**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATION (International Consultant)**

***“Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Lao PDR’s Agricultural and Land Management Policies, Plans and Programmes (ABP)”***

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the UNDP and AF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term evaluation of the full-size project “*Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Lao PDR’s Agricultural and Land Management Policies, Plans and Programmes (ABP)”* implemented through the *Ministry of Agriculture (MAF) / Permanence Secretary Office (PSO)* is to be undertaken in February 2014. The project started on the *11st of April 2011 (signing of project documents)* and is coming into its *3rd* year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term evaluation.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | *Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Lao PDR’s Agricultural and Land Management Policies, Plans and Programmes (ABP)* | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00075435 | **Project financing** | *At endorsement ( US$)* | *At MTE ( US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 00060069 | GEF financing: | 2,265,000 cash |  |
| Country: | Lao PDR | Government: | 556,200 in-kind |  |
| Region: | South East Asia | UNDP: | 321,900 in-kind |  |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | UNDP: | 213,000 cash |  |
| FAO:: | 345,772 in-kind |  |
| Executing Agency: | * Ministry of Agriculture (MAF) * Permanence Secretary Office (PSO) | SDC/TABI: | 3,000,000 parallel |  |
| Other Partners involved: | * FAO through Letter of Agreement * Department of Planning(DoP/MAF) * Department of Forestry * National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute (NAFRI) * Ministry of Justice (MoJ) * Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) * Department of Agriculture and Cooperative | Total resources- in cash: | 2,478,000 |  |
| Total resources- in kind | 1,223,872 |  |
|  | Planned closing date:  July 2016 |  |

### PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES

*Project background*

Lao Peoples’ Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) lies in the center of the Indochinese peninsula surrounded by Thailand, Vietnam, China, Myanmar and Cambodia. Lao PDR has a population of 6.67 million people, and the overall population density is low at 24 people per Km2. As a result of its relatively wide ranges of latitude and altitude, its rich water resources and tropical climate, Lao hosts globally significant tropical ecosystems.

Within these ecosystems are diverse agro-ecosystems ranging from the slash and burn agriculture of the uplands, through long standing agro-forests in the middle lands, to paddy fields, household or community managed wetlands in the lower-lying lands of the Mekong Plain. These ecosystems contain a huge number of globally and locally significant species of plants, animals, fungi and other organisms.

The richness and as such global significance of Lao PDR’s agro-biodiversity is attributable to several factors: location between two major bio-geographical zones –the temperature north and the tropical south –high ethnic diversity, and different climatic and altitudinal zones. Lao PDR is thought to be at the center of domestication for Asian rice and the center of origin for job’s tears. Other potentially globally significant agro-biodiversity include cultivated local and indigenous varieties of maize, sugar cane varieties such as oy hok and oy pa used in confectionaries; bushy peas including indigenous varieties currently being studied at NAFRI; Livestock; and crop associated biodiversity such as wild crop relatives and pollinators and other insects.

The Government of Lao PDR has developed and implemented a wide-range of policies that directly or indirectly impact the use, development and conservation of biodiversity. The main overall development goals reflect international commitments and focus on poverty reduction, economic growth and social development, advancement of infrastructure and investment in hydropower and mining, but also protecting the environment. They also acknowledge that future economic growth continues to rely on the sustainable use of the natural resource base and the conservation of forests and biodiversity. At the national level, main responsibility for the management and conservation of biodiversity in agricultural landscapes rests with The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), although responsibility to implement CBD related commitments has been recently transferred to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE).

The project aims to contribute to a long term solution whereby “Lao PDR’s biodiversity, including agro-biodiversity, is maintained, protected and sustainably used as a key to poverty alleviation and adaptation to climate change impact”. With this solution the overall goal is conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources in agro-ecosystems in Lao PDR for the attainment of food security sustainable economic development, however several barriers exist. To achieve productivity and food security at the household level, the multiple values of conserving Lao PDR”s biodiversity endowment has to be mainstreamed into government policies. There are inadequate incentives and capacities to mainstream biodiversity, especially agro-biodiversity, at community, district, province and national level.

