation of information collected from different sources/methods to enhance the validity of the findings.

The evaluation is expected to use a variety of data sources, primary, secondary, qualitative, quantitative, etc. to be extracted through surveys, storytelling, focus group discussions, face to face interviews, participatory methods, desk reviews, etc. conducted with a variety of partners. A transparent and participatory multi-stakeholder approach should be followed for data collection from government partners, community members, private sector, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, etc. Evidence will be provided for every claim generated by the evaluation and data will be triangulated to ensure validity. An evaluation matrix or other methods can be used to map the data and triangulate the available evidence.

In line with the UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, gender disaggregation of data is a key element of all UNDP's interventions and data collected for the evaluation will be disaggregated by gender, to the extent possible, and assessed against the programme outputs/outcomes.

Special note: Given the ongoing COVID 19 pandemic and the resultant restrictions may require many of the in-person missions/consultations and data gathering / activities to be carried out remotely using electronic conferencing means.

E. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR consultant shall prepare and submit the following:

- *Kick-off meeting:* MTR consultant will give an overall presentation about the review, including the approach, work plans and other necessary elements during the kick-off meeting. Consultant can seek further clarification and expectations of co-managers and PEA team in the kick-off meeting.
- *MTR Inception Report:* (up to 10 pages and to be submitted no later than 2 weeks after signing of the contract). The inception report, containing the proposed the theory of change, and evaluation methodology should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with Co-managers. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. The inception report should be endorsed by co-managers before the MTR starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit.
- *MTR debriefings* immediately following the review, the MTR consultant is required to present a preliminary debriefing of findings to co-managers and project board.
- *Draft evaluation report* (max 60 pages including executive summary with full report with annexes submitted two weeks after debriefings): Co-managers and other designated quality assurers and key stakeholders in the MTR, will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the consultant within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- *MTR report audit trail:* comments and changes by the MTR consultant in response to the draft report should be retained by the consultant to show how they have addressed comments.
- *Final MTR report:* the revised/final report with all considerations addressed to be submitted 2 weeks after receiving comments on draft report. The report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making clear the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review leading to the findings. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable and relevant. A recommendation table should form part of the report's executive summary.
- *Presentation of final evaluation report:* to co-managers, project board and key stakeholders (this maybe done remotely)
- *Evaluation brief* (2 pages maximum) and *other knowledge products* or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

F. Institutional Arrangement

The evaluation will be jointly managed by UNDP and UNEP in close collaboration with UNDP/BPPS and joint oversight from the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office and UN Environment Evaluation Offices of the evaluation process and products, refer to as HQ's evaluation focal point. This entails use of UNDP guidelines, oversight, review and comments during the key stages of evaluation cycle- finalization of the TORs; selection of the consultant and review of the inception, draft and final evaluation reports- to ensure full independence of the evaluation process.

The Evaluation will be conducted by an Independent Consultant who will be recruited and administered through UNDP BPPS who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory quality completion of Final Evaluation deliverables together with the PEA Co-Managers.

Furthermore, the PEA Co-Managers and PEA Board will provide insights and other inputs into evaluation deliverables and promote learning and ownership of the evaluation findings and recommendations among PEA stakeholders and partners. The Independent Consultant will report to the PEA Co-Managers. The day-to-day management of the Independent Consultant has been delegated to the Evaluation Manager, appointed by the PEA Co-Managers who will liaise with the relevant evaluation stakeholders, project manager and joint project team as well as participate in all stages of the evaluation process.

There will be close coordination with the PEA Co-Managers, Evaluation Manager and joint project team who will assist in connecting the Independent Consultant with senior management, development partners, beneficiaries and key stakeholders. In addition, the joint project team will provide key documentation prior to fieldwork and assist in developing a detailed programme to facilitate consultations as necessary.

Below are detailed roles and responsibilities for the insituational arrangements:

