|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To:** | Procurement unit | **Date** | 21 May 2018 |
| **From** | Mohammad Allahou / Programme Officer | **Cc:** | Dima Al-Khatib / DRR |

**Subject : NEW IC post Announcement**

This is to request the initiation of the necessary action for posting a job. Items with an \* are required

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **\*Description of the assignment:** | ***Mid-term evaluation of the project “Institutional Capacity Development for the Implementation of Kuwait National Development Plan (ICDI/KNDP)”*** | | |
| **\*Duty station:** | ***Kuwait*** | | |
| **\*Estimated number of travels** | ***One*** | | |
| **\*Period of assignment/services (stated in month and days)** | 25 Working Days (20 June -15 July 2018) | | |
| **\*Post title** | Project Evaluator | | |
| **\*Expected commence date** | ***19 June, 2018*** | | |
| **\* Project Number:** | ***00096707*** | **Project Name:** | ***“Institutional Capacity Development for the Implementation of Kuwait National Development Plan ICDI/KNDP”*** |
| **\*Project fund:** | ***30071*** | **Country:** | ***Kuwait*** |
| **\*Contract Type:**  Direct Contracting  Competitive IC | | **\*Job advertised:**  Globally advertised (Including jobs.undp.org)  locally advertised (only on CO website)  Roster: ***Evaluators*** | |
| **\*Practice Area:** | | | |

I certify that

The necessary funds are available (incl. for possible extension)

Procurement is included in the budget of annual work plan

Attached are

The detailed Terms of Reference (TORs)

The initial request from the GSSCPD

Post position for the duration of:  *(min 2 week duration unless IC contract/consultancies min 5 business days)*

Special Instructions:

**Individual Contract Terms of Reference**

1. **BACKGROUND**

|  |
| --- |
| UNDP provides technical support to the Government of Kuwait in the form of Capacity Development Projects in different areas including Governance, and Sustainable Development through a mutually agreed Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) between Government of Kuwait represented by the General Secretariat for Supreme Council for Planning and Development (GSSCPD), the main technical counterpart for UNDP in Kuwait, and the executing agency of the CPAP, which identifies the priority sectors and areas for UNDP during a 4 years cycle. Under the framework of the CPAP, projects are formulated to support different national agencies, who represent the project implementing partners. The (National Implementation Modality (NIM) of UNDP projects allows for strengthened national ownership and sustainability of results.  The project, “Institutional Capacity Development for the Implementation of Kuwait National Development Plan” was signed in 2015 between UNDP and GSSCPD which represents both executing agency and implementing partner in this project. The project covers the period of 3 years and six months, and was later extended to 4 years. Total approved budget of the project is 22,269,410 USD.  The project provides a framework of technical support to the GSSCPD, the Central Statistics Bureau (CSB), and other public entities, to create an enabling environment for KNDP results, reshape the national agenda towards Kuwait Vision 2035, and foster integration with SDGs, the expected outcome of this project is:  Project Outcome: Capacities of the GSSCPD and Key Government Agencies in Development Planning, Coordination and Monitoring Developed for Effective Implementation of the KNDP.  The overarching outcome will be reached through the following three specific outputs:   * Output 1.1: Improved human capacity and organizational effectiveness of the GSSCPD for development planning; * Output 1.2: Enhanced institutional and human capacities of the CSB for evidence-based plans and policies on sustainable development; * Output 1.3: Increased technical expertise and institutional capacities for strategic planning and implementation of KNDP projects by public entities.   The Project is mobilizing technical assistance, supporting capacity development activities and knowledge transfer, development of national systems for better formulation and implementation of development plans in line with Kuwait vision. |

