**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Mid-Term Review of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme Document 2013-2017**

**1.    Background**

UNDP and the Government of Sri Lanka signed the 2013-2017 Country Programme Document (CPD), which outlines UNDP’s contribution towards national development priorities. The country programme was developed within the overall framework of the then government’s policy document outlining national and sectoral development priorities, the Millennium Declaration and the Framework of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2013-2017. The country programme was designed with a view to contributing to the country’s vision of becoming a knowledge-based middle-income country that addresses socio-economic disparities in lagging areas.

The UNDP country programme has two main focus areas:

* Governance for Empowerment and Social Inclusion (GESI): This programme area relates to sustainable livelihoods, public service delivery, governance for local economic development, rule of law, access to justice, human rights and gender equality
* Environmental Sustainability and Disaster Resilience (ESDR): This programme area relates to environmental protection, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction.

As the CPD reaches the halfway mark, UNDP plans to assess the continuing relevance of the country programme document, to undertake a review of progress made, to explore areas for change in scope and focus of the CPD and receive recommendations for the next country programme cycle, which is especially relevant now, given the socio-political changes in the country.

**2. Purpose of the CPD Mid-term Review (MTR)**

The overall purpose of the CPD MTR is to assess relevance of the country programme in light of the many changes in the local and international context. This review takes place during a time of considerable socio-political change in Sri Lanka, which provides new opportunities for engaging with government and non-government actors in strengthening democratic governance. UNDP is well positioned to provide technical assistance in addressing some of the key priorities identified in the Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the two main political parties in forming a national government in August 2015, including strengthening of democracy and rule of law, combating corruption and equitable economic development. In the global arena, this year also denotes the beginning of the post-2015 agenda, when the millennium development goals are to be replaced by 17 Sustainable Development Goals that set ambitious targets on issues around income inequality, equitable growth, peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice, effective, accountable and inclusive institutions, disaster resilience, climate change and a host of other issues that UNDP Sri Lanka’s strategy centers around. This review comes at an opportune time, especially given that UNDP is to support the government in localizing the SDG agenda within the national planning framework.

Given recent local and international developments, this MTR presents an opportunity to review and redefine the strategic focus of UNDP Sri Lanka (in terms of the scope and focus of the CPD and corresponding Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) which identifies specific development challenges that UNDP should address and the interventions to support it) and to undertake a comprehensive review of UNDP’s contribution to the country’s development, which includes an assessment of the progress-to-date. Coincidentally, this review marks the mid-point of UNDP’s 2013-2017 country strategy and also coincides with the mid-term review of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The review will consider both local changes linked to the socio-political transformation and the priorities of the newly elected National Government, as well as international factors. The CPD review will be informed by the UNDAF MTR which is to be completed by end November, and will be an opportunity to re-align its strategy to the revised UNDAF.

The first stage of the CPD MTR will be to conduct a review of the current context, building on relevant context analysis from the UNDAF MTR, and taking into account the latest socio-economic and political developments locally as well as relevant developments at a global level. The second stage is to assess the relevance of the CPD to the current context, taking into account the emerging national and global development priorities. The final stage will be the provision of key recommendations, including any proposed adjustments to the design of the current country programme (through a revised Results and Resourced Framework) whilst also possibly informing the planning of the next phase of the country programme. This exercise would allow UNDP to engage with key stakeholders and partners to discuss achievements and way-forward in view of the evolving context and development landscape.

**3. Scope of work**

**3.1 Substantive components of the MTR**

The Mid-Term review will comprise of three parts:

1. Context Analysis: Building on relevant context analysis from the UNDAF MTR, and considering the changing local context and development priorities as well as the emerging sustainable development agenda.
2. Assessing the continued relevance of the current country programme to determine the extent to which the programme and its outcomes are consistent with national and local priorities and policies, the integrated and cross-cutting nature of the programme, and the ways and means of addressing the needs of the target groups.

