



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

Date: 2 May 2013

## INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

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

Country:	Viet Nam
Description of the assignment:	01 International Consultant and 01 National (local) Consultant for Mid-Term Evaluation
Project name:	Removing Barriers Hindering Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Viet Nam
Period of assignment/services (if applicable):	August 15 – October 15, 2013

1. Submissions should be sent by email to: [nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org](mailto:nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org) no later than: **17.00 hrs., 16 May 2013 (Hanoi time)**.

**With subject line: International / National Consultant – Mid-term evaluation (GEF Project)**

Submission received after that date or submission not in conformity with the requirements specified this document will not be considered.

**Note:** Maximum size per email is **7 MB**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. Procurement Unit – UNDP Viet Nam will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

2. Please find attached the relevant documents:

- [Terms of Reference \(TOR\)](#)..... (Annex I)
- [Individual Contract & General Conditions](#)..... (Annex II)
- [Reimbursable Loan Agreement](#) (for a consultant assigned by a firm) [& General Conditions](#) (Annex III)
- [Insurance Coverage Table](#)..... (Annex IV)
- [Vendor Form](#) ..... (Annex V)
- [Guidelines for CV preparation](#)..... (Annex VI)
- [Format of financial proposal](#)..... (Annex VII)

3. Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information **(in PDF Format)** to demonstrate their qualifications:

- a. Technical component:
  - Signed Curriculum vitae
  - Expression of interest, explaining why he/she is the most suitable for the work.
  - Copy of 2-3 publications/writing samples in English and Vietnamese (for National consultants).
  - Contact reference of past 4 clients for whom you have rendered preferably the similar service

b. Financial proposal **(with your signature):**

- The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in **US Dollar** (for international consultant) and in **Viet Nam Dong** (for National consultant) including consultancy fees and all associated costs i.e. airfares, travel cost, meal, accommodation, tax, insurance etc. – see format of financial offer in Annex VII.
- Please note that the cost of preparing a proposal and of negotiating a contract, including any related travel, is not reimbursable as a direct cost of the assignment.
- If quoted in other currency, prices shall be converted to the above currencies at UN Exchange Rate at the submission deadline.

Please note: For the consultancy firm/institution/organization, please provide the above information **of the assigned consultant (only ONE) for this service**, not the experience and information of **YOUR firm**. The documents must be submitted by the assigned consultant.

4. Evaluation:

The technical component will be evaluated using the following criteria:

**International consultant:**

<b>Consultant's experiences/qualification related to the services</b>		
	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>
1	Post graduate degree in environmental management, biology, biodiversity conservation, natural resources management or environment related issues	200
2	Least 10 years of working experience or expertise in the field of biodiversity conservation;  Experience with biodiversity conservation in Vietnam is desirable, knowledge on demonstration sites/National Parks is strong asset; Knowledge about financial mechanism for protected areas management effectiveness, payment for ecosystem services and other related issues as an asset	300
3	Minimum of 7 years evaluation and management experience for international supported projects;  Knowledge of M&E and experience with results-based management evaluation methodology;  Knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy would be an asset;  Project evaluation experience within the UN system would be considered an asset;	350
4	Experience as team leader of project evaluations	150
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000</b>

**National consultant:**

<b>Consultant's experiences/qualification related to the services</b>		
	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>
1	Post graduate degree in environmental management, biology, biodiversity conservation, natural resources management or environment related issues	200
2	Working experience in the areas of environmental and biodiversity conservation	300

	Working experience protected area management at demonstration sites will be an asset.	
3	At least 5 years experience in project implementation, management and evaluation for donor-funded development projects in Vietnam;  Experience with project evaluation experiences with United Nations system or with GEF will be considered an asset.	250
4	Experience of team work	100
5	Language skills with two writing examples in English and Vietnamese	150
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000</b>

A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the submissions, with evaluation of the technical components being completed prior to any price proposals being opened and compared. The price proposal will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score of 70% of the obtainable score of 1000 points in the evaluation of the technical component.