Loss of crop and domestic animal diversity, crop-associated biodiversity and other biodiversity within agro-ecosystems and degradation of ecosystems are being caused through a number of direct and indirect threats. Land use practices are placing greater pressures on biodiversity and agro-biodiversity, and significant impacts: reduced resilience, a loss of ecosystem services and reduced adaptive capacity for agriculture.

*Project Objective*

The objective of the project is to provide farmers with the necessary incentives, capacities and supporting institutional framework to conserve agricultural biodiversity within farming systems of the Lao PDR.

*Three* outcomes will contribute to this objective. The progress toward the objective and outcomes is measured through the following indicators:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective / Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Target by end of project** |
| **Objective:**  To provide farmers with the necessary incentives, capacities and supporting institutional framework to conserve agricultural biodiversity with in farming systems of Lao PDR | Area of provincial agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use total 100,000 ha | 100,000 ha |
| **Outcome 1:**  National policy and institutional frameworks for sustainable use, and in-situ conservation of biodiversity in agro-ecosystems | Number of new national plans, policies, laws, strategies, and guidelines with agro-biodiversity concerns | 8 |
| **Outcome 2:**  Capacities and incentives to mainstream biodiversity, especially agro-biodiversity, at the provincial, district and community levels | Number of farmers adopting skills and techniques promoted through Farmer Filed Scholl and farmer field days | 1,000 farmers. |
| **Outcome 3:**  Effective Project management | Number of strategic recommendations from the Agro-biodiversity from agro-biodiversity steering committee. | 6 |

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MID-TERM EVALUATION (MTE)**

The objective of the MTE is to provide an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTE will identify potential project design problems, evaluate progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF supported AF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTE will evaluate early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. It will also include recommendations for ensuring sustainability of the outcomes beyond the project end-date. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework (see Annex 1).

The MTE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluation team is expected to conduct field missions to different government agencies in Vientiane capital, Luangparbang and Xiengkoung provinces, including the project sites in Phonexay and Phoukout districts*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
2. Implementing Partner – National
3. The Chair of Project Board
4. The National Project Director (NPD) and Project Manager (PM)
5. Project stakeholders, to be determined at the inception meeting; including academia, local government and CBOs

The team will evaluate all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PIRs, GEF BD SO2 tracking tools, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the team for review is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference.

# SCOPE OF THE MTE

The evaluation team will evaluate the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the evaluation team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex 3.

* 1. **Progress towards Results**

Project design:

* Evaluate the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Evaluate the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.
* Evaluate the relevance of the project strategy (and theory of change) and whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Evaluate how the project addresses country priorities.
* Evaluate the baseline data included in the project results framework and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

* Evaluate the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
* 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. Suggest measures to improve the project’s development impact, including gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
* Evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners, and how the different needs of male and female stakeholders has been considered. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
  1. **Adaptive management**

Work Planning

1. Are works planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
2. Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and evaluate any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and evaluate the impact of the revised approach on project management.

Finance and co-finance:

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Complete the co-financing monitoring table (see Annex 4).
3. Evaluate the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems

1. Evaluate the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
2. Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators meet UNDP-GEF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
3. Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators as necessary.
4. Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

1. Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, PPRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Give particular attention to critical risks.
2. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

1. Evaluate how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
2. Evaluate how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
   1. **Management arrangements**
3. Evaluate 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.
4. Evaluate the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.

Evaluate the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

**4.4 Sustainability**

1. Evaluate clarity of project design sustainability expectations and project exit strategy development and determined effectiveness of these strategies.
2. Evaluate financial viability of mainstreaming measures that may support ongoing sustainability.
3. Outline policy development measures that may support sustainability.
4. Outline institutional capacity development measures that may support sustainability.
5. ***MID TERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| Inception Report | Evaluation team clarifies timing and method of evaluation | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission | Evaluation team submits to UNDP Country Office |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management and UNDP Country Office (CO) |
| Draft Final Report | Full report (as template in annex 5) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), Program Support Unit (PSU), and Implementing Partner (IP) |
| Final Report | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report). | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP CO |

1. ***IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS***

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Vientiane, Lao PDR. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions within Vientiane capital and to Luangparbang and Xiengkhoung provinces (Phonexay and Phoukot districts)

