



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

SENIOR EVALUATION CONSULTANT

PROCUREMENT NOTICE No. UNDP/IC/2014/002 Date: 2 May 2014

Country: Monrovia, Liberia

Duty Station: Monrovia

Description of the assignment: International Senior Evaluation Consultant

Project name: Peace Building Office

Period of assignment/services: 40 Working Days

Proposals should be submitted at the following address: by email to consultants.lr@undp.org (Please include procurement notice number in the subject area) no later than 12:00 Noon (GMT), **Monday, 5 May 2014**

Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The Elections office will respond by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

1. **BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVE**

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), established in 2006, is a flexible peacebuilding tool that supports the United Nations' broader peacebuilding objectives in countries at risk of relapsing into conflict. It is intended to be a catalytic fund, driven by existing planning, coordination and monitoring mechanisms to support the peacebuilding strategies of in-country UN-Government leadership. The Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) is responsible for the overall management of the PBF; UNDP's Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF)¹ is the Fund's Administrative Agent. At the country level, management of the Fund is delegated to a Joint Steering Committee (JSC), co-chaired by the national Government and the United Nations with a broader membership representing national and international stakeholders.

¹ Memorandum of Understanding between the Recipient UN Organizations and UNDP regarding the Operational Aspects of the PBF applies.

Liberia has been receiving Peacebuilding Funds since it was declared eligible in 2007. An initial allocation of \$15 million was granted in early 2008, based on a Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) that identified three priority areas: fostering national reconciliation and conflict management; 2) critical interventions to promote peace, and 3) resolve conflict and strengthen state capacity for peace consolidation.

In September 2010, Liberia was also placed on the agenda of the UN's Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), in response to the Government's request. In October of 2010, the PBC and the Government of Liberia adopted a Statement of Mutual Commitment (SMC) which outlined Security, Rule of Law, and Reconciliation as the priority areas. Since then, a further \$20 million was granted in June 2011 to fund a new Liberia Priority Plan in a second PRF, and in late 2013 a third Priority Plan was approved, granting US\$ 15 million.

To help support the implementation of the Priority Plan and the oversight function of the Joint Steering Committee, the Liberian Peacebuilding Office (PBO), based at the Liberian Ministry of Internal Affairs, was established in January 2009 as the PBF Secretariat in Liberia and as the Government's main office to coordinate all peacebuilding initiatives, supporting key national peacebuilding and reconciliation activities. As such, the PBO has maintained a dual responsibility - and "reporting" line - from its very inception: (i) as PBF Secretariat reporting mainly to the JSC and acting as the main focal point for PBF related matters; and ii) as the main coordinator of key peacebuilding initiatives in the country, reporting to the Ministry of Internal Affairs and other instances of the Liberian Government.

As the PBF has entered into its third tranche of support, it is timely to evaluate the evolving roles and structures of the PBO to ensure the optimal mechanism for supporting the implementation of the third PPP.

2. LIBERIA PBO ROLES & STRUCTURE : AN OVERVIEW

As PBF Secretariat, the PBO undertakes those activities typically related to the implementation of the PBF-supported portfolio on the ground, such as convening JSC meetings, following up decisions made by the JSC, serving as liaison between PBO and the field, etc. Furthermore, in Liberia, the PBO also serves as main focal point for certain PBC-related matters, including consolidating inputs for and drafting the progress report on the Statement of Mutual Commitments, among other things. Technically, however, this function is not necessarily related to the role of the PBO as Secretariat of the PBF, but to the responsibilities that the PBO has as the main governmental office in charge of coordination of peacebuilding initiatives.

In that latter capacity, the PBO is also supporting peacebuilding activities in different areas, including justice and security, reconciliation, early warning and mediation and conflict resolution. The specific support on these substantive issues ranges from training and capacity building to project implementation involving the development of infrastructures for peace at different levels.

In addition, the PBO undertakes monitoring and evaluation of a series of peacebuilding activities, some of which are related to the implementation of the PBF-supported portfolio, as well as others that go beyond the PBF. The range of substantive areas in which M&E is conducted also varies from justice and security to reconciliation, and even includes M&E capacity building for different stakeholders.

