



TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

POST TITLE: Consultant for Independent Evaluation
AGENCY/PROJECT NAME: The RoK-UNOSSC Facility – Phase 2
Facility/Programme for Capacity Development for Poverty Reduction through South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Science and Technology – Phase 2
COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT: Homebased with possible travel within Southeast Asia
NUMBER OF DAYS: 32 WORKING DAYS

1) GENERAL BACKGROUND

Background

In the run-up to the closure of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Office in the Republic of Korea (RoK) in 2010, a programme on South-South cooperation jointly implemented by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST) and UNDP was evaluated. The evaluation showed an interest from partner countries, especially in the Asia-Pacific Region, to have the project continued beyond 2010. Thus, the Ministry and the then Special Unit for South-South Cooperation (SU-SSC) engaged in discussions that culminated in the design and implementation of the Facility/Programme for Capacity Development for Poverty Reduction through South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Education, Science and Technology, or RoK-UNOSSC Facility. The United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC) enlisted the support of the UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS) to manage financial aspects of the project such as disbursements. UNOSSC led efforts to monitor the project and to report to the Facility Steering Committee and the Government of the Republic of Korea on progress and results achieved.

The Facility Phase I (2010-2016) was implemented with the basic structure inherited from the RoK/UNDP South-South project of 2005-2009. In a nutshell, a number of RoK Institutions were selected to implement projects based on proposals submitted to the SU-SSC. The projects were distributed across education, science and technology themes. Furthermore, one of the main criteria for participation was demonstrating that the RoK institution had a counterpart institution in a country that would work with them. The result was that the projects were usually located in local institutions and unknown to central government. Furthermore, almost every institution worked in a different country from the others.

Towards the end of Phase 1, a local (RoK) evaluation team was assembled with a view to synthesise lessons learnt and recommend the design of Phase 2 of the Facility. The findings of the evaluators were that although much had been achieved in Phase 1, the Facility could be strengthened by:

- 1 Supporting the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Agenda;
- 2 The institutions to cease working in silos and instead work in a more integrated way;

- 3 Ensuring that project activities would be sustained by engaging national governments;
- 4 Bringing in inputs and collaborating with international organisations to scale up impact of Facility;
- 5 As a UN institution led Facility, to ensure that it is consistent with UN Frameworks in countries of operation.

After an iterative process involving inputs from RoK experts and project appraisal by the UN Office for South-South Cooperation, (UNOSSC), the Facility Document was approved in June 2016. The approved Phase 2 document included three components. The first is a Scaled-up Project selected from the Phase 1 projects that were well implemented, achieved intended results and reached out to many countries. Although a few projects would have qualified, only one could be implemented for financial reasons. The second component reflected the intended scope to exchange knowledge, guide policy-level country interventions and document the progress made under Phase 2. This component was denoted the Knowledge Platform. The third component responded to the idea to concentrate collaboration among the theme-focused institutions to fewer geographic areas. Based on a demand survey, 6 institutions were selected to work in two countries, Indonesia and Cambodia. This component is the Consortium.

Mechanisms to implement the Facility were then put in place including:

- 1 Selection of the participating institutions;
- 2 In line with recommendations to focus on development activity, a demand survey was sent to countries in Asia and Africa. Based on the response, Indonesia and Cambodia were deemed to be the most suitable for the pilot and were selected as host countries for the Consortium.
- 3 Further consultative meetings took place with national level government coordination organisations, BAPPENAS in Indonesia and the General Secretariat of the National Science and Technology Council in Cambodia.

Project Objectives

The RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2 aims to share Korea's and its partners' development experiences and know-how in science, technology, and ICT as a way of bringing knowledge and technology application to promote social and economic advancement of developing countries in line with the 2030 Agenda. Under the three overall objectives of the South-South Cooperation Strategic Framework of UNOSSC¹, Korean participating institutions are considered by UNOSSC as Centres of Excellence for demonstrating capacity development in the areas of science, technology, and ICT.

Intended Outcome

Developing countries make progress in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through triangular cooperation and knowledge bridging spearheaded by Korean institutions and partnering UN agencies.

