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I. **INTRODUCTION**

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) reflects the strategic orientation of the United Nations (UN) system in Cambodia. An independent evaluation of the UNDAF 2011-2015 and UNDAF 2016-2018 is foreseen in 2017 to establish the extent to which the two cycles are/have been aligned to national development priorities and to what extent UNDAF outcomes have been attained. It will help to determine the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the UNDAF results, and the sustainability of the UN system support to national development priorities. The evaluation is scheduled for implementation from May to November 2017 and it will inform the design of the subsequent UNDAF.

This document presents the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation, proposed approach and methodological options for a team of a team leader and up to three additional team members (both national and international), who will be conducting the evaluation under the guidance of an evaluation management group. The UN in Cambodia is therefore looking for institutions with deep commitment and strong background in evaluation of development effectiveness to undertake the evaluation. Bidders will need to show relevant subject matter experience in growth and sustainable development, social development, social protection and human capital, governance and human rights.

II. **BACKGROUND AND EVALUATION CONTEXT**

Country Context

Cambodia has experienced significant socio-economic changes during the last decades, and has in recent years pursued a transitional approach to economic and social development: gradually promoting greater decentralisation, moving the focus of planning from rehabilitation to inclusive growth, shifting from establishing systems and developing capacity to more efficient performance of systems and use of capacity. Cambodia is expected to remain in the Least Developed Country category until at least 2025 as per UN classification. With annual average Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth of more than 7 per cent since 2011, the country has, however, become a lower middle income country in July 2016 and is gradually moving towards full economic integration into the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). This brings a related challenge of reduced international official development aid (ODA) and the need to raise more domestic resources and forge stronger partnerships within the region and with other developing nations. The Royal Government has put good governance at the centre of the Rectangular Strategy. While progress has been slow in strengthening the rule of law and the accountability of these institutions, reforms within public administration, public financial management and decentralisation and deconcentration are on-going.

Economic growth has contributed to a steep decline in poverty, from 47.2 per cent in 2007 to 17.7 per cent in 2012 (World Bank, 2014), with around 3 million Cambodians living in poverty. Of these, 90 per cent live in rural areas. However, the recent economic growth has not benefited all, and significant geographic disparities exist, with poverty rates ranging from around 15 per cent in Phnom Penh to up to 37 per cent in the mostly rural north-eastern provinces. Of the estimated total population of 15.3 million, over 45 per cent live just above the poverty line (World Bank, 2015) and are highly vulnerable to small economic changes, natural disasters and other shocks. Cambodia has a large, very young dependant population of children and adolescents; 45 per cent of the population is aged 19 years or younger while more than 11 per cent of the total population is under 5 years of age. Cambodia has therefore currently a larger number and proportion of young people of working age than ever before, leading to the opportunity of a demographic dividend, i.e. economic growth achieved by having proportionally more people of working age. The key to harnessing the demographic dividend is enabling young people to enjoy their human rights to achieve their potential.
The political landscape in Cambodia has, during the last years, featured increasing vocal demands of civil society organisations and citizens for more inclusive growth, the protection of human rights and political participation. After the great progress made in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Cambodia has started to prepare the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by localizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to the national context.

**The Role of the United Nations in Cambodia**

The overarching goal of the UN in Cambodia is to support the efforts of the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) and its development partners to improve the life of all people living in Cambodia, especially vulnerable, poor and marginalized groups (i.e., women, youth, indigenous people, people living with disabilities, people living with HIV/AIDS). Throughout the past years, the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) worked closely with all stakeholders for the achievement of the MDGs and is now supporting the localization and the preparations for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. Further, the UNCT supports major reforms and the realization of human rights and ensures a transparent and accountable use of resources made available for this purpose.

The UNDAF is the strategic programme framework that describes the collective response of the UN system to national development priorities. It reflects the comparative advantage of the UN by emphasizing the thematic competence of UN organizations involved, without necessarily highlighting their specific mandates. It shows where the UN system can bring its unique strengths to bear in advocacy, capacity development, programming, and cutting edge knowledge and policy advice, for the achievement of the internationally agreed standards and development goals, including national priorities related to the MDGs/SDGs.