1. ***TIMEFRAME***

The total duration of the evaluation will be 4 weeks starting February 2014 according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe** |
| Preparation | February 3-5, 2014 *(3 days)* |
| Evaluation mission and debriefing | February 6-16, 2014 *(11 days)* |
| Draft evaluation report | (February 17-19, 2014*)* *(3 days)* |
| Finalisation of final report | (February 20-22, 2014*)* *(3 days)* |

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION/ International**

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the evaluation - one international team leader and one national expert. The recruitment for both the international team leader and national expert with led by the UNDP Country Office as separate recruitments. The consultants will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The team should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

**The overall responsibility for methodology, work plan and organization of the mission, and production of a high quality final report in English lies with the International Consultant. The qualification requirement for the international consultant are included:**

* Recognized degree (at least MSc level) in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, Agro-biodiversity conservation policy, social sciences, agriculture and rural development, other biodiversity related sciences
* 15 years of relevant experience in development work, with a focus on socio-economic analysis, 10 years technical experience with agro-biodiversity policy development and analysis, the socio-economic impact assessment related to agro-biodiversity and rural development, and institutional development towards agro-biodiversity into the national strategy plans.
* Capability to lead and guide the works of the national consultant into joint working results and evaluation reports
* The team should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage
* Recent experience with UNDP ‘s result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in mainstream policies in to the agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use projects
* Recognized expertise in the management and sustainable use of biodiversity
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Excellent English communication skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience working in the Mekong region (South East Asia).

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| 50 | Upon approval of 1st draft mid-term evaluation report |
| 50 | Upon approval of final mid-term evaluation report |

Signature of Environment Unit Manager, UNDP Lao PDR\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ , Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Annex 1: Project log frame**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcomes/outputs | Baselines | Indicators | Targets |
| **Outcome1**. National policy and institutional frameworks for sustainable use, and *in-situ* conservation of biodiversity in agro-ecosystems | - Land use policies and legal instruments do not include focus on biodiversity (especially agro biodiversity).  - Agriculture Law does not incorporate emphasis on biodiversity, including agro-biodiversity.  - Integration of biodiversity related criteria into ESIA guidelines are poor. | Number of new national plans, policies, laws, strategies, and guidelines with agro-biodiversity concerns | 8 |
| Output 1.1. Biodiversity conservation, including agro-biodiversity, incorporated into Government policies, laws and other legal instruments. | Emphasis on agro-biodiversity in BD strategy and action plan is weak | Number of national workshops with biodiversity content | 10 |
| Output1.2.Institutional coordination of agro-biodiversity enhanced at national level | Currently, there is no formal coordination mechanism for agro-biodiversity conservation | Number of yearly agro-biodiversity inter- sectoral coordination meetings | 2 |
| Output1.3.Institutional capacity of MAF/GOL to plan for, implement and effectively communicate on agro-biodiversity enhanced at national level | Institutional and staff capacities of MAF/GOL to mainstream biodiversity into agriculture and land use policies are low. | Number of GOL officers participated in meetings where agro-biodiversity issues are discussed | 500 |
| Output 1.4.Key stakeholders understanding and capacity to respond to agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use enhanced. | Existing tools such as training, extension, communication and mapping are not adequately used for wider stakeholder awareness or mainstream biodiversity into their work | Number of tools developed to support and enhanced incorporation of agro-biodiversity into national and institutional frameworks | 6 |
| **Outcome2.** Capacities and incentives to mainstream biodiversity, especially agro-biodiversity, at the Provincial, District and community levels. | - Existing strategies and capacity building for 2 target provinces agriculture land use do not incorporate biodiversity conservation. - Existing training and extension do not incorporate agro-biodiversity conservation issues. | Number of farmers adopting skills and techniques promoted through FFS and farmer field days | 1,ooo farmers |
| Output2.1.Capacity of Provincial and District government to mainstream Biodiversity into agriculture increased | Existing strategies and capacity building for 2 target provinces; agriculture land use do not incorporate biodiversity. | Number of Technical Service Centers in cluster villages with agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use activities | 4 |
| Output2.2.Participatory land use plans integrating agro-biodiversity developed in pilot sites | Existing area with participatory land use plans and participatory are low and do not include agro-biodiversity conservation. | Number of cluster villages with pFLUP plans | 8 |
| Output2.3.*In-situ* conservation for important agro-biodiversity established | Currently there is no formal allocation of land for in-situ conservation of agro-biodiversity. | Number of districts with *in-situ* agro-biodiversity conservation plans | 2 |
| Output 2.4. Farmer skills. Knowledge and incentives necessary to undertake biodiversity-friendly farming enhanced | Existing training and extension do not incorporate agro-biodiversity conservation issues | Number of male and female farmers graduated from FFS | 1,000 (50% female) |
| Output 2.5.Agro-biodiversity and biodiversity friendly community products promoted | Existing market for agro-biodiversity and biodiversity friendly products are ineffective. | Number of value added agro-biodiversity products marketed for local or international markets | 10 |
| Output 2.6.Private and public sector agreements to mainstream agro-biodiversity into their plans facilitated | Private and public sectors involvement and incentives for biodiversity conservation are extremely limited. | Number of private-public sector agro-biodiversity agreements | 8 |
| **Outcome3.** Effective project management | lack of programme management capacity in general and integrated programmatic approach in particular | Number of strategic recommendations from the Agro-biodiversity Steering Committee | 6 |
| Output 3.1.capacity of Implementing Partner for integrated planning, management, monitoring and evaluation of programmes improved | Programmatic approach not fully operational. | Number of MAF-organized cross project meetings | 10 |