The technical component is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Term of Reference (TOR).

Maximum 1000 points will be given to the lowest offer and the other financial proposals will receive the points inversely proportional to their financial offers. i.e.  $S_f = 1000 \times F_m / F$ , in which  $S_f$  is the financial score,  $F_m$  is the lowest price and  $F$  the price of the submission under consideration.

The weight of technical points is 70% and financial points is 30%.

Submission obtaining the highest weighted points (technical points + financial points) will be selected.

An interview with the candidate given the highest combined score may be held before contract awarding, if deemed necessary.

## 8. Contract

“Lump-sum” Individual Contract will be applied for freelance consultant (Annex II)

“Lump-sum” RLA will be applied for consultant assigned by firm/institution/organization (Annex III)

Documents required before contract signing:

- Personal History
- International consultant whose work involves travel is required to complete the course on Basic Security in the Field and submit certificate to UNDP before contract issuance.

Note: The Basic Security in the Field Certificate can be obtained from website: <https://training.dss.un.org/consultants>. The training course takes around 3-4 hours to complete. The certificate is valid for 3 years.

- Full medical examination and Statement of Fitness to work for consultants from and above 62 years of age and involve travel. (This is not a requirement for RLA contracts).
- Release letter in case the selected consultant is government official.

## 9. Payment

UNDP shall effect payments to the consultant (by bank transfer to the consultant’s bank account provided in the vendor form (Annex V) upon acceptance by UNDP of the deliverables specified the TOR.

- First payment: 20% of the contract amount shall be paid upon the submission and approval of the assignment workplan, which will also authorize the schedule of the field mission.
- Second payment: 50% of the contract amount shall be paid upon the submission and approval of the mission report.

- Last payment: 30% of the contract amount shall be paid upon the final submission and UNDP's satisfactory approval of the final evaluation report.

Payment to the national consultant (team member) shall need certification from the international consultant (team leader).

If two currencies exist, UNDP exchange rate will be applied at the day UNDP instructs the bank to effect the payment.

10. Your proposals are received on the basis that you fully understand and accept these terms and conditions.



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

**Title:** 01 International Consultant and 01 National Consultant for Mid-Term Evaluation  
**Project:** *Removing Barriers Hindering Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Viet Nam*  
**Reporting to:** Programme Analyst  
**Duty Station:** Hanoi, Viet Nam  
**Contract Type:** Individual Contract (IC)  
**Duration:** Output based consultancy, 20 working days within the period of 2 months (August 15 – October 15, 2013)

### **1) GENERAL BACKGROUND**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), acting as an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), is providing assistance to the Viet Nam's Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) in the implementation of the GEF Full Size Project (FSP) "*Removing Barriers Hindering Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Viet Nam*". The Project was planned for five years (2010- 2015).

The objective of the project is "to secure a sustainably financed PA system to conserve globally significant biodiversity". This will contribute to the broader goal "Effective conservation of biodiversity in Vietnam". In order to achieve the project objective, a number of outcomes will be secured including: (1) A comprehensive and harmonized legal and policy framework supports sustainable PA financing; (2) Clear and harmonized institutional mandates and processes support sustainable PA financing mechanisms; (3) Knowledge and experience of sustainable financing options developed through demonstrations; (4) Information on biodiversity and PA status supports PA management and builds public support for the PA system.

The project has three demonstration clusters, namely (1) Xuan Thuy National Park (NP) – Tien Hai Natural Reserve, (2) Cat Ba National Park – Bai Tu Long National Park, (3) Bidoup – Nui Ba National Park – Chu Yang Sin National Park. Of which, Xuan Thuy NP, Cat Ba NP, and Bidoup – Nui Ba NP are being selected/considered as three main demonstration sites of the Project.