Under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC), the UNCT in Cambodia is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF in partnership with the RGC and in collaboration with civil society and development partners. The UNCT in Cambodia, in close partnership with the RGC, intends to undertake an UNDAF evaluation covering the UNDAF cycle 2011-2015 and the mid-point review of the 2016-2018 cycle, which should serve as a major input for the planning process of the subsequent UNDAF cycle.

**Evaluation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework**

Evaluation is an important part of the results based management cycle. A particular use of UNDAF evaluation is for course correction to strengthen programmes by realigning priorities, strategies and interventions. Evaluation-based evidence and recommendations can also be used for advocacy and resource leveraging as well as partnerships. UNDAF evaluation is mandatory as per guidance from the UN Development Group (UNDG). As the UN system in Cambodia will start preparing for a new UNDAF cycle and in anticipation that the formulation of the next National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) will become effective in 2019 it is important to assess what has worked to inform UNDAF approach moving forward and ensure that it is evidence-based.

Evaluation improves accountability for results and provides learning in terms of what has worked, what has not and why. This is seen as crucial given the broad-based scope and the large resources involved in the UNDAFs. An UNDAF evaluation provides important information for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF cycle and for improving UN coordination in Cambodia. Through evaluation, the UNCT, the RGC and other UNDAF stakeholders can learn from the process of documenting good practices which can then be used for future UNDAFs, national plans and benefit of other countries as well.
The UNDAF 2011-2015\(^5\) was developed in alignment with the Government’s Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency Phase II\(^6\) and the NSDP 2009-2013. It built on the achievements and progress made over the last decade and leveraged the position of the UN as a trusted and neutral partner of the RGC and the people of Cambodia. It was built around five strategic outcome areas, as follows:

1. Economic Growth and Sustainable Development;
2. Health and Education;
3. Gender Equality;
4. Governance; and
5. Social Protection.

It comprises a results matrix (Annex I) and a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework and the UNCT has prepared annual monitoring reports and conducted a joint review meeting with the RGC annually.

The UNDAF 2016-2018 reflects the strategic orientation of the UN system in Cambodia. It is aligned to the Rectangular Strategy Phase III and the current NSDP 2014-2018. It was developed through an interactive, consultative process and is designed at an outcome level only. The UNDAF has three mutually reinforcing outcome areas:

1. Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development;
2. Social Development, Social Protection and Human Capital; and

The UNDAF 2016-2018\(^7\) is harmonized with the national planning process and covers a three-year period, in line with the timeframe of the NSDP 2014-2018. In an effort to strengthen the monitoring function of UNDAF implementation and to allow evidence-based reporting at a more strategic level, the UNCT has developed consolidated annual workplans per outcome which cover the key results to be achieved for each year based on the agency country programmes and take into consideration the SDGs.

**Evaluation Rationale:** An evaluation of the UNDAF is mandatory as per the UNDAF guidelines provided by the UN Development Group (UNDG) and the UNDAF 2016-2018 document foresees the evaluation of the 2011-2015 and 2016-2018 cycles in 2017. Besides being in compliance with global guidelines and agreed timelines, the UNDAF evaluation comes at a crucial moment in the development of Cambodia. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs in September 2015, the RGC is localizing the agenda (Cambodia SDGs, CSDGs) and developing a CSDGs framework that is expected to be finalized in the 2nd quarter of 2017. While the RGC is currently undertaking a mid-term review of its NSDP (2014-2018), it is expected that the CSDG framework will be fully mainstreamed into the next NSDP (2019-2023). The findings and recommendations of this evaluation are therefore expected to not only feed into the development of the next UNDAF but also to inform the next NSDP.

**Evaluation Use:** The primary users of this evaluation are the decision-makers within the UNCT including resident and non-resident UN entities, UN partners and the RGC, which will use the results to strengthen accountability and learning, both for the implementation of the ongoing UNDAF and for the preparation of the subsequent one. Recommendations will be used to adjust the way the UNDAF is designed and could result in establishing a results measurement framework. Secondary users are other development partners and civil society organizations participating in UN programmes as well as the UN Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) and other countries, which are expected to use the evaluation process and results for accountability.

---


\(^6\) The Rectangular Strategy for growth, employment, equity and efficiency phase II is the “Socio Economic Policy Agenda” of the Royal Government of Cambodia of the fourth legislature of the national assembly. The Rectangular Strategy phase II maintains the earlier structure and fine-tunes and sharpens the prioritized policies of the rectangular strategy in its first phase.

learning, decision making and improved performance, awareness raising and advocacy purposes. Since DOCO is in the process of developing new guidelines for a new generation of UNDAFs that will take into account the results and recommendations from the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) 2016, this evaluation can constitute a meaningful source of what has worked and what has not.

