



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

SECTION 3: TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

ETHIOPIA

GENERAL INFORMATION

Services/Work Description: Consultancy Services for End of Project Evaluation (EOPE) of a Government of Sweden and Norad-Supported Project

Project/Program Title: End of Project Evaluation of the Project titled "Strengthening Regional and National Legislative Environments for HIV/SRHR to Support the Enjoyment of Human Rights of LGBT People and Women and Girls in Sub-Saharan Africa – Phase II" being implemented under HIV, Health & Development Team in UNDP Africa

Duty Station: Home-based with travel to project countries

Type of the Contract: Firm Level Consultancy Firms

Duration: 60 days over 4 calendar-months/122 days (1 August – 30 November 2018)

Expected Start Date: 01 August 2018

I. BACKGROUND / RATIONALE

As mentioned earlier, the current Project for which the end of project evaluation is sought, is the second phase of a Sida-supported project that initially covered 19 countries in Africa and was from 2013-2015. During the 'Phase 1', the project achieved meaningful results which were reported from 19 countries. Results included completion of legal environment assessments (LEAs) in several countries; strengthened capacity related to human rights and HIV amongst the judiciary, national human rights institutions, law enforcement agencies as well as among affected communities; greater inclusion of LGBT women and girls in LEAs and other national and regional processes; law review and reform; and greater involvement of regional economic entities (SADC, EAC, ECOWAS) and the AUC in addressing human rights and legal challenges pertaining to HIV and AIDS.

Based on the Phase 1 achievements, the Governments of Norway and Sweden provided additional support to UNDP for a further three years (2016-2018) – the 'Phase 2' of the project. While discussing the Phase 2 proposal, UNDP considered including the need to build on the lessons learned; incorporating recommendations from the mid-term evaluation done during Phase 1; the need for focussing on deeper interventions in a sub-set of countries, etc. Further, Phase 2 of the project is aligned with the Government of Sweden's 2015-2019 "Strategy for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights in sub-Saharan Africa", particularly for strengthening democracy and gender equality, and for ensuring greater respect for human rights, with focus on:

- Increased gender equality focusing on prevention of child marriages and sexual and gender-based violence.
- Greater enjoyment of human rights for LGBT people, young women and girls and other key and vulnerable populations.

This phase was planned to operationalize recommendations from the MTE; include more capacity strengthening activities at country level for government and civil society together, systematic mapping of the political and cultural context as it affects the legal environment in countries; and include case studies and research components to identify shorter-term goals along the pathway to legal change that can be used as markers of success.

The Project:

Countries initially selected for the Phase-II included Angola, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, DRC, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia, Lesotho, Mozambique, South Africa and Swaziland. With subsequent provision of supplementary funding received from the Global Fund Regional Grant and the Government of Netherlands, Angola, Mozambique and South Africa were funded from the other grants, while Sierra Leone, which requested a legal environment assessment, was added to the Sida Phase 2 Project countries.

The Development Objective of Phase II was “to strengthen sexual and reproductive health and rights in Sub-Saharan Africa”.

The Overall Programme Objective of Phase II was “*to strengthen national and regional legal environments relating to HIV and sexual and reproductive health and rights to support the enjoyment of human rights of LGBT people and women and girls in Sub-Saharan Africa*”.

Specific Objectives of this Phase of the Project are:

1. To strengthen the capacity of national governments to put in place legal environments that respect the rights of LGBT people and women and girls.
2. To strengthen the capacity of regional and national civil society organisations including community-based groups to claim rights and advocate for strengthened national legal environments.
3. To strengthen the capacity and leadership of regional economic communities to facilitate Member States to put in place legal environments that respect the rights of LGBT people and women and girls.
4. To strengthen the understanding of appropriate indicators and monitoring and evaluation processes that help promote accountability for implementation of human rights enabling activities that arise from legal assessments.

Specific activities to reach outcomes during Phase II of the Project included:

1. Legal Environment Assessments (LEA) and National Action Planning
2. Mapping of the Political and Cultural Context through development and implementation of *engagement scans*
3. Addressing Gaps/Legal Environment weaknesses that were identified in LEAs
4. Developing and testing relevant Regional Guidance documents
5. Working with the AUC and RECs – EAC, SADC and SADC-PF to strengthen SHRH and access to services for young women and girls and LGBT and key populations; and
6. Developing/writing up in-depth country case studies.