The Project Document signed between the Vietnamese Government and UNDP Viet Nam Country Office is available at

[http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/gef\\_prj\\_docs/GEFProjectDocuments/Biodiversity/Vietnam%20-%20%283603%29%20-%20Removing%20Barriers%20Hindering%20PA%20Management%20Effectiv/5-29-09%20-%20Project%20Document%20-%203603.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/gef_prj_docs/GEFProjectDocuments/Biodiversity/Vietnam%20-%20%283603%29%20-%20Removing%20Barriers%20Hindering%20PA%20Management%20Effectiv/5-29-09%20-%20Project%20Document%20-%203603.pdf)

The project is currently seeking qualified individuals (one international and one national) to conduct the project mid-term evaluation to assess the performance of the project.

### **2) OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

The Mid Term Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Viet Nam as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims at providing managers (Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, UNDP and the GEF Secretariat) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's outputs and outcomes. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The key objective of this Mid Term Evaluation is to assess the progress of the project towards achievements of its Objective and Outcomes , in order to guide its implementation towards effective implementation for a successful project completion.

### 3) SCOPE OF WORK

This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy.

The international consultant takes the role of team leader and leads the development of the deliverables. The national consultant will provide necessary inputs and clarification for the international consultant to produce the deliverables.

The Mid-term Evaluation will carrying out the following main tasks:

The MTE will undertake an assessment of **1) Relevance of the project, including the Outputs and Outcomes 2) Project results till date and the likelihood of the project achieving its stated results 2) Assessment of Likely Sustainability of Project Outcomes and ways to strengthen sustainability 3) Catalytic Role played till date and ways to strengthen it 4) Monitoring and Evaluation Systems 5) Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results till date. The report will also present the evaluation team's Lessons and Recommendations.** Ratings for different aspects of project will need to be presented by the evaluation team with appropriate data, analysis and explanations as outlined below. All these sections **MUST** be presented in the final report. The report must also contain an annex with co-finance details and appropriate tracking tools.

#### **A. Relevance of the project, including the Outputs and Outcomes**

Key questions the MTE will seek to answer include (and not limited to) the following:

1. Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Have the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Are lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Are the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Are counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Is the project's design adequate to address the problem(s) at hand?
2. Are the project specific outputs and their corresponding indicators as defined in the project logical framework and design and its modification in the inception report still relevant in the light of the project experience to date? Pinpoint any aspects of the "logframe" that shall be revisited and updated, and, if necessary, provide suggestion for timely changes or adjustment to activities and time-bound targets.
3. Do the project purposes and objectives remain valid and relevant, or are there items or outcomes in the project design that need to be reviewed an updated?
4. How is level of coherence an inter-link between and amongst project outcomes in terms of supporting each other towards achievement of the project objectives?
5. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Is the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Are relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Has the the recipient government maintained its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks been in line with the project's objectives?
6. **Stakeholder involvement.** Is the project involving relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implementing appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Is the project consulting and making use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Are perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process being taken into account while taking decisions? Are the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?

## B. Assessment of Project Results

- To what extent the project objectives have been met, taking into consideration the “achievement indicators” specified in the project document/inception report and logical framework
- To what extent have project results (outcomes and outputs) been achieved to date? And how have they been achieved in terms of inputs, timeliness, and cost-effectiveness?
- Do the outcomes/outputs complement and enhance one another, and if yes, to what extent?
- Given the level of achievement of the outputs and activities to date, is the project likely to achieve its objectives and overall target by the end of the project?
- What are factors that have facilitated or deterred the achievement of project objectives;
- How effective is the project monitoring and evaluation process to ensure the relevance and effectiveness of the activities and expected results in relation to TORs (RFP) issues, different level of work plans (AWPs and QWPs), and the required outputs? How has APR/PIR process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?
- Does the project take into consideration the likely risks in preparing AWP and QWP with the aim of mitigating negative impacts that could result from unexpected situation or change in the project environment?
- Is the project management arrangement appropriate to the extent of management functions, processes and procedure, in accordance with the staff capacity and reasonable workload? Is the project organization chart efficient for conducting and managing the whole project on the technical and administrative perspective?
- Financial accountability – extent to which the financial management has been an integral part of achieving project results, with particular reference to adequate reporting, identification of problems and adjustment of activities, budgets and inputs; and
- What is level of co-financing mobilized to the project till date?
- To determine short-term and long-term impacts of the project, including efficiency of the project and cost-effectiveness of the project on enhancing *Protected Area Management Effectiveness* in Vietnam; strengthened national regulations and institutional capacities.
- Has the current project management strategy exploited all opportunities for strengthening collaboration and substantive partnerships with other government bodies, institutes, different associations, other donors, financial sectors with aim to maximizing achievement of projects’ immediate results, and extending the project impacts in the long run beyond the end of the project timeframe?
- To determine how the intervention seeks to mainstream gender in development efforts.
- To determine synergies with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.