### III. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

#### Purpose of the Evaluation

The independent evaluation of the UNDAF 2011-2015 and mid-point review of the UNDAF 2016-2018 serves two main purposes:

1. **Support greater accountability of the UN system** for working effectively and in alignment with UN programming principles to contribute to agreed results in the UNDAF 2011-2015. By objectively verifying results achieved within the framework of the UNDAF and assessing the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions used, the evaluation will enable the various stakeholders in the UNDAF process, including national counterparts and donors, to hold the UNCT and other parties accountable for fulfilling their roles and commitments.

2. **Promote greater learning from the experience of implementing the current UNDAF 2016-2018** about what works, what doesn’t and why. This should include providing lessons learned on what the added value of the UN has been and could be in the future, especially considering the changing development landscape and emerging new actors and how the UN adapts to the changing environment in Cambodia. It should therefore take into consideration not only what is covered in the UNDAF, but also examine which aspects are not covered although they are relevant to the current and future context, including related to the SDGs (Cambodia is in the process of SDG localization which is expected to be completed in 2017). Recommendations should also include what can be excluded in the future UNDAF.

The UNDAF evaluation should be as forward looking as possible to provide lessons learned that will feed into the next UNDAF cycle. It will provide important information for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF programme cycle and for improving UN coordination at the country level. The UNCT, the RGC and other UNDAF stakeholders can learn from the process of documenting good practices. The evaluation should therefore also assess the UN architecture/structure and the way the UN in Cambodia functions and manages itself and how the UNDAF serves as a tool. In addition, attention should be given to how prepared the UN in Cambodia is for emergency situations and how effectively it develops related capacity of institutions.

#### Evaluation Objectives and Scope

The overall objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- Assess the previous (2011-2015) and current (2016-2018) UNDAF cycles by reviewing its effectiveness on advancing the national development agenda of the RGC;
- Review sustainability in relation to the results achieved under the 2011-2015 cycle;
- Focusing primarily on the current UNDAF 2016-2018 review its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability on the national development agenda of the RGC;
- Review design, focus and comparative advantage of the UN system in the inception process;
- Examine how the five UN programming principles have been mainstreamed in the results-based management cycle (design, implementation and M&E) of the UNDAF 2016-2018; and

---

8 Human rights based approach, gender equality, and environmental sustainability, capacity development, and results-based management.
• Provide actionable strategic and programmatic recommendations, in priority order, for improving the contribution of the UNCT to the RGC’s development priorities under the UNDAF 2016-2018, which can be considered for the next 2019-2023 UNDAF and taking into consideration the SDGs at the top level (and not be a compilation of agency specific evaluations or review exercises or comment on any agency specific performance).

Data collection is expected to be conducted at national, sub-national and community provincial level.

The UNDAFs will be evaluated against the strategic intent laid out in the two UNDAF documents, respectively, and specifically the contribution to the national development results laid out in the UNDAF results frameworks. The evaluation will therefore be global in scope, in the sense that it will cover all sectors of the UNDAF. In terms of time, the evaluation will cover two UNDAF cycles (2011-2015 and 2016-2018), hence the period from 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2015 and 1 January 2016 to 31 March 2017. Evidence and findings of the UNDAF evaluation will embrace the views of all key stakeholders, including vulnerable, poor and marginalized groups. Benefit gained by vulnerable population from UNDAF implementation and focus on provinces lagging behind should be given attention to during the evaluation. Two provinces are expected to be selected by the evaluation team based on an analysis during the inception phase.

IV. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Approach and Criteria

As per the guidance document ‘UNDAF Evaluation Guidelines for Terms of Reference’\(^9\) (TOR), this evaluation is a programmatic evaluation in that it assesses the UNCT’s performance against the UNDAF 2011-2015 and the UNDAF 2016-2018 programmatic framework that specifies its strategic intent, objectives and outcomes set forth in the results framework. As such it is a country-level evaluation carried out jointly with the UNCT and the overall approach is participatory and orientated towards learning on how to jointly enhance development results at the national level. As outlined in the purpose and scope section, the evaluation will also assess how the UN coordinates itself under the UNDAFs 2011-2015 and 2016-2018 including with regard to joint funding and resource mobilization, e.g., through joint programmes and joint initiatives.