Roles	Responsibilities
Commissioner of the MTR: Co-managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead and ensure the development of comprehensive, representative, strategic and costed MTR; • Determine scope of the MTR in consultation with key partners; • Provide clear advice to the Evaluation Manager on how the findings will be used; • Respond to the MTR by preparing a management response and use the findings as appropriate; • Safeguard the independence of the exercise; • Approve TOR, inception report and final report. • Allocate adequate funding and human resources. • Ensure dissemination of the MTR report to all the stakeholders
MTR Manager: M&E Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead the development of the MTR TOR in consultation with stakeholders; • Manage the selection and recruitment of the consultant; • Manage the contractual arrangements, the budget and the personnel involved in the MTR; • Provide executive and coordination support; • Provide the Evaluation Team with administrative support and required data; • Liaise with and respond to the commissioners; • Connect the consultant with the wider key evaluation stakeholders and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the MTR; • Review the inception report and final report.
Project Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide inputs/advice to the MTR on the detail and scope of the TOR and how the findings will be used; • Ensure and safeguard the independence of MTR;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the MTR manager with all required data and documentation and contacts/stakeholders list, etc.; • Support the arrangement of interview, meetings and field missions; • Provide comments and clarification on the terms of reference, inception report and draft reports; • In consultation with relevant stakeholders, respond to MTR recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations; • Ensure dissemination of the report to all the stakeholders including the project boards; • Responsible for the implementation of key actions on recommendations in partnership with Implementing partners
HQ's Evaluation Focal Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the review process and ensure compliance with corporate standards; • Provide technical support including advice on the development of terms of reference; recruitment of consultant; implementation and finalization of review, management responses and key actions • Ensure management response tracking and support M&E capacity development and knowledge-sharing; • Dispute resolution when issues arise in implementation of MTR. • Contributes to the quality assurance process of the MTR.
Key MTR Partner: Project Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of key evaluation deliverables, including terms of reference, the inception report and successive versions of the draft evaluation report; • Provide inputs/advice how the findings will be used; • Assist in collecting required data; • Review draft MTR report for accuracy and factual errors (if any);
MTR Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the terms of reference as appropriate; • Ensure the quality (including editorial) of the report and its findings and recommendations; • Develop the MTR inception report, including an MTR matrix, in line with the terms of reference, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines; • Draft reports and brief the evaluation manager, project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations; • Finalize the MTR report, taking into consideration comments and questions on the report. • Record and share feedback in the audit trail; • Support Project's efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination if required

G. Duration of the Contract

The MTR consultancy will be for 60 working days over a time of approximately 7 weeks and shall not exceed 3 months from when the consultant is hired. The final MTR report is expected to be completed and submitted by mid-December 2020.

The consultant will be homebased with International travel when situation permits due to Covid 19. Travel is required to Malawi, Nairobi/Kenya in Africa, Myanmar and Indonesia and Bangkok/Thailand in Asia. However, use of social platforms is encouraged for engagement with stakeholders due to current travel restrictions in most countries. Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>;

Suggested working day allocation and schedule for MTR:

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and Inception report				
Meeting briefing	-	At contract signing	In-person/ remote	MTR manager and commissioner
Sharing of the relevant documentation with consultant	-	At contract signing	Via email	Project manager, MTR manager/commissioner
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Within two weeks of contract signing	Home-based	MTR consultant
Kick-off meeting, submission of the inception report (10 pages maximum)	5 days	Within two weeks of contract signing	Home-based	MTR consultant
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report	Via email	MTR manager and commissioner
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	34 days	Within five weeks of contract signing	With field visits	Project Manager and MTR manager to arrange with relevant project partners/stakeholders etc.
Debriefing to PEA project and key stakeholders	1 day			MTR consultant
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation and submission of draft evaluation report	9 days	Within two weeks of the completion of the field mission	Home-based	MTR consultant
Share stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report	Via email	MTR manager, commissioner and HQs Evaluation focal points
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day	Within one week of receipt of comments	Remotely	UNDP, evaluation reference group,

				stakeholder and MTR consultant
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided	5 days	Within one week of final debriefing	Home-based	MTR consultant
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (60 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	Within one week of final debriefing	Home-based	MTR consultant
Estimated total days for MTR	60			

In the event that field visits of the consultant is not feasible due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, alternatives will have to be proposed by the consultant for Co-Managers' approval.

H. Remuneration:

UNDP will issue a lump sum contract based on the agreed fee, upon certification by the MTR commissioners/co-managers that expected services have been satisfactorily performed. The consultant payments will be made as shown in the table below.

Deliverables	Payment
1. Upon satisfactory delivery of Phase One: Desk review and Inception report	30%
2. Upon satisfactory delivery of Phase Two: Data-collection mission	30%
3. Upon satisfactory completion of Phase Three: Evaluation report writing and submission	40%

As per UNDP Travel guidelines, the standard for air travel authorized by UNDP for individual consultant is economy class; should the consultant choose to arrange travel by her/himself, s/he will receive the travel entitlement at full fare economy class from UNDP for each mission. Actual settlement of travel cost will be based on invoice of ticket purchased and paid up to the entitlement amount. Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be paid per nights spent outside consultant's home town; at the place the mission takes place following UNDP DSA standard rates. Travel costs will be settled separately from the consultant fees.