The following three criteria should be assessed to determine the level of achievements/ impacts of project outcomes and objectives and must be rated as objective as possible and must include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence

For Each Output and Outcome to be rated for below	Rating to be scored for each	Key Justification for rating
1. <b>Relevance:</b> Are the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?	<p><b>Satisfactory (S):</b> The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</p> <p><b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS):</b> The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</p> <p><b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):</b> The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</p> <p><b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b> The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its</p>	

	objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b> The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.	
2. <b>Effectiveness:</b> Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.	<b>Satisfactory (S):</b> The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS):</b> The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):</b> The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b> The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b> The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.	
3. <b>Efficiency:</b> Is the project cost effective? Is the project the least cost option? Is the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.	<b>Satisfactory (S):</b> The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS):</b> The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):</b> The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b> The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. <b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b> The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.	

The evaluators will also assess other results of the project, including positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long-term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess long-term project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, global environment, replication effects and other local effects.

## B. Assessment of Likely Sustainability of Project Outcomes

The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends.

Under this task the MTE international consultant will analyze following issues to evaluate sustainability of the project:

- Risks and assumptions that likely affect the persistence of the project outcomes, including financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks.
- How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the government?

- Availability of financial and economic mechanism to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the assistance ends;
- Policy and regulatory framework that will support continuation of benefits
- Level of commitment from the government to ensure sustainability of the results achieved? and
- How to secure changes observed in the improvement of the situation?

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

Key issues	Rating	Key justification for rating
<p>1. <b>Financial resources:</b> Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)</p>	<p><b>Likely (L):</b> There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Likely (ML):</b> There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Unlikely (MU):</b> There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability  <b>Unlikely (U):</b> There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p>	
<p>2. <b>Sociopolitical:</b> Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?</p>	<p><b>Likely (L):</b> There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Likely (ML):</b> There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Unlikely (MU):</b> There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability  <b>Unlikely (U):</b> There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p>	
<p>3. <b>Institutional framework and governance:</b> Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.</p>	<p><b>Likely (L):</b> There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Likely (ML):</b> There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Unlikely (MU):</b> There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability  <b>Unlikely (U):</b> There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p>	

<p>4. <b>Environmental:</b> Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Likely (L):</b> There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Likely (ML):</b> There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.  <b>Moderately Unlikely (MU):</b> There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability  <b>Unlikely (U):</b> There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p>	
<p><b>Overall Rating:</b></p>		

**NOTE:** All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

**C. Catalytic Role of the Project till date and ways to strengthen it**

The evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project could carry out. No ratings are required for the catalytic role.

**D. Assessment Monitoring and Evaluation Systems**

The evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E, the implementation of the Project M&E plan and whether long-term monitoring provisions to measure mid-term and long-term results (such as global environmental effect, replication effects, and other local effects) after project completion exist. The evaluation reports will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project M&E plan and of implementation of the M&E plan.

**M&E during Project Implementation**

**M&E design and M&E plan implementation.** The evaluation should verify that: an M&E system are in place that facilitates timely tracking of progress towards projects objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually; annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system are used to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and, projects had an M&E system is in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

**Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, a separate mention will be made of: whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted at the project planning stage; and, whether M&E are being adequately and timely funded during implementation.