Specific progress and the achievement of objectives are measured against set indicators specified in the Results Framework for the programme as outlined below:

Table 1: Strengthening Regional and National Legislative Environments to Support the Enjoyment of Human Rights of LGBT People and Women and Girls affected by HIV and AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa – Phase 2

Outcome objective level 1	Law, policy or strategy review, implementation or enforcement of laws which positively impact on women and girls affected by HIV strengthened							
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Results	Target	Results	Target	Results
		2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018
Indicator 1	Number of countries engaged in LEA follow-up for relevant law, policy and/or strategy reform or capacity strengthening of key stakeholders to	As determined by LEA	2		2		2	

	strengthen the legal and policy environment for women and girls							
Outcome objective level 2	Law, policy or strategy review, implementation or enforcement of laws which positively impact on LGBT affected by strengthened							
Indicator 1	Number of Countries engaged in LEA follow-up for relevant law, policy and/or strategy reform, or capacity strengthening of key stakeholders to strengthen the legal and policy environment for LGBT	As determined by LEA	2		2		2	
Indicator 2	Number of countries that include transgender issues in their policies or national strategic plans	As determined by LEA	0		1		1	
Output objective 1	Gaps in adherence to international and regional human rights standards related to HIV successfully identified							
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Results	Target	Results	Target	Results
		2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018
Indicator 1	Number of Countries which have completed LEAs	5	3		2		2	
Indicator 2	Percentage of CSOs representing women/girls and LGBT people participating in LEA processes	50/20	50/20		50/20		50/20	
Output objective 2	Accountability established for following up a nationally agreed prioritised plan of action to strengthen legal environments for HIV							
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Results	Target	Results	Target	Results
		2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018
Indicator 1	Number of countries with validated action plans and mechanism for accountability for LEA follow up		3		2		2	
Output objective 3	Capacity to apply human rights principles in HIV-related work strengthened through collective capacity building initiatives for key stakeholders (police, NAC, judiciary, Ministry of Justice, parliamentarians, National Human Rights Institutions, LGBT groups etc.)							
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Results	Target	Results	Target	Results
		2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018
Indicator 2	Number of countries institutionalizing capacity strengthening for the judiciary or law enforcement in their		0		1		1	

	national plans							
Output objective 4	Strengthened understanding of the links between human rights and HIV in 3 RECs							
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Results	Target	Results	Target	Results
		2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018
Indicator 1	Number of Member States/Partner States in the process of aligning/domesticating national laws, policies and strategies with regional frameworks and/or model laws	0	0		0		3	
Indicator 2	Sub-regional frameworks on HIV and human rights developed by RECs that integrate the rights of PLHIV, women, girls and/or LGBT populations in sub-regional frameworks	0	1		1		1	
Output objective 5	Strengthened understanding and application of human rights and HIV related indicators and milestones							
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Results	Target	Results	Target	Results
		2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018
Indicator 1	Number of countries using appropriate indicators or milestones to track progress/change in legal environments	0	0		0		2	
Indicator 2	Number of Country Case Studies developed which track milestones towards law/policy reform	1	2		2		0	

An Annual Report is prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the Programme Management Committee, (review reports for 2016 and 2017 are available), and the Project plan incorporates an End-of Project Evaluation.

The primary objective of the end of project evaluation (to be done during the final year of Phase 2 of the Project, i.e. during Quarter 3 of 2018) is to seek to draw lessons relating to the effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions themselves, as well as identify any patterns discernible across different types of HIV epidemics, sexual and reproductive health access challenges, legal systems, political systems, mix of interventions etc. In the short term, this should provide information on how these interventions are linked to the progress of the grant. In the longer term, it is expected that this evaluation will add to a body of critical scholarship that will help to maximize contributions to the longer-term desired outcomes and sustainable change in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals and the maxim of 'leaving no one behind'.

The end-of project evaluation will seek to:

- Assess the progress made against the results framework of the Phase 2 of the project, read in conjunction with the Phase 1 of the Project, and recommendations from the MTE conducted during the earlier phase.
- Document key achievements, successes and challenges and on the role played by the project and the project partners to overcome challenges.

