

The TOR calls for, in task (b): “Develop case-study analysis of at least five investments in each province, which will encompass in-depth quantitative assessments.” This task, in our view, may involve a wide range of level of effort. We would therefore like to ask UNDP to kindly clarify:

- Does UNDP expect the assessment of investments to include a *quantification* of economic, social and environmental *costs and benefits* for all 10 investments (at least 5 in each province)?
- Basic quantification of economic, social and environmental costs and benefits, based on participatory discussions
- Should the quantification provide monetary valuation of costs and benefits (an issue for non-market impacts such as health, ecological functions, culture and traditions, social disruptions, etc)?
- Selective non-market valuation on important issues that have national and provincial policy relevance, on a case-study specific basis and consultation with stakeholders
- Does UNDP expect the assessment to rely on secondary data and existing field/case studies, or should the consultancy include field survey work? If field survey work is expected, what is the extent of this survey work (may range from key informant interviews, focus group meetings to quantitative household and community surveys)?
- Primarily secondary data, however, case studies should be backed by field work on a selective basis (i.e. not all case studies require field work, although field work is required in order to add credibility and back up secondary information for some cases)
- In light of above, what proportion of total level of effort (of the approx 80 days of input) is expected to be allocated towards the quantitative assessment of investments (days of inputs per investment to be assessed)?
- Will vary according to investment, however, at least one day should be spent with affected communities to discuss quantitative and qualitative impacts per case study

Important Note: Deadline for submission of proposals was amended and now is 9:00 Vientiane time, 3 December 2009

- Point of clarification (**days**):
In the Terms of Reference provided, (Section "Inputs and Timing" of Annex III) the reference to "**days**" means "**calendar days**". Thus, "approx. 80 days" means approximately 2.67 calendar months (of 30-days per month).
The reference is NOT to "work days" (say 5 per week) and is NOT to "staff-days" of team members total inputs to be supplied.
- We mean days as "**calendar days**".
- Point of clarification (**proposal validity period**):
In the Instructions to Offerors provided, [Section C. "Preparation of Proposals", para. 11 "Period of validity of proposals" the reference is to "**sixty days**" in words which is correct and
NOT "90 days" in figures which is incorrect and has to be **changed to "60 days"** in figures;
that this understanding and corrections are compliant with the confirmed procedures of UNDP described later [para. 20 "If there is a discrepancy between words

and figures the **amount in words will prevail**] for procurement of services. Furthermore, in the Proposal Submission Form provided, [Annex IV, 3rd para] the period has to be **changed** to "**60 days**" in figures; the amount of "sixty days" in words has also to be **added** for compliance.

- The proposal validity period shall be 60 sixty days

4. Point of clarification (**unreferenced terminology**):

In the Price Schedule provided, [Annex V, table at bottom of page] we note in column No. 4 "F. Monthly Rate" as the column title; please advise of **meaning** of the "F." preceding as we cannot find any reference to this elsewhere; at this point we have ignored this terminology.

- Please ignore F, we have removed it from the document.