



Terms of Reference

CNF/2021/TAGA-GEO-172

1 KEY INFORMATION

Functional title	Support in a Technical Assessment and Implementation Plan for the Introduction of Entrance Fees at Mtirala National Park, Machakhela National Park and Kintrishi Protected Areas in Adjara
Project	UNDP-GEF PIMS6138 “Enhancing financial sustainability of the Protected Areas system in Georgia”
Duty station:	Home-based with missions to Mtirala National Park, Machakhela National Park and Kintrishi Protected Areas and Tbilisi as relevant
Duration of assignment:	9 months; July 2021 to end March 2022
Starting date:	1 st July 2021, or as soon as possible thereafter
Type of contract	National expert/Technical Assistance Provider; delivery-based
Application procedure:	The full Application Package should be sent to recruiting@caucasus-naturefund.org marked as “Entrance Fee Study-MaNP, MtNP, KPAs”
Application deadline:	COB Tbilisi, Georgia (UTC/GMT +4h) on June 10th, 2021
For additional information:	Ms. Tamar Pataridze, Consultancy Program Manager, at tpataridze@caucasus-naturefund.org

2 PROJECT FRAMEWORK

The Caucasus Nature Fund (CNF) is a conservation trust fund founded in 2007 with the support and encouragement of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through the German Development Bank KfW, Conservation International (CI) and WWF. By providing long-term funding and management assistance to help meet the core needs for Protected Areas (PAs) in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, CNF supports the conservation of the unique flora, fauna and ecosystems of the Caucasus for future generations, while at the same time improving the lives of local people today.

CNF is an implementing partners of the GEF/UNDP project “Enhancing financial sustainability of the Protected Areas (PA) system in Georgia” is a 5 year “technical assistance” project financed by the GEF through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Georgia, with resources allocated

from the GEF Operational Program for Biodiversity. The project was officially approved by the Global Environment Facility and signed by the Government of Georgia (GoG) on 12 December 2018.

The project objective is “To secure long-term financial sustainability and effective management to conserve globally significant biodiversity of target protected areas in Georgia”. Through the project, GEF incremental support will significantly contribute to enhancing the financial sustainability, and with it the management effectiveness, of target PAs, as such improving the Government’s ability to improve the status of biodiversity and ecosystem services through managing an effective system of PAs, as agreed to under national plans and international commitments. By increasing financial resources, especially from domestic revenue, and improved management effectiveness of target PAs, the project will contribute to reducing threats to, and improving the in-situ conservation status of identified globally threatened biodiversity in target PAs that meet established criteria for Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs).

To achieve this, the project provides technical support to the GoG with the implementation of activities under its three components: (i) Financial sustainability of sub-system of PAs representing Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs); (ii) Improved management and financial effectiveness demonstrated for targeted large-scale PAs; and (iii) Knowledge Management and monitoring and evaluation.

As part of the GEF/UNDP project, a detailed Finance Needs Assessment (FNA) was completed for the PA system in 2020 through a consultancy commissioned by CNF. The assessment estimated current financing or funding available for PA management, finance needs and the gap between finance needed and that available. The finance gap was found to be highly significant at a national level although relatively variable per individual PA. Focusing on Adjaran PAs, for Mtirala National Park (MNP), the finance gap was found to be between 70% for a basic level of management and 155% for an optimal level of management. Similarly significant gaps were also found for Machakhela National Park and Kintrishi Protected Areas.

In order to reduce the large funding gap for PAs in Georgia, the GEF/UNDP project intends to pilot and support the introduction of priority finance instruments/options that will generate additional revenue for PA management. With this in mind, CNF commissioned a Finance Opportunity Analysis (FOA) to assess the strengthening and/or upscaling of existing own revenue generating options and the introduction of new options in order to increase revenues and minimise pressure on the state budget. Its key output was a shortlist of priority finance instruments/options. These options are now being assessed and piloted further to move towards implementation – this consultancy aims to support this process with a focus on the introduction of an entrance fee at the Adjaran PAs, namely Mtirala, Machakhela and Kintrishi.