- Evaluate the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions implemented in the project countries.
- Assess changes in the legal environments, discriminatory practices and behaviors, stigma drivers and manifestations, protection of the rights of key populations, political commitment, financing, and capacities of national and regional entities to effect change.
- Produce an evaluation report that synthesizes lessons learned within and across countries, and the continental and regional entities.
- Develop and share framework and tools used to conduct in-depth country case studies and the end-line evaluation.
- Report on milestones and indicators for use at outcome level in further iterations of this project and for dissemination widely beyond this project. It is anticipated that this deliverable will be used to leverage additional funding beyond Sida for human rights projects across the globe.

The intended users of the end of project evaluation of this project include the UNDP, the external funders: Sida and Norad, stakeholders – national governments, civil society organizations and continental and regional entities and bodies who are partners to the project. As is UNDP’s practice, the final version of the end of project evaluation report will be widely disseminated and will be a public document accessed through searchable databases.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE SERVICE / WORK

- a. to draw lessons relating to the effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions themselves;
- b. to identify any patterns that are discernible across different types of HIV epidemics, legal systems, political systems and mix of interventions etc. within the Project countries;
- c. to comment on whether the short-term goals of the project were linked to the progress of the grant;
- d. to identify the key outputs, and outcomes from the project which are most promising to pursue the longer term;
- e. to identify ways to maximise contributions to the longer-term impact and sustainable change, and finally,
- f. to highlight some of the learnings the process of evaluating such projects add to the methodology and practice of evaluation.

The scope of the end of project evaluation includes examining how far has the Project’s Phase 2 programme objective of “strengthen(ing) (the) national and regional legal environments relating to HIV/SRHR and to support the enjoyment of human rights of LGBT people and women and girls in Sub-Saharan Africa” been achieved. It will also explore the pathways and linkages of these achievements to the overarching development objective of “strengthen(ing) Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights in Sub-Saharan Africa”.

III. CONTEXT, SCOPE, EXPECTED OUTCOME AND PURPOSE OF THE SERVICE / WORK:

As with all aspects of this project, the end of project evaluation will also employ a **human rights-based approach** to focus not only the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of activities carried out but also on the processes of project implementation. The evaluation will adhere to the principles of **inclusion, participation, equality** and **non-discrimination**, and **accountability** as addressed in project activities. The end of project evaluation will integrate human rights standards in the approach taken to evaluate the progress of grant implementation, evaluate the effects of the interventions, identify where there have been bottlenecks in implementation, promote learning and best practices, and link achieved results to the supported activities.

Context: The end of project evaluation needs to be placed in the context of the overall monitoring framework of the project. Apart from being a donor requirement, it is expected that the evaluation will identify the success, challenges and potential roadblocks to the project; identify the best practices, suggest what needs further follow up to ensure sustainability of the activities and processes initiated by this project and identify key ways in which UNDP and its partner agencies can take forward similar programme interventions in the context of sexual and reproductive health and rights for young women and girls and LGBT people in sub-Saharan African countries.

Scope: the broad scope of the evaluation covers review of the project document(s) and its results framework; annual workplans; country- and regional-level activities and results achieved against the timelines and result framework; review of the project interim and annual reports from 2016 and 2017, tools, technical reports, academic and conference presentations, case studies and guides produced by the project as deliverables for Phase2 of the Project and reviews and recordings of key challenges faced and key outcomes achieved.

The main expected output from the evaluation exercise is an end of project evaluation report that will **describe** the evaluated project and its scope and objectives, as well as the methodology of the evaluation process; **share** the main findings from the evaluation; **draw** evaluative conclusions from the exercise; **identify** the key lessons learned, barriers faced and overcome; and **recommend** steps for sustaining the efforts initiated by the project.

The overall **purpose** of the end of project evaluation is to understand the successes, achievements and planned activities of the project for greater learning about what works and what does not; and ways to address challenges encountered to meet the end-of project targets and achievable outputs and outcomes. The evaluation and its report will also achieve the purpose of being a learning document for UNDP, national government partners, regional economic communities, the African Union and for other stakeholders and the donors, and can be used for the benefit of other countries/regions.