Project monitoring and evaluation systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation:

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
2. **Satisfactory(S):** There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
3. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
4. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The Project had no M&E system.

The ratings should be justified with objective evidence.

## **Monitoring of Long Term Changes**

The evaluation will describe the actions and accomplishments of the project in the establishment of a long term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

1. Has this project contributed to the establishment of a long term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project included such a component?
2. What are the accomplishments and short comings in establishment of this system?
3. Is the system sustainable, i.e. is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and has financing?
4. Is the information generated by this M&E system being used as originally intended?

## **E. Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results**

Among other factors, when relevant, it is suggested that the evaluation team considers the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. However, evaluators are not expected to provide ratings or separate assessment on the following issues but they could be considered while assessing the performance and results sections of the report:

1. **Institutional arrangements:** Whether the designed institutional arrangement for the Removing Barriers Hindering Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Viet Nam Project has been performing effectively during the project implementation and allocated responsibilities among key stakeholders are still relevant; How the subjects fit into the partner Government's strategies and priorities; international and country development goals and priorities; and UNDP global, regional or country programmes as appropriate.
2. **Financial planning.** Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Has promised co-financing materialize? (Please fill the form in Annex 1 on co-financing).
3. **Implementing/Executing Agency's supervision and backstopping.** Are the Implementing/Executing Agency staff identifying problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimating their seriousness? Do Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time and restructured the project when needed? Does the Implementing/Executing Agencies have the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the GEF projects?
4. **Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
5. **Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

## **F. Lessons and Recommendations**

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations in the evaluation report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Evaluators should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead they should seek to provide a few well formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to GEF's overall portfolio. The evaluations should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the reports should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.

**The methodologies for the MTE will include:**

**1. Review project document, inception report and other project-produced documentations, including PIRs etc.**

**2. Field mission and visit to activity site in Viet Nam**

The international consultant will visit Vietnam based on the approved assignment workplan. She/he will collaboratively work with the national consultant. Meeting, interview, and discussion with relevant parties/key stakeholders will be conducted. The consultant team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative

approach ensuring close involvement of the government counterparts (MONRE) and relevant project partners. Type of interviews and expected questionnaires should be developed in advance. The finding of the field mission will be summarized and debriefed to UNDP and PMU prior to departure.

2. One-on One and group discussions/ mini workshops: with stakeholders

## 5) DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

The total effort for conducting the evaluation has been estimated to **20 working days** for each consultant. Based on the indicated scope of work and expected outputs, applicants to this consultancy must make their own estimate of the time taken to complete the assignment in line with this TOR and use this estimate as the basis of the financial proposals to be submitted which should include, among others, in their financial proposals, budget for travel, accommodation, etc.

About a 7-days mission to Vietnam will be needed for the international consultant, including a field visits to observe ongoing activities at the Demonstration site(s). However associated traveling costs from Hanoi to these sites and then back to Hanoi will be covered by the PMU and should not be submitted as part of financial proposal.

The mission is planned for the period from 15 August 2013 to 15 October 2013. The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Serbia are September 9-15, 2013. The report shall be submitted to the UNDP Viet Nam office. Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts, project team and UNDP Country Office. If any discrepancies have emerged between findings of the evaluation team and information available at the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

## 6) FINAL PRODUCTS

The deliverables include key evaluation products and consultancy products which will be developed jointly by the team. Tasks and responsibilities of each team member will be discussed internally and one consolidated deliverables will be submitted. Key evaluation products are the documents and reports that contribute to/become part of the final Mid-term Evaluation Report. Consultancy products are the documents and reports that describe the works and plans of the consultant.