3 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Entrances fees are well known as an important tool to enhance the financial sustainability of PAs. However, it is often challenging to introduce an appropriate and robust entrance fee, especially when this is done in extensive landscape. Aside from the practical challenges of controlling access and collecting fees, setting fee amounts generally involves balancing of objectives. For example, implementation costs need to be covered and revenues optimized without losing sight of competing attractions and affordability considerations especially for local citizens. Aside from the inherent challenges associated with balancing numerous (sometimes competing, or even conflicting) factors, protected area managers may have limited guiding information at their disposal to set fee amounts.

Benchmarking and taking into consideration the best international practices of various national parks in this regard is very important. See for example, Van Zyl et al. (2019) for a further discussion of these issues and a global benchmarking of entrance fees charged in various countries.

Currently within the APA network of PAs, entrance fees as strictly defined, are not charged but similar entrance 'tickets' are sold at Okastse, Martvili, Prometheus Caves, Sataplia although they are linked to specific experiences or access to special sites and facilities.¹ Fee amounts charged are shown in the Table below.

Table 3-1: Entrance or similar fee amounts per PA in GEL

Protected area	Children (6 - 18 years)	Citizens and residents	Foreigners
Prometheus	5	10	20
Martvili	5	9	15
Okatse	5	8	15
Sataplia	5	7	15

There is thus some experience in the protected area system with charging fees that are similar to entrance fees. There is also significant global experience with entrance fees which are quite often charged simply for access to the very special environments in PAs that may only offer basic infrastructure (e.g. they have an information hut, ablutions, signage, walking trails and a few rest areas).

The feasibility of introducing entrance fees (that cover the costs of fee collection) and fee revenue amounts will be linked to visitors numbers which are show for all PAs in the Table below. Total visitors numbers to Mtirala grew by 236% from 22,968 in 2014 to 77,264 in 2019. The composition of visitors also changed over this period. In 2019, the clear majority (i.e. 55,771) were international tourists and the remainder (21,493) were locals whereas, prior to 2015, the clear majority of visitors were Georgians. In 2020 visitors numbers to Mtirala decreased drastically to 15,424 due to the coronavirus pandemic with very few of these being international visitors. Future recovery of international visitors is, however, anticipated in 2021/22. Machakhela visitor numbers also grew very strongly by over 500% from 2,062 in 2016 to 11,303 in 2019 although this total number of visitors remains relatively low (when compared to Mtirala and other PAs). Total visitors numbers for Kintrishi were lower with more moderate growth of almost 100% from 3,696 in 2014 to 7,005 in 2019.

¹ Vashlovani has a fee per car which was introduced recently and is in a testing mode

Table 3-2: Tourism visitor numbers per PA (2014 to 2019)

Protected Area	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Kazbegi Protected Areas	64,622	98,788	134,111	154,085	174,520	195,228
Martvili Canyon	0	0	62,434	147,644	174,143	189,894
Prometheus Cave	91,711	106,959	138,227	163,923	185,516	184,264
Tbilisi National Park	20,960	15,220	35,439	52,015	97,480	102,104
Okatse Waterfall	3,165	44,527	52,197	73,113	84,189	92,872
Mtirala National Park	22,968	21,981	33,774	47,460	57,770	77,264
Sataplia	67,287	73,601	78,323	85,507	81,556	74,198
Borjomi-Kharagauli Protected Areas	49,549	51,573	55,818	59,458	61,952	64,357
Lagodekhi Protected Areas	39,417	44,065	49,590	55,519	57,472	59,761
Algeti National Park	8,828	8,030	16,076	28,020	33,248	37,758
Kolkheti National Park	17,699	13,747	26,816	29,523	34,000	27,300
Kinchkha Waterfall	0	0	0	0	0	22,130
Tusheti Protected Areas	9,786	9,676	13,793	14,306	14,867	16,427
Kobuleti Protected Areas	8,426	8,737	9,175	11,286	14,325	14,185
Machakhela National Park	0	0	2,062	5,092	10,086	11,303
Vashlovani Protected Areas	8,711	10,976	11,806	12,250	12,404	10,511
Kintrishi Protected Areas	3,696	3,758	5,138	5,384	6,554	7,005
Javakheti Protected Areas	2,305	4,190	6,803	6,872	4,616	6,425
Chachuna Protected Areas	1,036	2,390	3,292	3,235	3,262	3,060
Navenakhevi Cave	0	0	0	0	543	2,943
Mariamjvari Protected Areas	0	0	0	0	0	22
Total	420,166	518,218	734,874	954,692	1,108,503	1,199,011