Finally, the **overall scope** of the end of project evaluation includes examining how far has the Project's Phase 2 programme objective of "strengthen(ing) (the) national and regional legal environments relating to HIV/SRHR and to support the enjoyment of human rights of LGBT people and women and girls in Sub-Saharan Africa" been achieved. It will also explore the pathways and linkages of these achievements to the overarching development objective of "strengthen(ing) Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights in Sub-Saharan Africa".

IV. OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED OUTPUTS / DELIVERABLES OF THE EVALUATION

The **specific objectives** of the end of project evaluation are:

- **to draw lessons** relating to the effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions themselves;
- **to identify any patterns** that are discernible across different types of HIV epidemics, legal systems, political systems and mix of interventions etc. within the Project countries;
- **to comment on** whether the short-term goals of the project were linked to the progress of the grant;
- **to identify the key** outputs, and outcomes from the project which are most promising to pursue the longer term;
- **to identify ways** to maximize contributions to the longer-term impact and sustainable change, and finally,
- **to highlight some of the learnings the process of evaluating** such projects add to the methodology and practice of evaluation.

V. METHODOLOGY / APPROACH OF THE SERVICE (WORK)

Overall approach: This is an external programmatic and **end of project evaluation** – insofar as it assesses performance against a given results framework that specifies its strategic intent and objectives – by an external agency/organisation.

Given that outcomes are, by definition, the work of many entities, attribution of development change to the project (in the sense of establishing a causal linkage between a development intervention and an observed result) will be difficult, and in many cases not practically feasible. The evaluation will therefore consider contribution of the project to the stated results framework and identify the successes, challenges and ways forward. It will also take into consideration the recommendations made during the Phase 1 Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE),^[1] particularly, the MTE's recommendation to have "increased attention to **human rights principles**, including **inclusion, participation,**

¹ UNDP 2015. 'STRENGTHENING REGIONAL AND NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTS TO SUPPORT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF LGBT PEOPLE AND WOMEN AND GIRLS AFFECTED BY HIV AND AIDS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA'. Available at: <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7773>

equality, non-discrimination, and accountability"; and, "to further improve (the intervention's) **relevance, effectiveness and sustainability**". To make the assessment, the evaluators will examine the project document and results framework; identify the achievements with respect to the proposed deliverables over Phase 2 Project period on the basis of the baseline information presented in the results framework; and identify the strategies and actions undertaken at country, regional and continental levels, to understand the project's contributions to the change at the end of Phase 2. The evaluators will also review the end of project report from Phase 1 and the available annual reports and other documents from Phase 2 to map the outcomes from both the projects as part of a continuum.

Evaluation criteria: The contribution of the Project to the planned results and outcomes at the End of Project Evaluation will be assessed according the following set of evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the objectives of Project are consistent with country needs and requests, national, regional and continental priorities (e.g. the 'AU Roadmap for Shared Responsibility and Global Solidarity for AIDS, TB and Malaria in Africa' and the 'Catalytic Framework to End AIDS, TB and Eliminate Malaria in Africa By 2030: Stride towards sustainable health in Africa'[2]) and on international and regional commitments on human rights, HIV and AIDS and sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR).
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which the Project contributed to the outcomes defined in the Project Document and the Project Results Framework.
- **Sustainability.** The extent to which the results achieved as per the results framework point towards sustained changes in country- and/or regional-level laws, policies, regional and/or national strategic and development plans, and programming in the context of HIV and sexual and reproductive health and rights for young women and girls and LGBT people in Africa.

Enabling / explanatory factors: To allow for lessons to be learned, the evaluators, using the above criteria, will identify the various enabling and explanatory factors for the performance achieved at the end of Phase 2 of the Project.

Other factors. A number of specific factors that have affected the performance of the Project will also be examined. For example:

- **Partnerships:** How well did the Project use its partnerships (with national governments, regional and continental bodies, regional NGOs and CBOs, etc.) to improve its performance?
- **Risk analysis:** Did the Project implementation process undertake appropriate risk analysis and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost? To what extent are the benefits being, or are likely to be, maintained over time?