##### Scope of Work

|  |
| --- |
| **PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**  The mid-term evaluation is undertaken with the aim of gaining a deep understanding of project development impact. This will involve assessing project progress toward its stated objectives as well as contribution to relevant Country Programme Document (CPD) outcome.  The evaluation is intended to draw on lessons learned and achievements of projects so far to determine what can be done to achieve better project results and identify what improvements and adjustments can be made that would ensure achievement of project goals by mid of 2019. It should generate evidence based findings, conclusions and recommendations regarding the results, challenges, sustainability and cost-effectiveness and analyze the reasons for deviations, if any, from the project goals and outcomes. It will also further reflect on developments brought about by internal of external events that may have resulted in possible change in priority.  The evaluation will review of UNDP’s support added value to the government and provide concrete recommendations towards sustainability and provide recommendations on improving strategies that will feed into the new CPD  The mid-term evaluation is launched by UNDP Kuwait. The findings of the evaluation will enable UNDP and key stakeholders to gain a deeper independent perspective of project’s progress toward the intended results in order to adjust the design and/or strategy, make informed decisions and choices and consider alternative approaches to achieving project results.  **EVALUATION SCOPE AND CRITERIA**  The mid-term evaluation should cover implementation of the project from July 1st, 2015 - June 30th, 2018. The geographical scope of the evaluation is the State of Kuwait. The mid-term evaluation will focus on the extent of project achievements in meeting the identified priority areas needs and the project’s response to those needs as they have evolved over the lifespan of the project. The evaluation should also cover the project concept and activities, outputs, outcomes and provide information for further enhancement of the project’ s monitoring and evaluation strategy.  The evaluation scope should include findings, lessons learned and recommendations in the following areas:   * An analysis of how efficiently project planning and implementation are carried out. This includes assessing to which extent organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanism used by UNDP supports the project. * Whether there has been progress made towards achievement of the project results, as well as implementing the related Country Programme Document (CPD) outcomes. * Whether the project addresses the identified needs/problem (relevance) taking into consideration evolving context and institutional priorities. * Good practices identified by the project, key lessons learned from programme implementation, and recommendations for similar programmes/projects. * Recommendations for future implementations and follow-up by GSSCPD.   The scope should also include issues of:   * Relevance and attainability of the objectives and the extent to which the development intervention of the project meets the beneficiaries needs. * Resource efficiency, cost effectiveness and how economically efficient the resources were converted into results. * The usefulness of results and outcomes and the positive and negative impacts over the long-term and short-term. * Sustainability of expected results and the continuation of the benefits and probability of the continued long-term benefits after the project is completed. * Problems and constraints encountered during implementation. * Project’s contribution to human and institutional capacity building and to which extent the project contributed to the capacity development needs of the beneficiaries and its partners.   The evaluation should review following aspects of the project:   * Effectiveness: Is the project achieving satisfactory progress toward its stated objectives? * Appropriateness: Is the project the appropriate solution to the problem? * Relevance: Are the project objectives still relevant? What is the value of the project in relation to other priority needs and efforts in the sector? Is the problem addressed still a major problem? * Results: Were the expected results achieved? Did the reach the expected number of target groups? Are the beneficiaries satisfied with the quality and delivery? What are the improvements and changes resulted directly by the project? have the project indicators been achieved and how far along are they to being achieved? * Impact: What difference has the project made to beneficiaries? What are the social, economic, technical, environmental, and other effects on individuals, communities, and institutions – either short-, medium-, or long-term; intended or unintended; positive and negative; on a micro- or macro-level? How the project has supported the government in implementing the Kuwait National Development Plan (KNDP)? Which areas did the project support in regard to the KNDP? Which areas should the project focus on moving forward? How did the project support the government in establishing and promoting best governance practices? * Sustainability: Do the beneficiaries own up to the project, are they willing to continue, and is the host institution developing the capacity and motivation to administer it? Will the government counterpart be able to carry on the activities supported by the project after the conclusion of the project? Have the consultants transferred knowledge/built capacity to the employees in the government counterparts?   **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**  Evaluation methods suggested to be used by the evaluation expert includes:   * Document review, this will include all major documents such as the project document and its revision, progress reports, beneficiary entities forms…. etc (desk review study); * Presentations/inductions with project staff, primary internal and external stakeholders and social partners explaining the process, methodology, objectives and principles of the participatory evaluation which includes a detailed statement of proposed evaluation methods. * In country interviews with all key informants and key players: General Secretariat for Supreme Council for Planning and Development (GSSCPD), Central Statistics Bureau, UNDP, and other relevant stakeholders. Phone Interviews as necessary, and meetings with relevant focal points at the regional level; * Presentation of findings and recommendations to selected stakeholders and partners upon completion of the Evaluation Report.   The evaluation should be conducted be an independent Evaluator that has no prior involvement in the project “Institutional Capacity Development for the Implementation of Kuwait National Development Plan”.  The Evaluator will not act as a representative of any party and should remain independent, neutral, and impartial throughout the evaluation. |