Outcome Indicators

Improvement in the SDGs indicators of partner countries are considered outcome indicators of the project.

2) OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSIGNMENT

¹ The overall objective of the framework is to enable the international community to effectively (a) promote South-South cooperation as a viable strategy for the South to achieve the internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs, in pursuit of more inclusive globalization; (b) mobilize Southern expertise and the MDG solutions for mutual learning; and (c) help scale up the scope and impact of South-South and triangular cooperation in achieving internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs.

In compliance with the UNDP evaluation policy relating to the scale of the project and provisions in the monitoring and evaluation framework included in the Phase 2 Facility Document, a mid-term evaluation is planned and budgeted for. The mid-term evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the project mid-way. Such mid-term evaluations provide an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. The evaluation should also provide recommendations for strategies, approaches and/or activities to improve the potential of the project to achieve the expected outcome and meet objectives within the project timeframe.

The Second Steering Committee Meeting that took place in May 2018 agreed upon the objectives of the mid-term evaluation as follows:

- To assess feasibility of strategies and outputs adopted in Phase 2;
- To assess progress in achieving outputs; and,
- To assess recommendations on changes that could be done.

The Mid-term Evaluation Report will be stand-alone document that substantiates its findings, conclusions and recommendations. Lessons learned from the evaluation should also be included (as appropriate). The report will be targeted to meet the evaluation needs of all stakeholders including local government of hosting national and local governments where relevant, UN Office for South-South Cooperation, the Government of the Republic of Korea and the participating Republic of Korea Institutions.

3) SCOPE OF WORK

The Mid-term Evaluation will be based mainly on a desk research. It might also include interviews, meetings and field visits with stakeholders.

The methodology for the evaluation is envisaged to cover the following areas:

- Desk study review of all relevant project documentation
- Consultations with Programme Manager, the Science and Technology Policy Institute (STEPI) as a coordinating institution in the RoK, the Ministry of Science and ICT (MSIT) of the RoK; all ten (10) participating RoK institutions; counterparts in Cambodia and Indonesia, UN agencies such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, UN Environment, UNITAR and UN country teams
- Interviews with stakeholders: National Governments and local government

4) DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

- The Mid-term Evaluation of the RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2 is expected to take place in 2018 or early 2019 within a timeframe of 32 Days.
- The evaluation will be mostly a desk top study and will review, programme document, Steering Committee minutes, minutes of consultations with countries, annual report 2017, mid-term report 2018, and monitoring reports.
- Furthermore, the evaluation consultant will be expected to select one or two countries from which to interview counterparts.
- A report will be prepared based on the above.

5) FINAL PRODUCTS

- J Mid-term Evaluation Inception Report (see Annex 1) should be prepared by the evaluator before going into the data collection exercise. It should highlight the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. It should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each product if the evaluation team will include more than one person.
- J Draft Mid-term Evaluation Report will be reviewed by the UNOSSC Regional Office for Asia and Pacific and key stakeholders.
- J The final Mid-term Evaluation Report (see Annex 2) will include:
Findings and conclusions in relation to issues identified under section 3) of this TOR;
Recommendations for further implementation; and,
Discussion of lessons learnt from the evaluation (as appropriate).

6) PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

Evaluation management arrangements

The evaluator will be under supervision of the UNOSSC Regional Office (Asia-Pacific), which will coordinate the evaluation and will;

- J Provide the evaluator with the Code of Conduct for Evaluation, the UNDP Evaluation Policy and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System. UNDP quality criteria for commissioning evaluations and other useful references and guidelines relating to evaluation in UNDP/UN;
- J Make all information available to the evaluator and provide necessary support;
- J Provide, if asked by the evaluator, a preliminary list and contact information of stakeholders to support the stakeholder mapping exercise. Based on this preliminary information, the evaluation consultant will make independent decisions as to whom to meet; and,
- J Arrange interviews, meetings and field visits.

Submission deadline

The inception report will be submitted to the Programme Manager 2 weeks from the date of engagement of consultant. The draft report will be submitted to Programme Manager no later than 24 December, 2018 based on the feedback from stakeholders, a final report will be submitted to Programme Manager by 7 January, 2019.