Key evaluation products include:

- Presentation(s) to key stakeholders;
- An interim draft evaluation report;
- Final comprehensive mid-term evaluation report which might include, but is not limited to, the following components: (The Report should not exceed 45 pages in total, excluding annexes):
  - **Executive Summary**
  - Brief description of project
  - Context and purpose of the evaluation
  - Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
  - **Introduction**
  - Purpose of evaluation
  - Key issues addressed
  - Methodology of the evaluation
  - Structure of the evaluation
  - **The project and its development context**
  - Project start and its duration
  - Problems that the project seek to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Main stakeholders
  - Results expected
  - 
  - **Assessment of Project Results**
  - **Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes**
  - **Catalytic Role**

- **Assessment Monitoring and Evaluation Systems**
- **M&E during Project Implementation**
- **Monitoring of Long Term Changes**
- **Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results**
- **Lessons and Recommendations**
- **Annexes:**
- **Cofinancing etc.**
- **Tracking Tools**
- **Management Responses**
- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaires used and summary of results
- Co-financing and resource leveraging (see Table 1 attached)

For more detail information about the evaluation report, please see annex 7 of the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results that can be download from the following webpage: <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/Annex7.html>

Consultancy products include:

- Assignment workplan (including list of documents to be reviewed, organization and individuals to be interviewed, activity site to be visited during the field mission, etc.) and mission schedule;
- Mission report and debriefing note before leaving Vietnam;

## 7) PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

The selected consultant team should submit the assignment workplan to UNDP within a week after signing the contract. Implementation of the service's activities will be supervised by the UNDP representative.

The UNDP will require regular meetings or updating on progress as necessary. Consultant's outputs/reports will be reviewed by the UNDP and the PMU within 10 days from the date of report submission.

## 8) REQUIRED DEGREE OF EXPERTISE, AND QUALIFICATIONS

*The evaluation team members selected must not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and must not have conflict of interest with project related activities.*

**International Consultant (team leader)** should have following competencies and qualifications:

- At least Master degree in environmental management, biology, biodiversity conservation, natural resources management or environment related issues;
- Recognized expertise in the field of biodiversity conservation for at least 10 years;
- At least 07 years work experience in result-based management evaluation of ODA projects;
- Knowledge of and experience in GEF/UN monitoring and evaluation policy and approaches;
- Experience with biodiversity conservation in Vietnam is desirable, knowledge on demonstration sites/National Parks is strong asset;
- Knowledge about financial mechanism for protected areas management effectiveness, payment for ecosystem services and other related issues as an asset;
- Conceptual thinking and analytical skill;
- Proficiency in the English language especially competent in technical English writing (writing sample must be provided for assessment);

**National Consultant** should have following competencies and qualifications:

- Master degree in environmental management, biology, biodiversity conservation, natural resources management, or environmental economics;
- At least five (5) years of experience in the areas of biodiversity management, project implementation and management;
- Knowledge of monitoring and evaluation, and experience of project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in Vietnam;
- Familiarity and past experience with evaluation of GEF/UNDP projects, especially environment-

- related projects, will be an advantage;
- Proficient English writing and communication skills, with an ability to act as translator for international counterpart and to translate written documents from/ to Vietnamese are essential (writing sample must be provided for assessment)

## 9) EVALUATION TEAM SPECIFIC TASK

The main final output of the evaluation will be an independent and comprehensive Mid-Term Evaluation report with annexes as needed. The minimum requirements for the content of the final Mid-Term Evaluation report are given in item 6\_Final products.

The basis for the evaluators' main conclusions must be clear and the methodology clearly documented within the final report. Recommendations made must be based on clearly substantiated findings and stated in operational terms. They must address all issues identified by the evaluation mission, including changes in modalities, processes, strategies, focus and otherwise deemed necessary and appropriate

### International Consultant/ Team Leader

The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the work and operation of the evaluation team, including the coordination of inputs from national team member. The Team Leader is responsible and overall accountable for the production of the agreed outputs.