Key questions to consider:

* + To what extent is the country programme relevant to the evolving context and the national development agenda?
  + Is the current UNDP programme still relevant to the post-2015 sustainable development agenda?
  + Has the country programme been appropriately responsive to political, institutional, economic, legal and other changes in the country?
  + To what extent is UNDP’s engagement a reflection of strategic considerations and the agency’s comparative advantage?
  + What have been the major achievements and lessons learnt, with a view towards enhancing the relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the current programme cycle?
  + Identify UNDP’s contributions, gaps and missed opportunities to enable further progress to the country’s development priorities as identified in the Results and Resources Framework.
  + To what extent is UNDP’s selected method of implementation/ partnership modalities suitable to the country and the development context?
  + Have UNDP’s systems created capacities (human resource, systemic and structural) for sustained results of its programmes and what could be done to strengthen sustainability?

3. Provide forward-looking recommendations and a revised Results and Resourced Framework (in consultation with UNDP staff) that could possibly inform the next cycle of the country programme. Identify entry points to increase UNDP’s ability to effectively deliver on the national priorities.

**3.2 Suggested methodology for preparing the MTR**

In preparing the report, the consultant is expected to draw upon all available material to conduct the analysis. The consultant is not expected to collect primary data, but may instead rely on information available through the conduct of a desk review of UNDP documentation (for example, project documents and evaluation reports, Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs), and donor reports) as well as national policy documents and reports. The MTR would need to adopt an inclusive and participatory approach and therefore the service provider must hold consultations and interviews with a range of key stakeholders, including UN colleagues, Government counterparts, donor organizations, development partners, civil society representatives and the private sector (UNDP should be consulted after the checklist of partners and identified areas of query have been determined). It is essential that the team ensure the validity of data collected, which can be sought through regular exchanges with the UNDP country office staff as well as implementing partners.

An inception report is to be presented to UNDP following an initial desk review which details the service provider’s research design and methodology, while presenting preliminary findings on the context analysis and the country programme’s relevance in the evolving context. Upon receiving UNDP’s feedback on the inception report, the consultants must proceed to develop a draft report, which includes an analysis of the major findings as well as any recommendations. The consultant will also be required at this stage to present the major findings to UNDP and select external stakeholders, thereby allowing a review and validation exercise to be conducted prior to finalization of the CPD MTR report.

**4. Deliverables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PHASE** | **CONTENT** | **DELIVERABLES** | **ESTIMATED TIMEFRAME** |
| PHASE 1 | 1.    Discussions with UNDP senior management and programme and policy units as well as key Government counterparts  2.    Desk review of reference documentation and secondary data sources.  3.    Based on 1 and 2, develop an inception report that includes an overview of findings so far, together with a proposed methodology for data collection and analysis | ·    INCEPTION REPORT | 4 weeks  January 2016 |
| PHASE 2 | 1. Consultations with key stakeholders at all levels 2. Field visits (if required) 3. Working meetings with UN colleagues as required | ·     PRESENTATION OF INITIAL FINDINGS | 4 weeks  February 2016 |
| PHASE 3 | 1.    Prepare and submit first draft report to UNDP  2.    Based on feedback received from UNDP, prepare and submit second draft report for review  3.    Based on feedback received, finalize the mid-term review report | ·    1st DRAFT REPORT  ·    2nd DRAFT REPORT  ·    FINAL REPORT | 4 weeks  March 2016 |

**5. Selection of Consultant/ Service-Provider**

Selection will be based on an open and competitive bidding process. Interested applicants with the capacity to execute the scope of work described above should submit a detailed and realistic proposal **including methodology and work plan** along with **rationale** as to why it would be the best way to carry out the scope of work.  The information provided in the scope of work is not prescriptive and UNDP remains open to interested bidders elaborating and presenting what they consider to be the most appropriate methodological approach and work plan to achieving the desired end results. However, the decision as to the final methodology to be followed in the Report will rest with UNDP.