The Mid-term Evaluation Report must be completed and submitted to the Chairman of the Steering Committee and UNOSSC, both electronically and in hard copies, by 14 January, 2019.

• Inception Report	10 Dec 2018
• Draft Report	24 Dec 2018
• Final Report	7 Jan 2019
• Final Report to Steering Committee	14 Jan 2019

7) DEGREE OF EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS

From the scope of evaluation, it is expected that only one person will undertake evaluation. The

TOR will be advertised in line with UNDP procurement procedures.

Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNOSSC;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Technical Competencies:

- Analytic capacity and demonstrated ability to process, analyse and synthesise complex, technical information;
- Proven experience in the developing country context and working in different cultural settings.

Communication:

- Communicate effectively in writing to a varied and broad audience in a simple and concise manner.

Professionalism:

- Capable of working in a high-pressure environment with sharp and frequent deadlines, managing many tasks simultaneously;
- Excellent analytical and organizational skills.

Teamwork:

- Projects a positive image and is ready to take on a wide range of tasks;
- Focuses on results for the client;
- Welcomes constructive feedback.

Required Skills and Experience

Education:

- Master's Degree or equivalent in International Relations, Social Sciences, Economics, Journalism or closely-related field.

Experience:

- Minimum 5 years of experience in development issues and projects;
- Proven strong evaluation, research, communications and writing skills;
- Ability to summarize complex information;
- Experience in communication and developing communication products is essential;
- Experience working with UN, UNDP, UNOSSC, international organisations will be added advantage;
- Experience in evaluation research and report and partnership with international organization and national governments.

Language Requirements:

Fluency in written and spoken English

8) REQUIRED DOCUMENT

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

-) Proposal: Brief proposal explaining why you are the most suitable for this consultancy including confirmation on availability to take up assignment for the whole period.
-) Curium Vitae.

- J) Financial proposal (in USD, specifying the total lump sum amount as well as the requested amount of the fee per day).

9) CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE BEST OFFER

The following criteria will serve as basis for evaluating offers:

- Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated.
- The technical criteria (education, experience, language) will be worth a maximum 100 points. Only the top 5 candidates that have achieved a minimum of 70 points (70%) from the review of the education, experience, and language will be invited for an interview.
- Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 100 points; 70%)
 - a) Criteria 1: Relevance of Education – Max 15 points
 - b) Criteria 2: Experience in development issues and projects – Max 20 points
 - c) Criteria 3: Experience in evaluation, research, writing, communication, and developing communication products – Max 20 points
 - d) Criteria 4: Experience in evaluation research and report and partnership with United Nations system international organization and national governments in developing countries especially in Cambodia and Indonesia – Max 25 points
 - e) Criteria 5: Fluency in English language with excellent written skills required – Max 20 points
- For those passing technical evaluation above, offers will be evaluated per the Combined Scoring method;
 - a) Technical and Interview (70%)
 - b) Financial Evaluation (30%)

9) CONSULTANT PRESENCE REQUIRED ON DUTY STATION/UNDP PREMISES

NONE PARTIAL INTERMITTENT FULL TIME

IF FULL TIME – PLEASE ADD BELOW FOR JUSTIFICATION

If the assignment requires full time presence on UNDP premises, a sound justification on why a full time presence is required.

-

10) PAYMENT TERMS

Schedule of Payment:

The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages.

Payment will be disbursed upon submission and approval of deliverables by UNOSSC as follows:

Deliverable 1 – Inception report	20% of total contract amount
Deliverable 2 – Draft report	20% of total contract amount
Deliverable 3 – Final Report	30% of total contract amount
Deliverable 4 – Final report to Steering Committee	30% of total contract amount

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report)

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

Annex 2: The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports as follows:

Title and opening pages

- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organisations of evaluators
- Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary

- Introduction
- Description of the intervention

Evaluation scope and objectives

Evaluation approach and methods

- Data analysis
- Findings and conclusions

Recommendations

Lessons learned

Report annexes