As such, the range and number of responsibilities of the PBO seem to have considerably expanded since its inception in 2009. An office that was originally (in 2009) conceived with a focus on a certain set of peacebuilding priorities, namely related to justice and security, has seen its tasks and activities expand as the peacebuilding process has evolved.

In this context, the PBO has played a key role leading the efforts for the development of the Reconciliation Roadmap, both on the substantive drafting but also coordinating with key stakeholders, including Governmental and non-Governmental actors. The PBO also supported the launch and other events related to the implementation of the Reconciliation Roadmap and it is expected that it will continue engaged in such process through monitoring and providing support to such implementation.

Given these various functions, according to the 2013 Annual Report of the PBO, its main responsibilities currently include:

As PBF Secretariat

- Organization, facilitation and follow up to Joint Steering Committee (JSC) meetings: in 2013 the PBO organized 4 JSC meetings for which it prepared the documentation, drafted the minutes and provided follow up to the decisions made.
- Drafting of the JSC annual report. In 2013, the PBO also developed the 2014-2016 Priority Plan. Several stakeholders on the ground expressed concerns about the way the process for the development of the PP was being conducted by the PBO, particularly with regards to communication and effective engagement of several UN and civil society actors.
- Drafting of the SMC progress report. Even though this is not technically a role pertaining to a PBF Secretariat per se, in Liberia, the PBO drafts the mid-year and annual review of progress of the SMC.
- Key focal point for PBSO, including PBF and PBC Support Branch, and MPTFO.

As Government Office for peacebuilding and reconciliation activities

Justice and Security

- Support to the Justice and Security Technical Advisory Group (JSTAG), including the organization of meetings of the JSTAG. In 2013, this support included the lead in the development of a prioritized work plan for Regional Justice and Security Hubs 2 and 3.

Reconciliation

- Support to the drafting and finalization of the “Strategic Roadmap for National Healing, Peacebuilding and Reconciliation”. In 2013, this included a series of working sessions with relevant stakeholders.

- Support to the Liberia Peace Initiative led by Ambassador George Weah, including the organization of an event in 2013. PBO support in organizing the various reconciliation related events was acknowledged as very helpful by the GoL and other stakeholders, given that without proper organization and ensuring a participatory approach, such sensitive events could well have led to renewed tensions on reconciliation issues. In addition, in 2013, the PBO supported the organization of the Joint Council of Chiefs and Elders meeting as a cross-border reconciliation conference.

Capacity building in Conflict Management and Mediation

- Training for staff of the Regional Justice and Security Hubs. In 2013, the PBO supported and facilitated two trainings on mediation and intervention strategies for staff at the Gbarnga hub.
- Training for County Peace Committees. In 2013, the PBO conducted refresher training in mediation and conflict management for the leadership of the Bong County Peace Committee.
- Mainstreaming conflict sensitivity. In 2013, the PBO provided support to the Ministry of Education concerning conflict sensitivity mainstreaming in Citizenship Curriculum and Training Manuals for the Liberian School System.
- Social Cohesion Initiative. The PBO is implementing a social cohesion initiative in 5 counties aimed at developing local capacities for peace through support to small-scale peace and reconciliation projects (including training of “peace monitors”, among other things).

Crosscutting

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Review and strengthening of M&E systems. In 2013, the PBO conducted a review of the M&E framework of the Liberia Peacebuilding Programme (LPP), focusing on the indicators for justice and security.
- Public perception surveys. In 2013, the PBO conducted a public perception survey on justice and security in the 5 counties that will be covered by hubs 2 and 3. In 2012 a similar type of survey was conducted in the 3 counties covered by hub 1.
- M&E trainings. In 2013, the PBO conducted a series of M&E workshops for Governmental and non-Governmental actors.
- M&E technical advice and support. In 2013, the PBO provided technical advice and support on M&E to various institutions/agencies such as the Ministry of Justice, UNDP, UNICEF, UN Habitat among others.

3. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES & PURPOSE

The evaluation's objective will be to examine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency², connectedness³ and sustainability of the PBO's support on peacebuilding. Its main purpose will be to help the PBO and PBSO define the best structure and range of support activities to undertake during the implementation of the current tranche of PBF support. The evaluation will generate recommendations identifying concrete actions to undertake toward this end.