I. List of documents to be reviewed and consulted

- Poverty Environment Action for SDGs project document
- Project documents/proposals for all PEA countries
- Inception report (September-December 2018)
- 2019 donor annual reports (Narrative and Financial)
 - EU Donor report (Sept 2018-December 2019)
 - Horizons of Hope (January to December 2019)

- M&E framework
- PEA Visibility plan
- Resource mobilization strategy
- Technical assistance proposals
- Country office progress reports
- Country office Annual Work Plans
- Project organogram and ToRs
- Project multiyear budgets
- Approved global workplans
- Project Board Minutes
- Executive members meeting minutes

In addition to reviewing the documents relating to PEA project, the consultant should visit UNDP Independence Evaluation Office's website <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml> to be updated with UNDP's relevant information and documents required

J. Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' which are available here: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>.

The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultants must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

Qualifications and professional experience

- Minimum of a master's degree in international development, environmental sciences, development studies, relevant political or social science or closely related field
- Extensive project review experience, including of large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach
- Project review experience within United Nations system particularly UNDP supported projects
- Excellent understanding and experience of environment(-poverty) mainstreaming purpose and approaches.
- Experience in country-level project management and implementation
- Experience in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Demonstrable analytical skills

Consultant Independence:

The consultant should not 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 the project's related activities.

APPLICATION PROCESS

The application should contain:

- **CV** using Personal History Form (P11), indicating all relevant past experiences and the contact details of at least three (3) professional referees (Blank P11 form can be downloaded from http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc);
- **Financial Proposal** that indicates the daily rate/fee of the candidate in US dollars, using the **Offeror's letter to UNDP confirming interest and availability**

Incomplete applications will be disqualified automatically. All applications must be submitted through the UNDP eTendering portal.

- If already registered, please go to <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> and sign in using your username and password, and search for the **event**:
Business Unit: **UNDP1**
Event ID:
- If you do not remember your password, please use the "Forgotten password" link. Do not create a new profile.
- If you have never registered in the system before, please complete a one-time registration process first by visiting <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> and using the below generic credentials:
Username: **event.guest**
Password: **why2change**

Detailed user guide on how to register in the system and submit the proposal can be found at:

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/business/procurementnotices/resources/>

Email submission of applications will not be accepted. Queries about the position can be directed to bids.gpcnairobi@undp.org.

Note: Payments will be based on invoices on achievement of agreed milestones i.e. upon delivery of the deliverables specified in the TOR and certification of acceptance by the UNDP. The applicant must factor in all possible costs in his/her "All Inclusive Lump Sum Daily Fee" financial proposal including his/her consultancy and professional fee, communication cost such as telephone/internet usage, printing cost, ad-hoc costs, stationery costs, and any other foreseeable costs in this exercise. No costs other than what has been indicated in the financial proposal will be paid or reimbursed to the consultant. The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

Financial evaluation - Total 30% (30 points)

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

- $p = y (\mu/z)$, where
- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated

Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a) Completed Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- b) Personal CV or a P11 Personal History form, indicating all 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 two-page 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.
- d) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs. If an applicant 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 applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant who has obtained the highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions. Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. The offers will be evaluated using the "Combined Scoring method" where:

- a) The technical proposal will be weighted a max. of 70%;
- b) The financial proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

Technical evaluation criteria (70%)

Criteria 1. Minimum of a master's degree in international development, environmental sciences, development studies, relevant political or social science or closely related field; Weight = 10%; Maximum Points: 10;

Criteria 2. Extensive project review experience, including of large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach Weight = 20 %; Maximum Points: 20;

Criteria 3. Project review/evaluation experience within United Nations system particularly UNDP supported projects Weight = 10 %; Maximum Points: 15;

Criteria 4. Excellent understanding and expertise in environment and climate change mainstreaming issues and approaches Weight = 15% Maximum Points: 15;

Criteria 5. Experience in country-level project management and implementation. Weight = 10% Maximum Points: 10.

Having reviewed applications received, UNDP will invite the top three/four shortlisted candidates, with minimum scores of 42 points (70% of 60 points) for interview. Please note that only shortlisted candidates will be contacted. Candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% (49 points) of the maximum obtainable points for the technical criteria (70 points) shall be considered for the financial evaluation.

Contract Award

Candidate obtaining the highest combined scores in the combined score of Technical and Financial evaluation will be considered qualified and will be offered the contract with UNDP.