The consultancy is scheduled to begin in December 2015

**7. Required qualifications of Service-Provider**

The research institute/team should comprise of national experts with high levels of technical, sectoral and policy expertise; rigorous research and drafting skills; and the capacity to conduct an independent and quality analysis. Specific requirements:

*Analytical/theoretical capability*

* + Excellent understanding of the local context, and in particular the new and emerging policy directions;
  + A deep understanding of development, its drivers and trends in Sri Lanka;
  + A sound understanding of the United Nations system and its modalities of working;
  + Familiarity with the global development agenda;
  + Prior experience conducting strategic policy and programme reviews; and
  + Proven ability to produce analytical reports and high quality academic publications in English.

*Technical expertise*

•     Demonstrated ability to undertake similar assignments with adequate human resources.  The research team should bring extensive experience in research and policy analysis, with the lead researcher(s) having a PhD in a relevant field and bringing at least 10 years work experience.  Research Assistants should have an academic degree in a relevant field and experience;

•    The research team should have combined expertise in all of UNDP Sri Lanka’s thematic and cross-cutting areas of work, including democratic governance, rule of law and access to justice, sustainable livelihoods, reconciliation and social cohesion, environmental sustainability, disaster resilience, climate change, gender empowerment, and youth empowerment. The team should also include experts on partnership development, policy and advocacy, as well as programme design and implementation.

* Comprehensive background in research and strategic analysis;
* High degree of professionalism and ability to adhere to agreed timelines and deliverables;

•    Good ICT infrastructure and support; and

•    Extensive operational contacts with government institutions, development partners, civil society partners and the private sector.

**8). Technical evaluation criteria**

Overall technical evaluation criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary of Technical Proposal** | **Total Points** |  |
|  |
| Section1: Expertise of organization | 150 |  |
| Section 2: Proposed methodology, work plan and approach(es) | 275 |  |
| Section 3: Resource team/panel capacity | 275 |  |
| **Total** | **700** |  |

Details of evaluation criteria and marking scheme:

Section 1: Competence/expertise of the organisation:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Criteria | Points |
| 1.1 | Previous experience in undertaking research and strategic analysis across multiple development sectors | 60 |
| 1.2 | Quality of relevant sample materials related to development submitted, such as research studies, evaluations, policy briefs, etc. | 60 |
| 1.3 | Previous clients and partners | 30 |

Section 2: Proposed methodology, work plan and approach (es)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Criteria | Points |
| 2.1 | Methodology and approach | 225 |
| 2.2 | Realistic work plan | 50 |

Section 3: Resource team/panel capacity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Criteria | Points |
| 3.1 | Previous experience of resource panel | 115 |
| 3.2 | Sufficient human resources, with thematic expertise and cross-sectoral composition, to undertake scope of work and deliverables | 110 |
| 3.3 | Relevant qualifications | 50 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.** Contents of the Financial Proposal  The financial proposal should satisfy the following:  The calculation of fees should indicate the Total Cost for an ***“all-inclusive”*** cost in Sri Lanka Rupees (LKR) for the following breakdowns, as per the TOR:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Cost Item | Item Cost (LKR) | | 1). Cost for Phase 1 |  | | 2). Cost for Phase 2 |  | | 3). Cost for Phase 3 |  | | **Grant Total** – ***“All Inclusive” (***Sri Lanka Rupees) |  |   b) Any and all incidental Out of Pocket Expenses (OPE) must be included in the overall “all-inclusive” fees submitted to UNDP.  c) The fees proposed must be a total “fixed price” quotation indicating the overall total amount in Sri Lanka Rupees.  The total fees as quoted by your firm to UNDP for the purpose of the present RFP shall be firm and final.  d) All prices quoted must be exclusive of all taxes, since the UNDP is exempt from taxes as detailed in clause 18 of the General Conditions of Contract (Annexure III).  e) No amount other than the proposed total “all inclusive price” fees shall be paid by UNDP for the provision of the **CPD Mid Term Review** which is the subject of the present RFP.  f) The costs of preparing a proposal and of negotiating a contract are not reimbursable by UNDP. | | | | | | | | | | |  |  |  |