**Annex 2: List of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. Inception Report
3. Project Implementation Review (PIR) and BD SO2 tracking tool
4. Annual reports
5. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
6. Monthly minute meeting
7. Spot check report
8. Audit reports
9. Administrative and Financial Tracking tools
10. The Mission Reports and Lessons learnt study
11. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
12. Financial and Administration guidelines.
13. Strategy IMP/FFS

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. The GEF Completion Report guidelines; and
3. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.
4. Letter of Agreement (LoA) between Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and FAO

**Annex 3: Mid-term Evaluation Rating Scale**

**Progress towards results: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

**Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | The project has minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | The project has moderate shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | The project has significant shortcomings. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has major shortcomings. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The project has severe shortcomings. |

**Annex 4: Co-financing table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sources of Co-financing[[1]](#footnote-1) | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing[[2]](#footnote-2) | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm | Actual Amount Materialized at Closing |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **TOTAL** |  |  |  |

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:

**Annex 5: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported AF financed project * UNDP and AF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings |
| **3.1** | Progress toward Results:   * Project Design * Progress |
| **3.2** | Adaptive Management:   * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Monitoring systems * Risk management * Reporting |
| **3.3** | Management Arrangements:   * Overall project management * Quality of executive of Implementing Partners * Quality of support provided by UNDP |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons met or interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Co-financing table |

**Annex 6: Financial Proposal Template (International / National Consultant)**

International Consultant

Please use the template below for your financial proposal. Please assume a total of 11 days in Lao PDR, including 5 days in Vientiane and 6 days in field visits. Flights and local transport for the provincial field visit will be covered separately.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost Components** | **Unit Cost** | **Quantity**  *(Estimate 11 days in country)* | **Total Rate for the Contract Duration**  **(USD)** |
| Professional Fees | $\_\_\_\_/day | 20 days |  |
| Round Trip Airfares to and from mission |  |  |  |
| Living Allowance in Vientiane | $\_\_\_\_/day | 5 days |  |
| Living Allowance – provincial field visit \* | $\_\_\_\_/day | 6 days |  |
| Others  - please specify |  |  |  |
| Others  - please specify |  |  |  |
| Others  - please specify |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |

**\* Note that flights and transport for the provincial field visit will be covered separately.**

National Consultant

Please use the template below for your financial proposal. Please assume 6 days for the field visits. Note that flights and local transport for the provincial field visit will be covered separately.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost Components** | **Unit Cost** | **Quantity**  *(Estimate 11 days in country)* | **Total Rate for the Contract Duration**  **(USD)** |
| Professional Fees | $\_\_\_\_/day | 20 days |  |
| Living Allowance – provincial field visit\* | $\_\_\_\_/day | 6 days |  |
| Others  - please specify |  |  |  |
| Others  - please specify |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |

\* Note that flights and transport for the provincial field visit will be covered separately

1. Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency (ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency (ies), Private Sector, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-2)