Mtirala National Park (MNP) has the clearest potential for the introduction of entrance fees that cover the costs of fee collection, given its visitor numbers. This is recognized by APA and was mentioned as an option as part of the feasibility study of tourism income generating activities which was conducted in 2018 for Mtirala (see PMO, 2018). This study was not detailed but did recommend a moderate entrance fee (for instance 3-5 GEL) stating that such a fee level should not decrease the number of visitors significantly particularly if fee revenue is used to improve the infrastructure, facilities and services in the Park. The potential for the introduction of entrance fees for Machakhela and Kintrishi is less clear given much lower visitors numbers and therefore requires more careful consideration.

Benefit-sharing is an important issue to consider. Globally, benefit-sharing measures are generally used to compensate communities nearby PAs for a clear loss of access to resources (e.g. their wood cutting, plant harvesting or hunting may have been reduced) and/or to foster good relations between PAs and local communities. The form that benefit-sharing can take is diverse from ensuring locals are given PA management jobs, to providing business opportunities to sharing PA revenues. Mtirala is potentially a special case among APA Parks as there is a local settlement ‘inside’ the Park: Chakvistavi village. This may be a reason to consider active revenue sharing measures whereby APA would essentially share a portion of entrance fee revenue with locals. Note that Chakvistavi village has grown exponentially over the last 10 years in large part due to the tourism growth associated with the Park. Residents of Chakvistavi that are involved in tourism have thus already benefited, and will continue to benefit, from tourism revenues due to the presence of the Park. The access road to Chakvistavi village inside the Park was upgraded to a paved road in 2018/19. This will improve access to the Park as its primary entrance is from the Park office in Chakvistavi. Whether benefit-sharing is appropriate in the case of Mtirala, Machakhela and Kintrishi and what form it could take will have to be carefully considered early on as part of the project.

With the above in mind, the overall objective of the assignment is to support APA with the further assessment and planning for implementation of an entrance fee for Mtirala, Machakhela and Kintrishi.

4 SCOPE OF WORK AND ACTIVITIES

The provision of technical assistance would be in three phases – an **Inception/Scoping, Technical Assessment and Implementation Planning Phase**.

The Inception/Scoping Phase would need to focus on the question of benefit-sharing in order to inform the Technical Assessment and Implementation Planning Phases. Technical Assessment would need to focus on investigating and answering key technical questions. Drawing on the outcomes of the Technical Assessment, the Implementation Planning phase would be used to draw up a clear and practically achievable implementation plan for the introduction of entrance fees.

Stakeholder engagement will be an important part of both the Technical Assessment and Implementation Planning Phases. For the two stakeholder workshops per PA (i.e. six workshops in total), the technical assistance provider will be responsible for facilitation, structuring and presentations with inputs and co-operation from CNF and APA in order to ensure useful feedback from stakeholders. Whenever appropriate CNF and APA will support with meeting venue and catering needs during the meetings (CNF can cover catering expenses directly, while APA can provide the meeting venue for free on the territories of administrations). They will also support organising the workshops and inviting stakeholders to attend. APA, the individual PA administration and CNF will be actively involved in process as needed to provide to the initiative legitimacy and accountability.

4.1 Inception/Scoping Phase

The Inception Phase would include an element of Scoping the project given uncertainties on key issues and especially with respect to benefit-sharing. It would also be used to refine the approach to the project, clarify stakeholder engagement and agree on timelines with a more detailed workplan, lines of communication and reporting.