In order to look both backward and forward, the evaluation will need to assess the evolution of PBO's systems and roles to date as a means of tracking progress. The evaluation will therefore take both a summative and a formative approach, in that it will look at results achieved or not achieved thus far (summative) in order to shape the direction of the PBO's role and structure in the future (formative). The evaluation will thus serve two purposes. On one hand, independent evaluation that candidly examines the PBO's performance of its multiple roles to date is a vital part of ensuring *accountability*—e.g., to the Joint Steering Committee and to the Peacebuilding Support Office for results achieved, to donors for showing value for their investments in this secretariat function, and to UN and non-UN partners, including populations affected by conflict. On the other hand, *learning* from this information on past experience is necessary if the PBO is to improve its practice and policies in future. Moreover, results of this evaluation can be expected to provide the foundation for broader learning on good practices for supporting nationally-led peacebuilding efforts within the framework of the PBF. While both summative and formative purposes will be important in this exercise, ultimately it is the latter that will receive somewhat greater weight.

Given this dual focus on accountability and learning, the intended users of this evaluation are manifold. The main client will be the Co-Chairs of the Joint Steering Committee in Monrovia. Other key stakeholders include government Ministries directly involved in peacebuilding, the Peacebuilding Fund, UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes and other resident UN entities in Liberia.

4. SCOPE

The evaluation is intended to provide an understanding of the role the PBO has played since its establishment through to the present, with an emphasis on examining what kinds of activities it has performed/implemented and how effectively/efficiently, with an aim toward determining the optimal configuration and accountabilities moving forward. In doing so, the evaluation should also relate these activities to the PBO's organizational structure, making clear how well situated the PBO has been to perform its required tasks based on its reporting lines, staffing, and multiple accountabilities to various offices.

² For the purpose of this evaluation, Efficiency will be broadly defined to include areas ranging from how effectively the PBO has allocated its human and financial resources to its peacebuilding support work, to cost-effectiveness and cost-efficiency considerations. (See Section IV.) Should formal cost-efficiency and -effectiveness analysis be undertaken, every effort will be made at the outset of the evaluation to establish clear and measurable benchmarks for expenditure, results, success and failure.

³ Given its pivotal role in support of other office's implementation of peacebuilding initiatives and as the Secretariat to the PBF Joint Steering Committee, the evaluation will explore to what extent the PBO has managed its relationships and enabled an optimal flow of information, analysis and oversight with the wide and varied stakeholders with which it is mandated to interact.

The following set of evaluation questions, framed along the OECD/DAC criteria, will guide the evaluation in pursuit of its stated objectives and purposes:

○ **Relevance/Appropriateness**

- How “fit-for-purpose” is PBO’s organizational structure for achieving its main objectives of peacebuilding coordination, support to the JSC, reporting on Priority Plan results, Monitoring and Evaluation, and delivery of targeted peacebuilding projects?
- How appropriate for the context is the range of substantive areas in which the PBO is engaged (i.e. justice and security, reconciliation, conflict prevention and resolution, etc.). If the substantive areas are deemed appropriate for the context, how appropriate are they for the PBO to undertake?

○ **Effectiveness/Impact**

- How effective has the PBO been in implementing the range of substantive areas in which the PBO is engaged (i.e. justice and security, reconciliation, conflict prevention and resolution, etc.).
- What have been the PBO’s greatest accomplishments/contributions and value-added to supporting peacebuilding in Liberia? In the event of a redefinition of its mandate, which are the functions it is best placed to retain and which could better be performed by others (particularly relevant for questions of justice and security)?
- How effective has the PBO been in implementing the range of support functions in which the PBO is engaged (i.e. monitoring & evaluation, reporting, coordination and support for JSC, etc.).

○ **Efficiency**

- How efficient has the PBO been in implementing the range of substantive areas in which the PBO is engaged (i.e. justice and security, reconciliation, conflict prevention and resolution, etc.).
- How efficient has the PBO been in implementing the range of support functions in which the PBO is engaged (i.e. monitoring & evaluation, reporting, coordination and support for JSC, etc.).
- To what extent, if any, have delays in developing and implementing the Priority Plan been attributable to actions or inactions by the PBO?
- Are the human resources assigned to the PBO a sufficient and efficient use of resources given the PBO’s accountabilities?
- Do other actors exist that are better placed to assume functions currently invested in the PBO?