In addition to the above, the Team Leader is responsible for the following:

- Desk research of existing management plans, survey/ research/ evaluation reports and databases.
- Conduct fieldwork together with the national counterpart and interview stakeholders, and communities (if necessary) to generate authentic information and opinions.
- Write and compile the information and reports as needed.
- Make a presentation of key findings highlighting achievements, constraints, and make practical recommendations to decision makers and stakeholders.
- Draft and finalize the Evaluation Report

### National Consultant

- The National Consultant will assist and collaborate with the Team Leader in all the tasks mentioned above including fieldwork, desk based translation, report writing as agreed with Team Leader, and assist with translation/interpret in the field.
- The national consultant will be mobilized several days before the Team Leader in an effort to collect and collate data related to the project beforehand.
- The National consultant will translate the final evaluation report into Vietnamese.

## 10) ADMIN SUPPORT AND REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Administrative support will be provided by the Project Management Unit (PMU). The consultant will be provided following supports:

- Work station: Working places will be provided to the consultants at the Project Office;
- Logistical arrangements including domestic travel for site visits located outside of Hanoi, contacting to local authorities, meetings with government/ other officials, local people, etc.
- Support to obtaining necessary project documents and reference documents which include (but not limited to):
  - Project document
  - Project inception report
  - Consultants Reports (Research/Studies/Training)
  - Annual/quarterly work plans/progress reports
  - Legal documents related to biodiversity conservation
  - Harmonized Project & Program Management Guidelines (HPPMG 2010)
  - Etc.

## 11) REVIEW TIME REQUIRED AND PAYMENT TERM

All payment will only be authorized upon the UNDP approval of the deliverables. Proposed payments are indicated below:

- 20% of the contract amount is paid upon the submission and approval of the assignment workplan, which will also authorize the schedule of the field mission.
- 50% of the contract amount is paid upon the submission and approval of the mission report.
- The remaining amount is paid upon the final submission and satisfactory approval of the final evaluation report.

Payment to the national consultant (team member) shall need certification from the international consultant (team leader).

The same payment condition will be applied for both international and national consultants. The work progress will be assessed according to the approved assignment work plan.

## **Annex VI**

### **GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING CV**

WE REQUEST THAT YOU USE THE FOLLOWING CHECKLIST WHEN PREPARING YOUR CV:

Limit the CV to 3 or 4 pages

NAME (First, Middle Initial, Family Name)

Address:

City, Region/State, Province, Postal Code

Country:

Telephone, Facsimile and other numbers

Internet Address:

Sex, Date of Birth, Nationality, Other Citizenship, Marital Status

Company associated with (if applicable, include company name, contact person and phone number)

#### **SUMMARY OF EXPERTISE**

Field(s) of expertise (be as specific as possible)

Particular development competencies-thematic (e.g. Women in Development, NGOs, Privatization, Sustainable Development) or technical (e.g. project design/evaluation)

Credentials/education/training, relevant to the expertise

#### **LANGUAGES**

Mother Tongue:

Indicate written and verbal proficiency of your English:

#### **SUMMARY OF RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE**

Provide an overview of work history in reverse chronological order. Provide dates, your function/title, the area of work and the major accomplishments include honorarium/salary. References (name and contact email address) must be provided for each assignment undertaken by the consultant that UNDP may contact.

#### **UN SYSTEM EXPERIENCE**

If applicable, provide details of work done for the UN System including WB. Provide names and email address of UN staff who were your main contacts. Include honorarium/salary.

#### **UNIVERSITY DEGREES**

List the degree(s) and major area of study. Indicate the date (in reverse chronological order) and the name of the institution where the degree was obtained.

#### **PUBLICATIONS**

Provide total number of Publications and list the titles of 5 major publications (if any)

#### **MISCELLANEOUS**

Indicate the minimum and maximum time you would be available for consultancies and any other factors, including impediments or restrictions that should be taken into account in connection with your work with this assignment.

Please ensure the following statement is included in the resume and that it is signed and dated:

I CERTIFY THAT ALL INFORMATION STATED IN THIS RESUME IS TRUE AND COMPLETE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE. I AUTHORIZE UNDP/UNOPS OR ITS AGENT TO VERIFY THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THIS RESUME.

(Signature)