Benefit-sharing should not be discussed with local stakeholders during the Technical Assessment Phase unless APA has the intention of undertaking some form of revenue sharing – i.e. if asked, stakeholders are likely to want benefit-sharing, and more especially revenue-sharing, and will thereafter expect it to happen. Benefit and revenue-sharing is thus a sensitive topic which requires clarification before any potential stakeholder engagement. The question of how to approach revenue/benefit sharing with local communities will therefore need to be properly scoped and considered during the Inception/Scoping Phase in close collaboration with APA and CNF. The technical assistance provider will need to undertake the following specific tasks in this regard:

1. Brief desk-top review of local and international best practice with respect to benefit-sharing focused on identifying circumstances when benefit sharing is most commonly applied or required, how it is applied, what are key lessons, pros and cons. The outcomes of review would take the form of a brief discussion document (length guideline: 6 to 10 pages)
2. Facilitate half-day online workshop with APA and CNF during which outcomes of review are presented and discussion is facilitated that focuses on whether, and how, benefit-sharing should be investigated further for Mtirala, Machakhela and Kintrishi.

Therefore, after the workshop, APA and CNF should be in a position to make a decision on how best to proceed with benefit-sharing during the remainder of the project.

Aside from clarifying the approach to benefit-sharing, particular attention will be given to confirming which stakeholders should be consulted, how they should be consulted and at what stage in the overall process with clear guidance from APA and CNF. This will include the appropriate consultation of the local community, municipality, tourism operators and business owners, etc. At this point, two stakeholder workshops are envisaged for each PA some of which could be online if needed. It is recognised that the assignment should respond to stakeholder inputs to the degree deemed appropriate bearing in mind that one preferred outcome or option that meets the approval of everyone may be difficult to find.

At the end of the Inception/Scoping Phase, an Inception/Scoping report will be required reflecting all agreements on how to proceed with the further Phases of the project (length guideline: 6 to 10 pages).

4.2 Technical Assessment Phase

The Technical Assessment Phase should be used to consider and assess all technical issues that are relevant to the introduction of entrance fees at each of the three PAs. These include confirming stakeholder acceptability, setting fee amounts, recommending access control and fee collection options, estimating costs and revenues and comparing them.

The technical assistance provider will need to undertake the following specific tasks in this phase:

1. Confirm that the concept of introducing an entrance fee is generally acceptable to stakeholders (i.e. the risk of such a fee seems low from a stakeholder acceptability perspective). This should be informed by discussions with key stakeholders identified in collaboration with APA and CNF and should include a consideration of lessons learnt by APA when implementing fees in other PAs.
2. Assess and recommend a range of appropriate basic fee amounts that would apply. These should be based on the natural beauty, attractions, activities that are possible, infrastructure (including basic infrastructure such as trails, benches, etc.) and facilities on offer currently and also take into account any plans that APA has for upgrades or additional infrastructure or facilities. They should draw on current APA entrance fees at other PAs with a similar level of attraction and facilities and on benchmarking relative to entrance fee amounts in other countries focused on similar parks. Differentiated fees should be considered at least for (1) children and adults, (2) for international visitors, (3) for Georgians.
3. Recommend any appropriate fee waivers or discounts that should apply to the basic fees. For example, these could apply to larger groups (e.g. 8-12 people or more), for off-season times, for pensioners, to encourage the use of certain entrances or trails, etc. In addition, assess whether there is a need and justification for a special annual fee amount or fee waiver for local residents and their family or guests (this is anticipated to be a particular issued for Chakvistavi village ‘inside’ Mtirala National Park). And, if so, how such a fee or waiver could be practically applied without it being abused.
4. Consider whether it would be possible and practical to use fees to limit visitors numbers to ease congestion or whether other non-fee measures are more suitable.
5. Consider how best to apply entrance fees to persons that are entering the PA to undertake other paid activities (such as the zip-line near Chakvistavi in the case of Mtirala). For example, such persons could pay their entrance fee like other visitors or they could be allowed to pay their entrance fees directly to the zip-line operators who will then pay them over to APA. Discounted fees may be worth considering for such users.
6. Estimate likely fee revenues over 10 years based on the recommended fee amounts and likely future visitor numbers projected using past visitor numbers appropriately adjusted.