1. **REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

|  |
| --- |
| I. Academic Qualifications:   * Master Degree in social science, statistics, public administration, or any other related field, with specialized training in monitoring and evaluation.   II. Years of experience:   * + Minimum 5 years of experience in planning, monitoring, evaluation, and management of public administration development or development planning of government counterparts.   + Experience in working with government institutions in Middle East region and UN, is an added advantage;   + Experience in evaluations in the UN system, preferably as team leader.   III. Competencies:   * + Possess a solid understanding of the institutional arrangements and resources required to carry out the scope of work;   + Demonstrate flexibility in the event adjustments are required based on the findings, both at the organizational and technical levels, for successful implementation of the consultancy;   + Personal skills: team work and cooperation; capability to work with diverse stakeholders; communication; strong drafting skills; analytical skills; negotiation skills;   + Demonstrate competence in report writing, presenting information and consulting with stakeholders;   + Written and spoken proficiency in English is required, knowledge of Arabic language will be an added value. |

##### Expected Outputs and Deliverables

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Deliverables/ Outputs*** | ***Target Due Dates*** | ***Review and Approvals Required*** |
| **Desk review**  Draft inception report with detailed evaluation plan and methodology prepared; including discussion on and finalization of draft inception report, methodology and evaluation tools. | 5 Working Days  (19-23 June) | **Programme Officer** |
| **Discussions and documentations with key stakeholders**  interview with project team, UNDP staff and key national project stakeholders submitting a summary report of meetings findings | 5 Working Days  (24-28 June) | **Programme Officer** |
| **Data analysis and preparation of draft evaluation report**  Evaluation draft report with findings, lessons learned and results submitted to UNDP and the national counterpart for review. | 10 Working Days  (1 -10 July) | **Programme Officer** |
| **Finalization of the evaluation report based on comments received from UNDP and the national counterpart**  Evaluation finding presented and recommendations refined. | 5 Working Days  (11-15 July) | **Programme Officer** |

1. **Institutional Arrangement**

* The Evaluator shall work under the supervision of UNDP Governance Programme Officer and shall update him/her on the progress of his/her evaluation work.
* He/she will liaise directly with project team on day to day matters for supplying documentations, obtaining information and arranging in country interviews.
* The evaluation process should be planned and conducted in close consultation with UNDP Kuwait and GSSCPD.
* The evaluation tools and methodology must be agreed with UNDP Kuwait.
* The independent Evaluator must have access to Internet and phone during regular office hours during the entire period of the assignment.
* The project will provide office space, with access to internet during the in-country visit.
* Evaluation expert should bring his/her own laptop.
* The expert will receive the following key documents as part of the desk review:
* Country Programme Document (CPD).
* Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP).
* Project document and extension document.
* Quarterly and yearly progress reports.
* Relevant Project Board decisions/documentation.
* Technical /workshop reports.

The recommended presentation of **Evaluation report:**

* Language of the report is English.
* The desirable report outline:
* Executive summary (maximum 4 pages)
* Introduction
* Background (project description)
* Evaluation purpose and objective
* Evaluation Methodology
* Major findings
* Lessons learned
* Constraints that impacted project delivery
* Recommendations and conclusions
* Annexes to the evaluation report should be kept to an absolute minimum. Only those annexes that save to demonstrate or clarify an issue related to a major finding should be included. Existing documents should be referenced but not necessarily annexed. Maximum number of pages for annexes is 15.