Given that (a) outcomes are, by definition, the work of a number of partners, and (b) UNDAF outcomes are set at a very high level, attribution of development change to the UNCT (in the sense of establishing a causal linkage between a development intervention and an observed result) may be extremely difficult and in many cases infeasible. The evaluation will therefore consider contribution of the UNCT to the change in the stated UNDAF outcomes and the evaluators will need to explain how the UNCT contributed to the observed results. In conducting the assessment, first, the evaluators will examine the stated UNDAF outcomes for 2011-2015 and 2016-2018; identify the change over the period being evaluated on the basis of available baseline information; and observe the national strategy and actions relevant to the focus of the UNDAF and the role of the UN in support of that change. Second, they will examine the implementation of UNDAF strategy and actions in support of national efforts. The following key areas of inquiry, drawn from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards\(^10\) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) evaluation criteria\(^11\), must be addressed by the evaluation:

UNDAF 2011-2015

---


\(^10\) See [www.uneval.org](http://www.uneval.org)

Relevance

- To what extent was the UNDAF designed to be in line with the national development needs and priorities and MDGs?

Effectiveness

- To what extent have the outcomes from the UNDAF 2011-2015 been achieved and helped to inform the formulation of the current UNDAF planning cycle?
- What lessons have been learned from the previous UNDAF, which helped to support to CMDG achievement and can be used to effect the achievement of the CSDGs?

Sustainability

- Looking at the past, the present and the future, how well designed was the previous UNDAF in relation to the results achieved?

UNDAF 2016-2018

Relevance

- To what extent is the UNDAF aligned with the national development needs and priorities and should adjustment in UNDAF implementation be considered to align with SDGs? How well does the design of the UNDAF address the needs of the most vulnerable groups in Cambodia?
- To what extent is the UNDAF responsive to changing environment in Cambodia at national and subnational level and how should it adapt to these changes?

Effectiveness

- To what extent is the current UNDAF on track to achieve planned results (incl. intended and unintended, positive or negative)?
- How were the five UN programming principles mainstreamed in the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the UNDAF 2016-2018?
- To what extent has the UN been able to form and maintain partnerships with other development actors including bilateral and multi-lateral organizations, civil society organizations and the private sector to leverage results?

Efficiency

- To what extent and how has the UN system mobilized and used its resources (human, technical and financial) and improve inter-agency synergies to achieve its planned results in the current UNDAF cycle?
- To what extent has the UNDAF increased the synergies between the programmes of UN agencies?

Sustainability

- What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from the previous and current UNDAF will continue at national and subnational level through adequate ownership, commitment, willingness displayed by the government?
• Looking at the past, the present and the future, how well designed is the UNDAF in order to remain valid in light of the changing environment?

In addition to these core questions, the evaluation team will develop context-specific sub-questions during the inception phase of the UNDAF evaluation. To this purpose, during the inception mission the evaluation team will conduct a **stakeholder analysis** followed by ample in-country consultations will all key response stakeholders, to ensure that their views on issues that need to be considered, potential sub-questions, etc. are incorporated into the UNDAF evaluation. The inception report will also confirm the objectives around which to assess results and consider the preparation for the new UNDAF. The evaluation is intended to be forward looking and therefore needs to take into consideration what is important for the future, including with regard to the 2030 Agenda.

**Methodology**

The evaluation will use **mixed-method analysis**, employing the most appropriate **qualitative** and **quantitative** approaches, data types and methods of data analysis. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources. **Methodological rigor will be weighted significantly in the assessment of proposals.** Hence bidders are invited to interrogate the approach and methodology proffered in the TOR and improve on it, or propose an approach they deem more appropriate to achieve the intended evaluation results. In addition, a participatory and utilization-focused approach to involve key stakeholders and boost ownership of the evaluation shall be adopted.

The evaluation team will be guided by the major analytical frameworks that form the basis for drawing final conclusions and generating forward looking recommendations, namely: the evaluation criteria, the UNDAF 2011-2015 and UNDAF 2016-2018 results framework, the National Strategic Development Plan 2009-2013 and 2014-2018 as well as CMDGs reports as the main reference to assess the overall UNCT’s performance, and to understand whether the UNDAF’s objectives have been met and what results have been achieved.