High, medium and low revenue scenarios should be used for these estimates in recognition of uncertainties.

7. Investigate access control and fee collection and enforcement options and identify a preferred option. This should include the consideration of appropriate locations, infrastructure and facilities (e.g. gates, ticket booths, tourism information provision etc) and methods or processes (e.g. how are fees to be collected, what payment options to offer incl. online payment options). The preferred option should be the most practical, cost-effective and fair way to undertake access control and fee collection.
8. Estimate all of the additional costs over 10 years of the preferred access control, fee collection and enforcement options identified in Task 6. The distinction must be made between once-off capital or establishment costs items and ongoing operational costs such as salaries, overheads, cash management, banking, administration, etc. These costs should be based on APA experience with charging fees in comparable situations along with APA costs conventions such as for salaries typically paid.
9. Compare likely fee revenues with all fee collection and enforcement costs over a 20-year period using a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) framework. This should show the difference between revenues and costs for each individual year and thereby indicate whether fee revenues will cover the additional costs associated with collecting and enforcing them (i.e. whether financial feasibility can be achieved). It should be based on a simple CBA template/model which will be provided by CNF which allows for the estimation of indicators such as net present value (NPV), benefit: cost ratio and internal rate of return (IRR).
10. If relevant, based on outcomes of Inception/Scoping phase, assess and propose appropriate benefit/revenue-sharing measures for local communities. This should be done on the basis of what is discussed during the Inception/Scoping Phase. It is likely that this will need to include a clear justification for benefit-sharing and appropriate amounts (e.g. as percentage of total revenue) taking into account experiences from elsewhere in Georgia and internationally. A preferred benefit-sharing mechanism will also need to be specified that is workable for APA.

In terms of sequencing of the above tasks, it is expected that tasks associated with estimating fee amounts and revenues can be carried out roughly simultaneously with tasks that are focused on assessing access control and fee collection options and their costs.

Stakeholder engagement in this Phase should take the form of one day-long stakeholder workshop for each of the three PAs. The workshops should take place early on during the Phase but after some baseline data has been gathered and should be used to introduce the project, get initial feedback on the acceptability of an entrance fee and on key issues, gather information and stakeholder suggestions that can guide the assessment process. If appropriate, stakeholders should also be encouraged to raise key issues that relate to the implementation of entrance fees thereby informing implementation planning in the next phase.

At the end of this phase, the Technical Assessment report (length guideline: 45 to 65 pages) should detail the preferred options for the introduction of an entrance fee for each PA along with their financial feasibility (the balance between costs and benefits).

It is particularly important that proposals from technical assistance providers specify a separate costing for all work on benefit-sharing in the Technical Assessment and Implementation Planning Phase. This is required as the Inception/Scoping Phase will determine the need for further work on benefit-sharing and the exact nature of such work in the Technical Assessment and Implementation Planning Phase. It is anticipated that no more than 20% of the total costs (and therefore professional time) allocated to

the Technical Assessment and Implementation Planning Phases should be devoted to benefit-sharing work.

4.3 Implementation Planning Phase

Based on the findings of the Technical Assessment, inputs from APA and stakeholder feedback, a clear and succinct Implementation Plan should be developed to guide implementation for each PA (length guideline: 20 to 25 pages). The overall objective of the Plan would be to clearly and comprehensively capture all key aspects of how the fee should be introduced and administered. It should include a workplan detailing the list of activities or actions that need to be undertaken along with their timing and who would be responsible for carrying them out.

The Plan should therefore, at a minimum, address the following for each PA:

1. Clarity on fee collection and enforcement procedures.
2. Construction of all infrastructure and facilities needed for access control and fee collection including their costs, timing and likely funding sources.
3. Appropriate timing for announcing and then actually introducing the fees. For example, tourism operators and agencies should be asked how much time they need to be able to include fees in the tours and packages they offer.
4. Details on appropriate application of fee waivers or discounts particularly for local community members.
5. Processes that will be followed for periodic review or adjustment of fees (at least for inflation).
6. Details of how revenues or benefits are to be shared with local communities and other stakeholders if relevant. This should include recommendations for a basic governance structure to be used in order to determine how revenues will be used in a way that satisfies community needs and is transparent, accountable etc.
7. Risk management and dispute resolution measures and processes.