1. **Duration of the Work[[1]](#footnote-1)**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 19 June - 15 July 2018 (total of 25 working days) 2. To complete the tasks, selected evaluator will need to visit Kuwait during (24-28 June), 2018. |

1. **Duty Station**

|  |
| --- |
| Home based work with 1 mission to Kuwait (5 working days in duty station) |

1. **Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

|  |
| --- |
| The financial proposal submitted shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. The financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, living allowance, and number of anticipated working days).  Travel: All envisaged travel and other related costs related to join the duty station must be included in the financial proposal. Any other trips outside the scope of work are to be covered from consultant’s expenses. |

1. **EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cumulative analysis  Total score=Technical Score + Financial Score.  Technical Criteria weight - 70%, 700 scores maximum  Financial Criteria weight - 30%. 300 scores maximum  **The selection of candidates will be done in 3 stages**:  **1st stage**: Prior to detailed evaluation, all applications will be thoroughly screened against eligibility criteria (minimum qualification requirements) as set in the TOR in order to determine whether they are compliant/non-compliant.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Shortlisting criteria** | | | 1 | Master’s degree in social science, statistics, public administration, or any other related field, with specialized training in monitoring and evaluation. | | 2 | Minimum 5 years of experience in planning, monitoring, evaluation, and management of public administration development or development planning of government counterparts. | | 3 | Written and spoken proficiency in English. |   **2nd stage**: Evaluation of technical proposals  Short-listed candidates will be evaluated based on the following criteria. Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 490 points (70%) at the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Technical Evaluation Criteria (Desk review and Interview based)** | Maximum obtainable points – 700; Threshold – 490 points | | 5 years of experience in planning, monitoring and management of public administration development or development planning of government counterparts.  For each additional year of experience – 10 points, but not more than 50 points in total. | 100  50 | | Experience in working with government institutions in Middle East region and UN, is an added advantage. | 50 | | Experience in evaluations in the UN system – 50 points, experience as a team leader in an evaluation in the UN system – additional 30 points. | 80 | | Knowledge of Arabic language is advantage  20 - 30 points - excellent  9 – 19 points – good  0 – 8 points – poor | 30 | | Proven oral and written communication and analytical skills (interview and submitted proposal based) | 30 | | Technical proposal with clear methodology presented (interview and submitted proposal based) | 360 | | **Financial Evaluation Criteria** | Maximum obtainable points – 300 (30%) |   **3rd stage**: Financial evaluation  Cumulative analysis will be used based on the following methodology:All the offers of individual consultants who scored 490 (70% from 700) and more points during the desk review are acceptable for financial evaluation. The lowest financial qualified proposal receives 300 points and all the other technically qualified proposals receive points in inverse proportion per the formula:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Formula applied | P=y(µ/z) | | P=points for the financial proposal being evaluated |  | | y=maximum number of points for the financial proposal equal to 300 |  | | µ=the lowest priced proposal |  | | z=price of the proposal being evaluated |  |   **The candidate achieving the highest cumulative score for both Technical and Financial evaluations will be recommended by the Evaluation Committee for contracting.** |

1. **DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Duly accomplished and signed Offeror’s **letter/filled-in template to UNDP confirming interest and Breakdown of Costs Supporting the Final All-Inclusive Price** as per Template. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP<http://www.kw.undp.org/content/kuwait/en/home/operations/procurement.html> ; 2. **Personal CV or P11** <http://www.kw.undp.org/content/kuwait/en/home/operations/procurement.html>, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least **three (3) professional references**; 3. **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment; 4. **Technical proposal with clear methodology presented**: Provide a brief methodology with description of Approach to Work, timeframe. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **This TOR is approved by** |  |
| Signature |  |
| Name and Designation | Dima Al-Khatib, UNDP DRR |
| Date of Signing |  |

1. *The IC modality is expected to be used only for short-term consultancy engagements. If the duration of the IC for the same TOR exceeds twelve (12) months, the duration must be justified and be subjected to the approval of the Director of the Regional Bureau, or a different contract modality must be considered. This policy applies regardless of the delegated procurement authority of the Head of the Business Unit.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)