Suggested / Proposed methodology and deliverables for the End of Project Evaluation

Development of assessment framework and evaluation work plan

The evaluators will develop an assessment framework that outlines how the evaluation will be operationalised. This will include an evaluation matrix that maps each evaluation question to the information required to answer it, sources for that information, the proposed methods of data collection and analysis, an activities timeline and an outline of the evaluation reports. The deliverable from this phase of the evaluation process will be an **inception report and evaluation workplan**.

Data collection methods

The following methodologies are proposed:

- A *desk review* of relevant documents at project, regional and national levels, and

² AU. 2015. *Catalytic Framework to End AIDS, TB and Eliminate Malaria in Africa By 2030: Stride towards sustainable health in Africa*. Available at: <http://www.carmma.org/resource/catalytic-framework-end-aids-tb-and-eliminate-malaria-africa-2030-stride-towards>

- *Engagement with project partners and stakeholders* focusing primarily on qualitative data collection, including a combination of semi-structured key informant interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) with project stakeholders, in all the project countries, as well as with the AUC (Department of Social Affairs), the EAC and the SADC.
- *Field work in selected countries considering time constraints*, that focus on in-depth interviews of project stakeholders and FGDs with community members including LGBT and young women.

Background material in the form of available project documents and data available at or around the time of the evaluation team briefing will be used to inform all data collection tools including the desk review data extraction tool and qualitative data collection instruments.

Attention to **ethical considerations will be paramount** throughout qualitative data collection, especially in particularly sensitive settings such as meeting with representatives of key populations. The evaluation team will seek necessary clearances from relevant authorities as well as informed consent from participants prior to collecting personal information.

Data collection methods *must be linked to the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions that are included within the scope of the evaluation*. Therefore, the evaluator is encouraged to prepare and use an **evaluation matrix** which is a helpful tool for linking these elements together. In addition, the *precise data collection methods should be identified after understanding*:

- The *availability* of existing evaluative evidence;
- *Logistical constraints* (travel, costs, time, etc.); and
- *Ethical considerations* (especially when evaluating sensitive issues such as key population, human rights and HIV, or in sensitive settings such as meeting with key population and LGBT representatives). The overall ethical principle that the evaluation must adhere to is the principle of “do no harm”.

The evaluation should also consider **all the project interventions** including *legal environment assessments, law reform processes, national engagement scans, national stakeholders’ meetings, continuing participation of affected communities, capacity-building activities on HIV and the law and their outcomes, etc.*

Data analysis

The use of standardised data collection instruments for the desk review and the qualitative data collection is expected to facilitate thematic analyses across documents and interviews/FGDs. The evaluation matrix will highlight how the data extracted from the desk review can be supplemented with the qualitative data (and any additional quantitative data collected) to address each of the evaluation objectives outlined in the inception report. Outputs from the document review data extraction; qualitative interviews, and quantitative data collection will be analysed jointly. Data collection tools and data analysis will be informed by the theory of change, the evaluation criteria, and human rights norms and standards. This will necessarily involve an iterative process of data immersion across diverse sources and ensuring systematic attention to the framework guiding the evaluation.

Beyond reviewing the project’s success in meeting its targets, the evaluation will also seek to disentangle the different elements of the processes through which these targets were (or were not) achieved in different project settings. As previously noted, attention will be given to the principles of **inclusion, participation, equality and non-discrimination**, and **accountability** as addressed through project activities. A critical component of this evaluation will be a **focus on processes**, with these principles in mind, in a conscious attempt to better integrate rights into evaluation criteria. This focus on processes includes, for example, seeking to understand to the extent possible who has led the project processes at each level, which partners were engaged in distinct phases of the project and through what processes, and the extent to which risks to the project were foreseen and mitigated over time with the aim of assessing the difference this has made to outputs. This assessment of processes should help identify the enabling factors and challenges to the project with a view to informing specific and actionable recommendations.

Given the complexity of effecting change at the various levels at which this project operates and the range of actors

required for such change to happen, causal attribution will be difficult to establish at times. However, the focus on understanding the processes through which the project operates in different settings will support assessment of the project's contribution to change.