Stakeholder engagement in this phase should include one day-long stakeholder workshop for each of the three PAs to present the key findings of the Technical Assessment Phase and initial ideas on implementation that require stakeholder inputs and feedback in order to improve and refine them.

Note that if financial feasibility is not achievable or there are other serious constraints, APA may decide at the end of the Technical Assessment Phase to not pursue the idea of entrance fees further for some or even all of the three PAs. This will mean that the project may not continue to the Implementation Planning Phase. Proposals should therefore cost the Implementation Planning Phase separately. It is anticipated that no more than 25% of total costs of the whole project (and therefore professional time) should be allocated to the Implementation Planning Phase.

5 DELIVERABLES

During the duration of the assignment the following deliverables will be submitted to CNF:

- (1) Discussion Document on benefit-sharing to inform internal workshop during Inception/Scoping Phase
- (2) Inception/Scoping report with detailed description of approach and a project plan including timelines and key risks.

- (3) Technical Assessment report with an outline of the preferred fee options in terms of fee amounts, access control and fee collection, costs and revenues and their comparison, recommendations for revenue sharing.
- (4) Implementation Plan report providing clear guidance on implementation.

Any qualitative descriptive information and quantitative data presented in any report shall be maximally supported by tables, graphs and (geo-referenced) maps, as appropriate, containing all available quantitative and/or geographic information on issues related to the subject of the consultancy. The consultant will submit copies of presentations, excel models used or detailed comments provided by individual stakeholders.

All reports prepared under the assignment shall include a complete list of literature consulted, including peer-reviewed publications, project reports, internal PA reports, and others as appropriate.

Also, all reports shall contain detailed descriptions of practical activities implemented: minutes/protocols of stakeholder meetings, names and affiliations of stakeholders consulted, etc.

The language for notices, instructions, and other formal messages between CNF and the Technical Assistance provider under this Agreement shall be English. The language for all reports, shall be Georgian with translation also into English.

6 PRELIMINARY WORK AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The following schedule of activities and deliverables would be required according to the tentative work plan for 2021. The schedule also provides an estimate of the professional time (technical assistance time) that should be adequate for each activity totaling 130 days:

Activity (deliverable)	Days	Workplan								
		Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5	Month 6	Month 7	Month 8	Month 9
Inception / Scoping Phase										
1 Benefit-sharing discussion document and workshop	10									
2 Other clarifications and Inception/Scoping report	5									
Technical Assessment Phase										
3 Technical assessment and associated investigations	73									
4 Stakeholder workshops (one per PA)	9									
Implementation Planning Phase										
5 Implementation Plan and associated investigations	27									
6 Stakeholder workshops (one per PA)	6									
Total national consultant professional time:		130								

As noted above the project will be undertaken with a phased approach. In particular:

- The extent and nature of work commissioned on benefit-sharing in the Technical Assessment and Implementation Planning Phases will be determined during the Inception/Scoping Phase.

- The outcomes of the Technical Assessment Phase will determine the extent and nature of work commissioned during the Implementation Planning Phase.

The payment schedule would be as follows:

Invoice nr	Deliverable or activity	Percentage of total budget to be invoiced
1	Submission of draft Inception/Scoping Report	20%
2	Submission of draft Technical Assessment	40%
3	Submission of draft Implementation Plan	25%
4	Submission of a final Technical Assessment and Implementation Plan	15%

7 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERTISE

Technical assistance can be provided by one or a team of individuals.

Academic qualifications:

Master's degree or higher in conservation/biodiversity finance, environmental economics, tourism focused on commercial aspects, business development, or related fields. A relevant university degree in combination with qualifying experience in the areas related to the objectives will be accepted in lieu of the post-graduate degree.

