## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

**Title:** UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Specialist (International Consultant)

**Project:** Establishing Transparency Framework for the Republic of Serbia

**Reporting to:** UNDP Portfolio and Evaluation Managers

**Duty Station:** Home-based

**Contract Type:** Individual Contract Framework Agreement (IC) or Reimbursable Loan

**Duration:** 20 working days within the period December 2020 – 25 February 2021

**Background**

**Purpose**

To conduct the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the GEF -funded medium -sized project “Establishing Transparency Framework for the Republic of Serbia” (PIMS#6211) implemented by the Ministry of Environmental Protection with UNDP’s technical support.

**Objective**

The MTR will 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 neces-sary 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, its risks to sustainability.

**Background Information**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), acting as an implementing agency of the Global Envi-ronment Facility (GEF), is providing assistance to the Serbian Government, namely Ministry of Environmental Protection, in the preparation and implementation of the GEF funded project “Establishing Transparency Framework for the Republic of Serbia” (CBIT project).

The project started on March 8th, 2019 and is in its second year of implementation. The project was designed to:

* support the Government of Serbia in mainstreaming and integrating climate change considerations into development strategies and sector-based policy frameworks by strengthening and sustaining efforts to monitor, report, and verify activities to address climate change. Specifically, the project will assist the Gov-ernment of Serbia with strengthening the methodologies and tools necessary to enhance transparency as described in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement.
* accelerate Serbia’s EU accession process in the area of environment, energy and climate change, contrib-uting to creation of enabling policy and institutional environment for effective implementation of relevant EU Acquis and related national legal acts.

The project will result in the improved system of monitoring, reporting and verification of the data and infor-mation that will be used by the Serbian Government to implement climate & energy legislation and feed in the reporting processes and obligations arising out of various international treaties, such as UNFCCC and EU commitments.

The project will finalize and launch a monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) system that will provide more accurate information and analysis of the instruments that the country selects to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The MRV system will also allow Serbia to define and implement climate change-related policies and measures as expressed in its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) effectively.

Furthermore, the MRV system will increase stakeholder engagement, including local governments and the private sector in a gender-inclusive manner. Finally, the project will use training and peer exchanges to strengthen capacity for transparency, which will allow the country to undertake more ambitious commitments in its NDCs over time.

In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.

**Duties and Responsibilities**

a. **Scope of work and Methodology**

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The MTR Specialist will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the prepara-tion phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP), the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR Specialist will re-view the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins. The MTR Specialist is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders and project beneficiaries. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to implementing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Even though the MTR Specialist is expected to conduct field mission to Serbia, due to Covid-19 pandemic situation all meetings/interviews should be organized virtually.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team. The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR Specialist must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final MTR report must describe the full MTR 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. The MTR Specialist will closely work with engaged National consultant for UNDP-GEF Midterm Review.

b. **Key tasks**

The MTR Specialist will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned re-ports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR Specialist will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and draft midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool completed before the MTR mission begins. The MTR mission will consist of interviews with key staff involved in the project implementation and project beneficiaries. Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation all meetings/interviews should be organized vir-tually.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR 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.

Prior to the MTR mission/interviews The MTR Specialist should prepare a MTR inception report. The MTR in-ception report should outline the MTR team’s understanding of the project being assessed and the methodolo-gy(ies) the team will use to ensure the data collected is credible, reliable and useful. The inception report should also include a clear overview of the midterm review approach, including: the purpose, objective, and scope of the review; the MTR approach including a summary of the data collection methodologies and the criteria on which these methodologies were selected. For example, documentation reviews, stakeholder interviews, site visits, questionnaires, focus groups and other participatory techniques for information gathering; the principles and criteria against which the MTR Specialist is selecting interviewees, any limitations of the MTR; a proposed work plan including a schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables of the MTR (including a proposed detailed MTR mission plan); a MTR evaluative matrix, specifying the main review criteria, and the indicators or benchmarks against which the criteria will be assessed (see ToR Annex C for a MTR evaluative matrix tem-plate).

The MTR Specialist will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

1. **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 de-sign?
* 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?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.
* Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?

If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for

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 governance 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.
1. **Progress Towards Results**
* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right be-fore the Midterm Review.
* 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.
1. **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? 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 GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
* What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
* What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

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.
* 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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, pro-vide 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?
* Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditures’. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Co-financing** | **Name of Co- financer** | **Type of Co- financing** | **Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)** | **Actual Amount Contribut d at stage of Midterm Review (US$)** | **Actual % of Expected Amount** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **TOTAL** |  |  |  |

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?

• Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.

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?

• How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women’s participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

• Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?

• Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:

o The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.

o The identified types of risks2 (in the SESP).

o The individual risk ratings (in the SESP) .

• Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project’s social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project’s design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures. A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP’s safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project’s approval.

Reporting

• Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.

• Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)

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

Communications & Knowledge Management

• 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.