While assessing performance using the above criteria the evaluators will identify the various factors that can explain the performance. This will allow lessons to be learned about why the UNCT performed as it did. Where these factors have been identified as UNDAF outcomes in their own right, they should be considered both results and enabling factors. For instance, strengthened human rights and equity and gender equality could be an UNDAF outcome to be assessed as part of the evaluation, while gender-responsive programming or gender mainstreaming as an explanatory factor that may have helped achieve UNDAF results from equitable poverty reduction to improved social services. Although UNDAFs are implemented in a wide range of contexts, there are some standard issues that can be assumed to affect performance.

During the inception phase, the evaluation team will propose a detailed methodology designed to provide evidence around the result areas of the UNDAF 2011-2015 and the UNDAF 2016-2018. An evaluation matrix will be prepared during the inception phase in which the sources of data, methods and criteria will be defined for each evaluation question, including assuring triangulation of data. The inception report should include a description of data sources, data collection and analysis methods, indicators, triangulation plan, factors for comparative analysis, and validation strategy, as well as how the team intends to incorporate the views various stakeholders (including vulnerable, poor and marginalized groups). The inception report will also provide a detailed stakeholder analysis and a clear indication of how and which national and provincial entities and communities will be consulted, engaged and involved in the evaluation process as relevant. The evaluation team should explicitly describe in the inception report the approaches and strategies that will be used to identify and reach out to various stakeholders. These strategies may include, among others, the selection of key informants, the use of snowball sampling strategies, the use of focus groups, etc. The advantages and limitations of the use of these methods should also be clearly explained.
The evaluation team will conduct field visits to pertinent programmatic areas. The team should seek to spend the necessary amount of time during the field mission to conduct direct consultations with subnational authorities and communities that have benefitted from the UN assistance. The focus of these consultations should be on the change in government actions at national and subnational level as a result of UN policy advice. The evaluation should, wherever possible, undertake systematic data gathering from both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries on the appropriateness and quality of the assistance provided. In deciding the amount of time to be spent in consultation with communities, it is important that the evaluation team maintains a balance in terms of the need to identify high-level outcomes and the need to ensure sufficiently ample consultations.

The UNDAF evaluation will use a variety of validation methods to ensure that the data and information used and conclusions made carry the necessary depth including, but not limited to:

- **Document review** focusing on UNDAF planning documents, mid-term progress reviews (where undertaken), annual reports and past evaluation reports (incl. those on projects and small-scale initiatives, and those issued by national counterparts), strategy papers, national plans and policies and related programme and project documents. These should include reports on the progress against national and international commitments. There are several crucial strategic documents currently under development which need to be taken into consideration even though they might become available only when the actual reviewing phase is over.\(^\text{12}\)
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members, and implementing partners;
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, UNCT members, and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic level;
- **Focus group discussions** involving groups and sub-groups of stakeholders and decision-makers; and
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, etc.

In general, the evaluation approach should follow the UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality, UNEG norms and standards and international principles for development evaluation.\(^\text{13}\) In particular, in line with the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP)\(^\text{14}\) on gender equality, data collection methods and process should consider gender sensitivity. The final report should be compliant with UNEG quality checklist of evaluation reports\(^\text{15}\) and acknowledge how inclusive stakeholder participation was ensured during the evaluation process and any challenges to obtaining the gender equality information or to addressing these issues appropriately. Data should be systematically disaggregated by sex and age and, to the extent possible, disaggregated by geographical region, ethnicity, disability, migratory status and other contextually-relevant markers of equity. Adherence to a code of ethics and a human rights based and gender sensitive approach in the gathering, treatment and use of data collected should be made explicit in the inception report. Perspective from both rights holders and duty bearers shall be collected.

### V. MANAGEMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION

The UNDAF evaluation team will work under the supervision of a dual-tiered evaluation management structure: an **evaluation commission and an evaluation management group (EMG)**. The evaluation commission,

---

\(^{12}\) A list of all relevant documents will be made available.


comprised by the RC and UN Head of Agencies and Government representatives, is the decision-making organ for the UNDAF evaluation. All key deliverables need to be validated by an evaluation commission.