○ **Connectedness/Coordination/Coherence**

- How clearly and uniformly understood throughout the PBO are the reporting lines to the various offices to which it is accountable? How complementary, reinforcing or conflicting are these reporting lines?
 - How well has PBO managed its relationships across its various areas of responsibility (with Government, the JSC, UN partners, civil society, PBF, PBC, MPTFO, etc.)?
 - How effective has PBO’s communication and coordination function been among and between the various actors with which it must interact?
- **Sustainability**
- What is the optimal level of sustainability of the PBO given the existence of the PMU (in terms of the range of functions it is mandated to perform, staffing needs, and structural position of the office within a set of institutions)? What changes might have to be made to realise this level?

All of the above questions will be explored with a view to uncovering the explanatory factors (internal and external factors) that have helped or hindered PBO’s peacebuilding support efforts⁴. Answers to the “why” question underlying each of the items above will help elucidate the key enabling factors that need to be continued or replicated – and constraining factors that need to be addressed. These will form the basis the recommendations that emerge from the evaluation.

5. APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Overarching Approach

The evaluation’s overall approach will be guided by the principle of credibility – that is, ensuring that the best evidence available is harnessed, and that it is analyzed appropriately, so as to generate findings, conclusions and recommendations that resonate and that management can therefore feel confident acting on. This approach presumes four main pillars. These include:

- a. **Consultation** with and participation by key stakeholders, in the form of a Reference Group (see Section VI) and other venues (e.g., on-going communications and updates), so as to ensure that the evaluation remains relevant to the PBO’s work, and that the evidence and analysis are sound and factually accurate;
- b. **Methodological rigour** to ensure that the most appropriate sources of evidence for answering the questions in Section IV are used in a technically appropriate manner;
- c. **Independence** to ensure that the analysis stands solely on an impartial and objective analysis of the evidence, without undue influence by any key stakeholder group;

⁴ Such factors may include initiatives or policies not related to the Peacebuilding Fund work but which nonetheless impinge upon PBO’s ability to support the JSC as well as UN partners in a timely, predictable and efficient manner.

d. **Evaluator's relevant expertise** to ensure that the foregoing three pillars are adequately understood and followed, and that the appropriate evaluation skills and appropriate subject matter expertise to make the analysis of the evidence authoritative and believable.

It will be the PBF Monitoring & Evaluation Unit's responsibility to ensure that each of these elements is adequately attended to throughout the evaluation, and the Reference Group's responsibility to support the M&E Unit in achieving each.

Prior to embarking on data collection, the evaluator will prepare a short Inception Report, based on a desk review and augmented with phone interviews wherever possible, for review by the Monitoring & Evaluation Unit and the Reference Group. The Inception Report will illustrate the team's understanding of the evaluation and the expectations around it, and set forth a specific roadmap for implementing this ToR and delivering an independent, credible and utilization-focused evaluation. It will be a forum for spelling out the specific methods and data sources from which it will garner evidence to answer each evaluation question and to assess attribution/contribution of results to the PBO's peacebuilding support efforts (i.e., an analytical framework); a more thorough internal and external stakeholder analysis; and any proposed modifications to the evaluation questions. Data collection instruments will be shared with the M&E Unit separately, on which the M&E Unit will in turn seek Reference Group feedback.

Methodology

Upon finalization of the Inception Report by the M&E Unit in consultation with the Reference Group, the evaluator will embark on data collection and analysis. In keeping with the emphasis on methodological rigor, the selected evaluator will be expected to employ a mixed-method approach – i.e., triangulation of the most appropriate qualitative and quantitative methods, and the most appropriate documentary and perceptual evidence⁵, for answering each evaluation question at hand.