• List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

1. **Sustainability**

• Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register 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 GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, in-come 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 / stake holder 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 jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR Specialist will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Additionally, the MTR Specialist is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. 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. The MTR Specialist should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR Specialist will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

c. **Deliverables and Timeline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Deadline** |
| 1. UNDP- GEF MTR Inception Report prepared and accepted | 11 January 2021 |
| 2. Presentation of Initial Findings to UNDP, Implementing partner and beneficiaries prepared and conducted | 29 January 2021 |
| 3. Draft MTR Report: Full report with annexes prepared and submitted | 15 February 2021 |
| 4.Final MTR Report (up to 30 pages) prepared and accepted | 5 days upon received comments, not later than 25 February 2021 |

NOTE 1: All deliverables are subject to quality review, clearance and acceptance by UNDP Evaluation Manager. None of the materi-als, reports, produced under this Contract may be used, released, and/or disseminated without prior approval by UNDP.

NOTE 2: Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation all meetings/interviews should be organized virtually

NOTE 3: The final MTR report must be in English

**Institutional Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP CO Serbia will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

Note: Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation all meetings/interviews should be organized virtually

**Skills and Competencies**

* Excellent analytical skills
* Displays ability to synthesize research and reach empirically based conclusions on related subject
* Strong writing skills
* Proven capacity to produce reports
* Displays capacity to provide experienced advice on best practices
* Possesses knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues
* Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback
* Good application of Results-Based Management
* Good communication, coordination and facilitation skills
* Consistently ensures timeliness and quality of work
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
* Demonstrates integrity by modeling ethical standards

**Qualifications and Experience**

Education

* An advanced university degree in the project related field (mechanical/ electrical/ agriculture/ forestry/ environment engineering or economy)
* Knowledge of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement

Experience

* Minimum 10 years of professional experience in relevant technical areas, preferably in energy/environmental protection sectors
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies
* Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF Climate Change Focal Area
* Track record of professional international experience in project development/ management/ monitoring/ evaluation in the climate change field
* Proven record of managed/developed GEF projects
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations, means of verification: the list of evaluat-ed GEF projects
* Good knowledge of international experiences, state of the art approaches and best practices in the specific areas the project and its subcomponents are dealing with
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
* Experience in working with wide range of stakeholders (private, governmental, etc.).

Languages

Fluency in English

Ethics

The MTR Specialist/team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the princi-ples outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The MTR team 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 MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

The MTR 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.

DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS

Application Procedure

Application should include:

• CV in English language containing date of birth, contact information (home address, phone number, e-mail) and timeline of work experience (including description of duties);

• Offeror’s Letter (only PDF format will be accepted) confirming Interest and availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment. Can be downloaded from the following link: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/Confirmation.docx>.

• The Offeror’s Letter should include financial proposal specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement with a breakdown of costs.

• Offeror’s Letter must also include the methodology concept containing a preliminary plan of work (no more than two pages).

Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the e-mail vacancy.rs@undp.org. The procuring UNDP entity will respond by standard electronic mail and will send response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

Financial Proposal:

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 installments 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 request-ing unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, 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 sta-tion/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 he/she should do so using their own resources.

Evaluation

1. Cumulative analysis

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

1. responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical Criteria weight; 70%

Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Points** |  |
|  | Technical | 70% | 70 points |  |
|  |  Criteria A | Desk review of CVs based on relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas, preferably in energy/environmental protection sectors | 30 |  |
|  |  Criteria B | Desk Review of CVs based on experience in working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations | 25 |  |
|  |  Criteria C | Qualifications (Educational background and language requirements) | 15 |  |
|  | Financial | 30% | 30 points |  |

Additional Information:

• Individual Contract (IC) will be applicable for individual consultants applying in their own capacity.

• Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) will be applicable for applicants employed by anylegal entity. Template of RLA with General Terms and Conditions could be found on: http://www.undp.org.rs/download/RLA%20with%20General%20Terms%20and%20Conditions.doc.

In the case of engagement of Civil servants under IC contract modality a no-objection letter should be provided by the Government entity. The ‘no-objection’ letter must also state that the employer formally certifies that their employees are allowed to receive short-term consultancy assignment from another entity without being on “leave-without-pay” status (if applicable) and include any conditions and restrictions on granting such permission, if any. If the previous is not applicable ‘leave-without-pay’ confirmation should be submitted.

Engagement of Government Officials and Employees

• Government Officials or Employees are civil servants of UN Member States. As such, if they will be engaged by UNDP under an IC which they will be signing in their individual capacity (i.e., engagement is not done through RLA signed by their Government employer), the following conditions must be met prior to the award of contract:

1. A “No-objection” letter in respect of the individual is received from the Government employing him/her, and;
2. The individual must provide an official documentation from his/her employer formally certifying his or her status as being on “official leave without pay” for the duration of the IC.

• The above requirements are also applicable to Government-owned and controlled enterprises and well as other semi/partially or fully owned Government entities, whether or not the Government ownership is of majority or mi-nority status.

• UNDP recognizes the possibility that there are situations when the Government entity employing the individual that UNDP wishes to engage is one that allows its employees to receive external short-term consultancy as-signments (including but not limited to research institutions, state-owned colleges/universities, etc.), whereby a status of “on-leave-without-pay” is not required. Under such circumstance, the individual entering into an IC with UNDP must still provide a “No-objection” letter from the Government employing him/her. The “no objection” let-ter required under (i) above must also state that the employer formally certifies that their employees are allowed to receive short-term consultancy assignment from another entity without being on “leave-without-pay” status, and include any conditions and restrictions on granting such permission, if any. The said document may be ob-tained by, and put on record of, UNDP, in lieu of the document (ii) listed above