An **evaluation management group** (EMG) will provide direct supervision and will function as the guardian of the independence of the evaluation. The EMG is responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation and management of the evaluation budget. The EMG core group is composed by a staff member of the RC’s Office, the M&E officers/focal points from UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UN Women and WHO, one representative from the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC) and one representative from the National Working Group (NWG) on M&E. Additional members of the EMG are three members of the Programme Management Team (UNICEF, UNOPS, WFP).

A **reference group** will provide inputs and comments on the TOR, the inception report and final report and review the main deliverables to provide quality assurance. It is composed of two focal points from CDC and the NWG M&E, three UNDAF Focal Points on Head of Agency level, the chairs of the four UN thematic groups (Gender, Human Rights, HIV/AIDS, Youth), two representatives from CSOs (CCC and NGO Forum), two evaluation experts from UNEDAP and one staff from RCO. The group will provide comments on the TOR and meets at least two times: (1) to discuss the inception report, and (2) to discuss the final report. Specific dates are suggested in Table 1, page 15. All members are expected to attend validation workshops. All deliverables will be reviewed first by members of the EMG before sharing with the reference group members.

Given the importance of UNDAF evaluation and the complexities involved in its design and implementation, it is critical that due time and effort is accorded to recruiting an external **evaluation team** which will meet the standards to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation team should ideally consist of **one team leader and between two and three additional team members with the following responsibilities**. For UNDAF evaluations, working with evaluation teams composed of members with a diverse mix of qualifications is recommended. The evaluation team needs to be balanced in terms of gender and should include at least one national team member as this will bring local perspective to the evaluation.

The evaluation team leader will lead the entire evaluation process, working closely with all team members. He/she will conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner and communicate with the EMG on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered. The team leader will be responsible for producing high quality inception report and the draft and final evaluation reports in standard British English (both the Evaluation Brief and Executive Summary of the Evaluation Report will need to be translated in Khmer at the cost of the company).

The team members will contribute to the evaluation process substantively through data collection and analysis. They will share responsibilities for conducting desk review and interviews and conduct field visits to the project sites identified during the inception phase and collect data. They will provide substantive inputs to the inception report as well as to the draft and final evaluation reports.

**Qualification of Evaluation Team**

1) **International Team Leader (1 person)**

- Advanced University Degree (Masters or PhD) in political science, public administration, development studies, law, human rights or other relevant field;
- Minimum fifteen years of relevant professional experience;
- A strong record in designing and leading evaluations;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- Demonstrated managerial competence and experience in organizing, leading and coordinating evaluation teams at the international level;
• Technical competence in undertaking complex evaluations which involve use of mixed methods;
• Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies;
• Knowledge of UN role, UN reform process and UN programming at the country level, particularly UNDAF;
• Strong experience and knowledge in the five UN programming principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system), gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development; and
• Fluency in English, excellent oral, written, communication and reporting skills.

2) International Team Member(s) (Max 2 persons)

• Advanced University Degree (Master or PhD) political science, public administration, development studies, law, human rights or other relevant field;
• Minimum of ten years of relevant professional experience;
• Technical competence in undertaking complex evaluations which involve use of mixed methods;
• Strong data collection and analysis skills;
• Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies;
• Knowledge of UN role, UN reform process and UN programming at the country level, particularly UNDAF;
• Strong experience and knowledge in the five UN programming principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system), gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development;
• Process management skills such as facilitation skills and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders;
• Fluency in English, excellent oral, written, communication and reporting skills; knowledge of Khmer would be an asset;
• Experience in conducting evaluation of an UNDAF especially the one of the similar country context is considered a strong asset; and
• Previous working experience in an East Asian context is desirable, together with understanding of Cambodia context and cultural dynamics is also considered an asset.

3) National Team Member(s) (Max 2 persons)

• Advanced University Degree (Master or PhD) in the field of political science, governance, public administration, development studies, law, human rights or other relevant field;
• Minimum five years of relevant professional experience;
• Process management skills such as facilitation skills and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders (including in local language);
• Strong experience and knowledge in the five UN programming principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system), gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development;
• In-depth knowledge and strong research record of Cambodian socio-economic development;
• Fluency in English and Khmer; and
• Experience in translation and interpretation.