Experience:

- Minimum 5 years of demonstrated relevant experience preferably including experience in protected areas/biodiversity finance with a focus on revenue generation mechanisms such as entrance or other types of fees and charges.
- Experience in conducting feasibility studies and other relevant financial and basic technical analysis of similar projects.
- Experience in setting up administrative and governance processes.
- Experience working with diverse groups of stakeholders including experience in facilitating workshops and consultation processes.
- Ability to distil complex information from various sources into concise and clear communications and excellent synthesis and report writing skills
- Knowledge of the regional socio-economic and tourism context at the project site would be an advantage.
- Knowledge of/ experience with protected areas planning and management including of protected area finances would be an advantage.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Any costs or expenses incurred in preparing the application are at the applicant's risk, and are not eligible for reimbursement by CNF.

The successful Applicant – individual National Expert (NE) can propose additional NEs as appropriate. If and when such is appropriate, the individual NE shall sign service agreements individually with each additional NEs, including a description of tasks and responsibilities, remuneration agreed, and payment schedule. During implementation of the assignment, the individual NE shall bear full responsibility for the services any additional NE performs. The assignment of all activities to one or several additional NEs is not permissible. The individual NE shall present to CNF prior to the start of the Consultancy a description of experience and CVs of all proposed additional NEs. Before any contract with CNF shall be signed, the individual NE will be required to submit (a) signed copy(ies) of the service agreements signed with additional NEs, including a description of joint and individual liability.

During implementation process of the assignment the successful applicant will be closely work with CNF's international backstopping expert who has experience in entrance fees and other protected area finance mechanisms. The level of assistance available from the international expert will be approximately 10 days of professional time over the duration of the project.

Awarding of the contract shall be based on an evaluation by the CNF Tender Commission, consisting of representatives of CNF and third-party representatives as relevant. The Tender Committee shall evaluate information provided in the Application Package on: (1) knowledge and understanding of the subject of the tender; (2) evidence of relevant experiences in the subject of the tender; (3) knowledge of and experiences working with and in PAs in the South Caucasus, specifically Georgia, and specifically on entrance fee related topics; (4) demonstrated capability to deliver against timetable; (5) detailed financial proposal. The Tender Commission may interview one or more applicants to assist its evaluation process.

The Tender Commission reserves the right to cancel the procedure at any moment and not conclude any contract, without further notice to the applicants. It also reserves the right not to accept the lowest bid.

The NE will act as an independent contractor under a Technical Assistance Agreement with CNF. The NE will not be an employee of CNF, and accordingly will be personally responsible for the payment of taxes according to relevant legislation.

Only short-listed candidates will be contacted. If you are not contacted within 2 weeks after the closing date, please assume that you have not been successful on this occasion.

MODE OF APPLICATION

Applicants are requested to submit a full Application Package in the English language, including the following:

- Cover Letter, explaining the relevant qualifications, experience and skills of the Applicant for the position.

- Detailed Description of Approach (max. 3 pages) to deliver the outcomes sought, including an understanding of the work required, comments on the TOR and activities proposed (if any), description of proposed approach and methodology, main implementation activities, etc. as considered relevant.
- Full CV for each team member proposed.
- Detailed Financial Proposal, including a breakdown of costs – all-inclusive consultancy fees (in days and stating unit rate) per individual team member, travel (air/land roundtrips and per diem as appropriate), any applicable VAT or other taxes, other costs, etc. - in USD.
- Contact details for two referees (who will not be approached without your permission).

8 REFERENCES

PMO Business Consulting (PMO). 2018. Feasibility Study of Income Generation Projects in Machakhela and Mtirala National Parks. Report prepared for the UNDP and APA. PMO, Tbilisi.

Van Zyl, H.W., Kinghorn, J.W. and Emerton, L. 2019. National Park Entrance Fees: A Global Benchmarking Focused on Affordability. International Journal of Protected Areas and Conservation (PARKS), Vol. 25.1, May 2019. https://parksjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PARKS-25.1-Van-Zyl-10.2305-IUCN.CH_.2019.PARKS-25-1HVZ.en_-1.pdf