Within this overarching framework, and in light of the evaluation questions posed in Section IV, the evaluator will be expected to use the following combination of data collection methods in this evaluation:

- **Informal desk review** for general background on the evolution and impact of the PBO's work;
- **Formal desk review** of relevant documentation from within and outside the PBO (e.g. programme-related annual reports, evaluations, annual work plans, PBO project documents, and so on), which the evaluator systematically reviews either for specific qualitative or quantitative data points or for an aggregated tally of specific data points across documents;
- **Key informant interviews (KIIs)** and **focus group discussions (FGDs)**, in person or by telephone or Skype, with PBO staff, New York-based PBSO staff, Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office staff, in-country UN staff members, JSC members, representatives of relevant Ministries engaged in

⁵ Documentary data is gathered from written records, reports, papers, emails, etc. It can provide time-specific and factual information of events and proceedings. Perceptual data is gathered from individuals' opinions based on their experiences. Findings based solely on perceptual data should use trend analysis and/or triangulation with other data to deduce findings given its subjective nature.

peacebuilding, and other partners including programme beneficiaries and operational partners at the country level;

- A country-focused **survey** of PBF interlocutors to elicit a snapshot of the role and functioning of the PBO; and
- **Direct observation** of key PBO activities (capacity building, reconciliation project activities, coordination functions, etc.) in real time to obtain a direct, first-hand perspective on how PBO “does” and talks about peacebuilding support.

The evaluator will visit Monrovia for approximately two weeks in order to examine how the PBO’s peacebuilding support activities are undertaken in country, determine the extent to which these have contributed to effective coordination and implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan and the earlier Liberia Peacebuilding Plan, and capacity building, and assess the PBO’s and partners’ perspectives in greater depth. The evaluator will provide the JSC, PBO and other relevant stakeholders with an end-of-mission debrief on its findings, and provide the JSC and PBO an opportunity to validate these findings or point the team toward further evidence to consider.

6. MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Management and governance arrangements for the exercise will be established with a view to maximizing the credibility and hence utility of the evaluation. A Senior Evaluation Specialist in PBF’s M&E Unit will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the exercise. As evaluation manager for the evaluation, the Evaluation Specialist’s role will be to oversee the project from inception to product dissemination, including: recruiting and managing the evaluator, serving as the interlocutor with relevant stakeholders, monitoring the budget and work plan, organizing field missions and desk research to support data collection, coordinating Reference Group meetings, and ensuring clear and consistent communications with key stakeholders. In managing the evaluator, the Evaluation Specialist will focus on ensuring adherence to these ToR and to established norms and standards for evaluation.

An Evaluation Reference Group will constitute the main consultation platform. The Group will serve in an advisory capacity, its key role being to help strengthen the evaluation’s substantive grounding and its relevance to the Organization, and thereby increase its ultimate utility. Reference Group members will be responsible for reviewing key outputs of the evaluation, including this Terms of Reference, the Inception Report and draft reports. Additionally, individual Reference Group members may be asked to assist the M&E Unit in the recruitment of the evaluator. Ultimately, the evaluator will assess the appropriateness for incorporation into the final products based on other evidence collected during the evaluation process, and make the best-informed judgment possible and square Reference Group members’ views, bearing in mind the overall objectives and purpose of the exercise, its cost, and other issues. Formal responsibilities of the Reference Group will be articulated in a separate Terms of Reference.

It is proposed that the Reference Group include representatives from the following 7 groups:

- The Peacebuilding Commission Support Branch, PBSO

- Ministry of Internal Affairs
- Ministry of Justice
- UNMIL
- UNDP
- Donor
- Civil Society

7. RISKS, CHALLENGES & OPORTUNITIES

A number of potential risks to the timeliness and the quality of the evaluation include:

- inadequate time allotted for the field mission;
- inability to speak with key informants during the field mission as a result of scheduling challenges or other unforeseen obligations;
- difficulty in reaching key informants with institutional memory regarding “the early days of PBO” (2009-11); and
- possible delays in finalizing deliverables due to Reference Group members unfamiliar with participating in evaluations and bound to other commitments.

8. DELIVERABLES & TIME FRAME

The evaluation will produce the following major outputs, all of which will be grounded in UNEG Norms and Standards and good evaluation practice, to be disseminated to the appropriate audiences:

- An **Inception Report** (maximum 15 pages), informed by an initial desk-based scoping exercise, that outlines the selected evaluator’s understanding of the evaluation and expectations, along with a concrete action plan for undertaking the evaluation. It will spell out the specific methods and data sources from which it will garner evidence to answer each evaluation question; provide a thorough internal and external stakeholder analysis and sampling strategies; propose modifications, if any, to the evaluation questions. The Inception Report will be reviewed by the Evaluation Manager and the Reference Group for feedback before finalization;
- A **Draft Report (maximum 40 pages)** generating key findings and recommendations for concrete action, underpinned by clear evidence (for review by the Evaluation Manager and Reference Group), and an Executive Summary of no more than 3 pages that weaves together the evaluation findings and recommendations into a crisp, clear, compelling storyline;
- A **Validation Exercise** with Reference Group members and key PBF staff;
- A **Final Report** that incorporates final comments from the M&E Unit and Reference Group; and
- A short **synopsis of the final report**, intended for wider external circulation that may include a PBF community of practice as well as donors and the PBF Advisory Group.