Minimum qualifications of firm/organization:
• A minimum of five years of experiences in managing evaluations, producing high quality analytical research/assessment and providing technical advice or consulting services on issues pertaining to development;
• Back-stopping support and quality assurance systems;
• A strong record in conducting qualitative and quantitative evaluations, using UNEG norms and standards;
• Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies;
• Knowledge of UN role, UN reform process and UN programming at the country level, particularly UNDAF;
• Experience in conducting evaluation of an UNDAF especially the one of the similar country context is considered a strong asset; and
• Previous working experience in an East Asian context is desirable, together with understanding of Cambodia context and cultural dynamics is also considered an asset.

All the members of the evaluation team should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the UNDAF subject of the evaluation

VI. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Evaluation products expected for this exercise are: 1) an inception report, including an Evaluation Brief for external communication; 2) a Power Point presentation containing initial evaluation findings to facilitate validation of the preliminary findings; 3) the final report of the evaluation with up to three revisions (complete first draft be reviewed by the EMG; second draft to be reviewed by the evaluation commission and the reference group, and a penultimate draft) that includes an executive summary; 4) infographics to be used for publication; and a PowerPoint presentation used to share findings with the reference group and for use in subsequent dissemination events. Outlines and descriptions of each evaluation products are meant to be indicatives, and include:

• Inception report: The evaluation team will produce an inception report not to exceed 25 pages, or 20,000 words, excluding annexes setting out: the team’s understanding of the issues to be evaluated (scope), questions that the UNDAF evaluation intends to answer, and their understanding of the context in which the evaluation takes place; including of a comprehensive stakeholder analysis; any suggested deviations from the TOR, including any additional issues raised during the initial consultations; an evaluation matrix showing selected criteria of analysis, questions and sub-questions, the indicators proposed and sources of information; methodology, including details of gender analysis and triangulation strategy; data collection and analysis tools that will be used to conduct the evaluation; any limitations of the chosen methods of data collection and analysis and how they will be addressed; explanation of how the views of various stakeholders, including vulnerable and marginalized groups, will be addressed during the evaluation; fieldwork plan, timeline for the evaluation, draft dissemination strategy of the evaluation results. Please refer to the quality check for the Inception Report: http://uneval.org/document/detail/608. The inception will be presented at a formal meeting of the evaluation commission and the reference group.

• PowerPoint presentation: Initially prepared and used by the evaluation team in their presentation of the preliminary findings to the evaluation commission and the reference group, a standalone PowerPoint will be submitted to the EMG as part of the evaluation deliverables.

• Evaluation report: The evaluation report will not exceed 50 pages, or 35,000 words, excluding a standalone executive summary (max 2,500 words) and annexes. A complete draft report will include: table of
contents, summary table linking findings, conclusions and recommendations, including where responsibility for follow up should lie; analysis of the context in which the UNDAF is implemented; methodology summary: a brief chapter, with a more detailed description provided in an annex; main body of the report, including overall assessment, findings in response to the evaluation questions; conclusions and lessons learned; a parsimonious set of actionable strategic and programmatic recommendations in priority order, and a description of how they were validated; and annexes (evaluation terms of reference; data analysis framework, list of people interviewed, list of background materials used, etc.). Please refer to the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report for guidance: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607.

- **Data and infographics:** Data, live data tables and infographics will be submitted to the evaluation management team as part of the evaluation deliverables.

**Bidders are invited to reflect on each outline and effect the necessary modification to enhance their coverage and clarity. Having said so, products are expected to conform to the stipulated number of pages where that applies.**

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed according to the UNEG norms and standards for evaluation and the UNICEF and WFP quality assurance system for evaluations, respectively GEROS and EQUAS.

The inception and draft reports will be produced jointly by the members of the evaluation team and will reflect their collective understanding of the evaluation. All deliverables listed will be written in standard British English (the Evaluation Brief, Executive Summary of the Evaluation Report, the PowerPoint presentation and infographics will need to be translated into Khmer). If the EMG finds that the reports do not meet the required standards, the evaluation team will make the edits and changes needed to bring it in line with the required standards at their own expenses.

An estimated budget has been allocated for this evaluation. The implementation of the evaluation is expected to follow the following time schedule.