Deliverables/outputs

- An end-line review on change/progress and outcomes reported from each of the 10 Project countries and from the AUC and the 3 RECs (EAC, ECOWAS and SADC). [Drawing on the project's theory of change, this review will focus on evaluating the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions implemented in the different countries. Among other things, the end-line evaluation will seek to assess changes in: (a) different national (and regional) legal environment(s); (b) discriminatory practices and behaviours, (c) stigma drivers and manifestations, (d) protection of the rights of key populations, and (d) political commitment, financing, and capacity.]
- An **endline evaluation report** synthesizing lessons learned within and across countries, and the continental and regional entities.
- Framework and Tools used to conduct in-depth country case studies and the end-line evaluation.
- Report on milestones and indicators for use at outcome level for dissemination widely beyond this project. It is anticipated that this deliverable will be used to leverage additional funding beyond Sida for human rights projects across the globe.

Evaluation Standards

The evaluation should also be conducted as per the following four broad sets of quality standards, namely *propriety standards*, *feasibility standards*, *accuracy standards* and *utility standards*: [i]

- The *propriety standards* are ethical standards meant to ensure that evaluations are conducted with due regard for the rights and welfare of affected people. The most basic of the propriety standards is that evaluations should never violate or endanger human rights. Evaluators should respect human dignity and worth in their interaction with all persons encountered during the evaluation, and do all in their power to ensure that they are not wronged.
- The *feasibility standards* are intended to ensure that evaluations are realistic and efficient. To satisfy these requirements, an evaluation must be based on practical procedures, not unduly disrupting normal activities, and be planned and conducted in such a way that the co-operation of key stakeholders can be obtained. They should also be efficient.
- The *accuracy standards* are meant to ensure that the information produced by evaluations is factually correct, free of bias, and appropriate to the evaluation issues at hand.
- The *utility standards*, finally, are meant to ensure that evaluations serve the information needs of their intended users: to be useful, evaluations must be responsive to the interests, perspectives and values of stakeholders.

Validation: This end of project evaluation will use a variety of validation methods to ensure that the information used and conclusions made carry the necessary depth.

VI. LOCATION, DURATION AND TIMEFRAME OF THE WORK/DELIVERABLES/OUTPUT

This end of project evaluation is expected to be conducted process will be conducted over **three** calendar months (from **1st August to 31st October**), and should be based on phases as defined below:

1. Briefing of the evaluation team by HIV Health and Development (HHD) Africa Team based in Istanbul. This briefing can be conducted remotely to save costs, time and reduce the carbon footprint of the process. The HHD Team will brief the evaluation team about the project, the evaluation and its management process, communications and coordination etc.
2. Inception Report preparation: The evaluation team will prepare an **inception report** that will operationalize the design elements, and develop a workplan based on this ToR prior to undertaking the

evaluation.

3. Data collection – that will include desk review, key informant interviews, focused group discussion, etc.
 4. Zero-draft evaluation report for sharing with UNDP HHD Team members and the **PMC**.
 5. Validation of zero draft by the Project Management Committee and relevant stakeholders.
 6. Submission of the Draft One of the evaluation report for final comments and feedback.
 7. Delivering final report (as per annexed format), based on the feedback received.
- **Follow-up and use.** Once the evaluation report is completed and validated, and a final report prepared, UNDP will make it public by posting in relevant UNDP websites, UNDP internal Yammer® site, and UNDP Africa website (<http://www.africa.undp.org/content/rba/en/home.html>), and UNDP’s social media platforms including on Twitter® and Facebook®, and share it with relevant country offices, government and civil society partners and regional and continental entities via the Global Commission on HIV and the Law website (www.hivlawcommission.org). The Project Management Committee of this Project will endorse a management response to the evaluation recommendations. This includes committing follow up actions to the recommendations as well as establishing responsibilities for the follow up.