The following timeframe assumes one month as a rough estimate for finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference and recruitment of the evaluator. The calendar will be revisited with more concrete dates as the M&E Unit approaches the kick-off of the evaluation.

Project Timeline

Constitute Reference Group	5 March
Finalize Terms of Reference	10 March
Recruit consulting team	28 April
Kick off evaluation	5 May
Deliver draft Inception Report	12 May
Undertake data collection, including field mission	21 May
Undertake data analysis and draft report	4 June
Deliver first Draft Report	16 June
Deliver Final Report with synopsis	30 June

9. DISSEMINATION & USE

The final report will be a published document, publically available on PBSO's website. It is therefore critical that the report not only be strongly evidence-based, but also well written – including a 3 page Executive Summary that captures the core story of the PBO's peacebuilding support efforts in a crisp, clear and compelling narrative. The M&E Unit will work with Reference Group members from the outset to determine the best vehicles for communicating findings and recommendations for maximum uptake.

It is expected that a standard management response will proceed, led by the Co-Chairs of the JSC. On the Chairs' request, the M&E Unit will support them in this process.

10. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

A senior evaluation expert will be recruited to conduct the evaluation. The evaluator will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish, and in a timely and high-quality manner, including data collection and analysis, as well as report drafting.

Education:

An advanced university degree (Masters required, Ph.D. preferred) in social sciences, ideally in peace/conflict studies, or other area relevant to the assignment.

Experience:

At least 7 years' relevant experience in Monitoring and Evaluation of development projects & programmes, including experience with the following:

- The logical framework approach and other strategic planning approaches;
- Knowledge of various M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory);
- Solid understanding of mainstreaming of equity issues for gender and youth into M&E frameworks;
- Familiarity with UN coordination mechanisms;
- Knowledge of Liberia peace implementation would be a particular advantage;

- Good knowledge and understanding of UNDP or major donor policies and practice on M&E;
- Excellent reading and writing skills in English, particularly the ability to rapidly, clearly and succinctly convey critical comments on key project outputs;
- Ability and availability to promptly review and comment on key project outputs; and
- Demonstrated track record for working well in a complex environment.

a) Language Requirement:

Fluency in written and spoken English is compulsory

11. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal:

(i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work (1 page)

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work

(iii) Writing Sample: an unedited writing sample in English of sole-authored work. Preference given to past evaluation reports.

2. Financial proposal

3. Personal CV (P11) including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

4. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

12. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The financial proposal shall specify a daily fee. Payments will be made to the Individual Consultant based on the number of days worked and based on specific and measurable deliverables as specified in the TOR upon completion of all deliverables.

<u>Description</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Total price</u>
Consultancy fee ; daily rate (all-inclusive, fees + living allowance)	days	40		

Air ticket (economy class – most direct route)	Trip	1		
---	-------------	----------	--	--

11. EVALUATION

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

Award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial

** Technical Criteria; [70 points]*

** Financial Criteria; [30 points]*

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the maximum points would be considered for the financial evaluation

Criteria		Max. Point
<u>Technical</u>		
<i>Criteria A:</i> Overall experience in the provision with the services		25
<i>Criteria B:</i> Technical skills, given by qualifications and research record;		25
<i>Criteria C:</i> Adequacy of the proposal in responding to the Terms of Reference (TOR)		20
<u>Financial</u>	30 points x price of the lowest	30 points

	<i>price proposed / price of proposal</i>	
--	---	--

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

ANNEX 2- INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

<http://www.lr.undp.org/procure.htm>

ANNEX 3 – P11 FORM

<http://www.lr.undp.org/procure.htm>