**Table 1: Proposed UNDAF Evaluation Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>TIME ESTIMATE</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCEPTION, DOCUMENT REVIEW AND ANALYSIS</td>
<td>7 weeks, concurrent (April – May 2017)(^\text{16})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception visit, drafting the inception report (methods, instruments, etc.)</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>3 April – start</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of first draft inception report to EMG (in-house) and feedback to the evaluation team</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>18 April</td>
<td>EMG/ Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second inception report - Presentation to the evaluation commission and the reference group</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>25 April</td>
<td>Evaluation team EMG/evaluation commission/reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit final inception report</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td>EMG/ Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct document review, survey and analysis</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) There are a number of public holidays in April/May, i.e. 14-16 April Khmer New Year (with many officials usually taking the whole week 10-14 April); 1 May International Labour Day; 10 May Visak Bochea (Birth of Buddha), 13-15 King’s birthday; 14 May Royal Plowing Ceremony.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize and present desk review report to EMG, confirm planning for field visit</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>Evaluation team/EMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 weeks, consecutive (End-May – mid-June, 2017)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct field-based data collection</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>12 July</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct workshop to validate preliminary findings</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORTING</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 weeks, consecutive (July – August, 2017)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and submit a first draft of evaluation report</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>9 August</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive first draft and feedback to evaluation team</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>16 August</td>
<td>EMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and submit second draft of evaluation report to EMG</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>23 August</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive second draft and feedback to evaluation team</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>6 September</td>
<td>EMG/evaluation commission/reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive penultimate draft and feedback to evaluation team</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>13 September</td>
<td>Evaluation team/EMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit and present final report to the evaluation commission and the reference group in a workshop</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>20 September</td>
<td>Evaluation team/EMG/evaluation commission/reference group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UNDAF evaluation has a timeline of six months from beginning of April to September, 2017. Adequate effort should be allocated to the evaluation to ensure timely submission of all deliverables, approximately 20 weeks on the part of the evaluation team.

**VII. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT**

As stated under *V. MANAGEMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION*, the UNDAF evaluation team will work under the supervision of a dual-tiered evaluation management structure: an evaluation commission and an EMG. The evaluation commission, comprised of the RC and UN Heads of Agencies and Government representatives, is the decision-making organ for the UNDAF evaluation. All key deliverables need to be validated by the evaluation commission. The EMG will provide direct supervision to the evaluation team. Head of RC office will function as the main focal point for coordinating and directly communicating with the contractor.

**VIII. DUTY STATION**

The duty station of the work is home based and Phnom Penh, Cambodia but the team will be required to visit pertinent programmatic areas in some selected provinces. As stated above under *Evaluation Objectives and*

---

17 4 June - Date of Cambodia Communal Elections.
Scope, two provinces are expected to be selected by the evaluation team based on an analysis during the inception phase.

**IX. SCOPE OF BID PRICE AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS**

The Service Provider shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones:
- 30% after approval of the inception report, including an Evaluation Brief for external communication;
- 30% after presentation of a Power Point presentation containing initial evaluation findings to facilitate validation of the preliminary findings; and
- 40% after approval of the final evaluation report that includes an executive summary, infographics to be used for publication; and a PowerPoint presentation used to share findings with the reference group and for use in subsequent dissemination events.

The contractor fee will be paid as a lump sum amount (all-inclusive of expenses related to the consultancy including travels inside and outside the duty station and any tax obligations). The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

**X. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL**

The bidder shall structure the technical part of its Proposal according to the format proposed in this TOR, as follows.

a) Expertise of firm/organization submitting proposal: This section should describe the organizational unit that will be responsible for the contract, and the general management approach towards this evaluation. This should fully explain the Bidder’s resources in terms of personnel and other resources necessary for achieving project results. This section should also provide orientation to the organization/firm including the year and state/country of incorporation and a brief description of the Bidder’s present activities (focusing on services related to the Proposal). Information on similar activities having been undertaken by the company, institution or team of individuals going to be involved in this assignment and recent and current contracts with similar agencies.

b) Proposed methodology: This section should demonstrate the Bidder’s responsiveness to the specification by identifying the specific components proposed, addressing the requirements, as specified, point by point; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics proposed; and demonstrating how the proposed methodology meets or exceeds the specifications.

c) Personnel: CVs for all team members should be attached, including a copy of an evaluation report written by the proposed Team Leader.

d) Three references for each team member.