VII. EVALUATION CALENDAR WITH INDICATIVE NUMBER OF DAYS

Conducting the Evaluation	INDICATIVE Number of Days	Person/Team Responsible
1. <u>Briefing the Evaluation Team</u>	3 Days	UNDP, Evaluation Team
2. <u>Development of evaluation work plan and Inception Report</u>	7 Days	Evaluation Team
3. <u>Data Collection</u> : The Evaluation Team collects data deploying various data collection methods agreed upon in the Inception Report. Relevant stakeholders from UNDP COs will facilitate access to information and provide necessary logistic / organizational support.	30 Days	Evaluation Team (support from relevant UNDP COs)
4. <u>Zero-Draft evaluation report</u> : The Evaluation Team shares and presents the zero-draft of the evaluation report – for circulation with UNDP and PMC	3 Days	Evaluation team, UNDP, PMC
5. <u>Validation of zero draft</u> by the Project Management Committee and relevant stakeholders.	2 Days	UNDP, Evaluation Team
6. <u>Draft One Evaluation report</u> : incorporation of the feedback from the PMC and relevant stakeholders by the Evaluation Team to develop and present the Draft One of the Evaluation Report to UNDP.	5 Days	Evaluation Team
7. <u>Feedback on the Draft One Evaluation Report</u> : UNDP HHD regional and global teams provide feedback to the Draft One of the Evaluation Report to the Evaluation Team for finalizing.	5 Days	UNDP, Evaluation Team
8. <u>Final Report</u> : The Evaluation Team produces and submits the final report based on the final feedback from UNDP, by 30 th November 2018 in time for UNDP to deliver it to the donor by end of the year and Project Closing.	5 Days	Evaluation Team
TOTAL	60 Days over the 4 Month Period	

VIII. PAYMENT MILESTONES AND AUTHORITY

The qualified consultancy organization shall receive their lump sum service fees upon certification of the completed tasks satisfactorily, as per the following payment schedule:

Instalment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained	Percentage of Payment
1 st Instalment	Inception Report and Work Plan	From HHD Team Leader	20%
2 nd Instalment	Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report	"	80%

IX. MINIMUM ORGANIZATION AND CONSULTANCY TASK FORCE REQUIREMENTS

A) Applications are solicited from highly-experienced regional and global organizations that have Africa-wide experience in HIV, human rights, sexual and reproductive health and rights, key populations, LGBT groups, the law, health and development.

B) As the **End of Project Evaluation** is considered an independent evaluation, an organization will be recruited as the external evaluation team.

C) The evaluation team should be able to demonstrate:

- a. Strong experience and knowledge in the area of HIV, human rights, the law as it pertains to HIV and SRH, treatment access, key populations, people living with HIV and LGBT groups, labor and trade laws and laws pertaining to access to medicines.
- b. Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying qualitative evaluation methods, and demonstrable experience in conducting evaluations of projects that focus on issues of HIV, human rights, sexual and reproductive health, women, key populations, LGBT people, and the law;
- c. A strong record of working with key populations and/or on key population, young women, girls, PLHIV and LGBT issues pertaining to law, human rights and access to justice in the context of HIV and sexual and reproductive health and rights;
- d. Demonstrable experience and knowledge of conducting research with highest levels of ethical integrity; including the ability to obtain ethical and other clearances from relevant bodies and entities;
- e. Qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis skills;
- f. Process management skills such as facilitation skills and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders;
- g. Technical competence in undertaking project evaluations which predominantly involve the use of qualitative research/social science methods;
- h. Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies;
- i. Knowledge of UNDP's role, and UN programming at the country level and regional levels;
- j. Additional qualifications desired: these include demonstrable language skills (in English and French); experience in working across African countries; and experience in working with NACs, MOH and other relevant regional and/or continental entities and international donors.

D) The Evaluation team should comply with the following UN Core Values to name a few:

- Professionalism and Planning and Organizing ability
- Accountability: takes ownership of responsibilities and honors commitments.
- Communications: speaks and writes clearly and effectively; listens to others, correctly interprets messages from others and responds appropriately; asks questions to clarify, and exhibits interest in having two-way communication; tailors, language, tone, style and format to match audience. Keeps confidential information undisclosed.

- Innovator: learns, shares and acquires new competencies and seeks new challenges by exploring new approaches
- Performer: works against an agreed outcome and priorities and seeks performance feedback from supervisors and support staff in the performance review in a constructive and objective manner.

X. CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFER

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, **qualified organizations** are expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly, the proposers (organizations) will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weights of the proposals are:
 - a. Technical Criteria weight is **70%**
 - b. Financial Criteria weight is **30%**

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))	70%	100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criteria a. Strong experience and knowledge in the area of HIV, human rights, sexual and reproductive health (SRH), the law as it pertains to HIV, SRH, treatment access, key populations, PLHIV, LGBT groups, young women and adolescent girls. 		40
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criteria b. Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying qualitative evaluation methods, and demonstrable experience in conducting evaluations of projects that focus on issues of HIV, human rights, SRH, key populations, LGBT, young women and adolescent girls and the law. 		30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criteria c. A strong and demonstrable record of working with key populations and/or on key population, PLHIV, LGBT, young women and adolescent girls on issues pertaining to law, human rights and access to justice in the context of HIV and SRH and rights. 		15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criteria d. technical competence in undertaking project evaluations which predominantly involve the use of qualitative research/social science methods; prior experience in working with multilateral agencies and knowledge of UNDP's role, and UN programming at the country level and regional levels. 		10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criteria e. Additional qualifications required desired include demonstrable language skills (in English <i>and</i> French); and experience in working across African countries with governments. 		5
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30%	30
Total Score	Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30%	

XI. LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

No logistical support will be provided to the Service Provider by the UN – ***Service Provider to take care of all logistical requirements under the contract.***

XII. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, a Service Provider advised to use a proposed Table of Contents. Hence, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the respective RFP Proposal Submission Form.

XIII. CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROPRIETARY INTERESTS

The consultants shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy or Government(s) without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP. This assignment will be administrated by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and all relevant UNDP rules, policies and procedures will apply.

PROPOSED STANDARD TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Herewith please find the **Standard Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria** along with respective allocated weight template for Requester's subsequent review. As per the relevance of the proposed criteria it can either:

- a. Redistribute the allocated weight;
- b. Delete specific criteria if you find it irrelevant or less relevant; or
- c. Replace with new criteria along with corresponding allocated weight

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable
1	Expertise of Firm / Organization	30%	300
2	Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan	40%	400
3	Management Structure and Key Personnel	30%	300
TOTAL		100%	1000
Technical Proposal Evaluation (FORM I)			
Expertise of the Firm / Organization			Points Obtainable
1.1	Reputation of Organization and Staff / Credibility / Reliability / Industry Standing		50
1.2	General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation		90
	- Financial Stability		
	- Loose consortium, Holding company or One firm		
	- Age/size of the firm		
	- Strength of the Project Management Support		
	- Project Financing Capacity		
	- Project Management Control		
1.3	Extent to which any work would be subcontracted (subcontracting carries additional risks which may affect project implementation, but properly done it offers a chance to access specialized skills.)		15
1.4	Quality assurance procedure, warranty		25
1.5	Relevance of:		120
	- Specialized Knowledge		
	- Experience on Similar Programme / Projects		
	- Experience on Projects in the Region		
	- Work for UNDP/ major multilateral/ or bilateral programmes		
SUB TOTAL			300
Technical Proposal Evaluation (FORM II)			
Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan			
2.1	To what degree does the Proposer understand the task?		30
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?		25
2.3	Are the different components of the project adequately weighted relative to one another?		20
2.4	Is the proposal based on a survey of the project environment and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposal?		55
2.5	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task?		65

2.6	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	120
2.7	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?	85
	SUB TOTAL	400
Technical Proposal Evaluation (FORM III)		
Management Structure and Key Personnel		
3.1	Task/Project Manager / Team Leader	
	General Qualification	
	Suitability for the Project	
	- International experience	25
	- Training experience	20
	- Professional experience in the area of specialization	45
	- Knowledge of region	30
	- Language qualification	20
	SUB TOTAL	140
3.2	Senior Expert(s) / Lead Consultant(s)	
	General Qualification	
	Suitability for the project	
	- International experience	15
	- Training experience	15
	- Professional experience in the area of specialization	45
	- Knowledge of the region	25
	- Language qualification	20
	SUB TOTAL	120
3.3	Project Staff/ Associate Consultants	
	General Qualification	
	Suitability for the project	
	- International experience	5
	- Training experience	5
	- Professional experience in the area of specialization	10
	- Knowledge of the region	10
	- Language qualification	10
	SUB TOTAL	40
	Aggregate	1000

This TOR is approved by: [indicate name of Approving Manager]

Name: Mesfin Geahun Haileyesus

Designation: Head, HIV, Health and Development Team, UNDP, RSCA (OIC)



Signature: _____

Date Signed: 9-Jul-18

ⁱ Molund S & Schill G. *Looking Back Moving Forward: Sida Evaluation Manual*. Sida (2004)