

# ANNEX I



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

ETHIOPIA

## TERM OF REFERENCE (ToR) FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC)

Requisitioner's Guide to Drafting Terms of Reference (TOR) for an Assignment Requiring the Services of an Individual to be engaged through an Individual Contract (IC)

### GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Services/Work Description:</b>	Recruitment of a Consultant for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the EU co-funded project titled "Support for Effective Cooperation and Coordination of Cross-border Initiatives in Southwest Ethiopia-Northwest Kenya, Marsabit-Borana & Dawa, and Kenya-Somalia-Ethiopia" (SECCCI)
<b>Project/Program Title:</b>	Support for Effective Cooperation and Coordination of Cross-border Initiatives in Southwest Ethiopia-Northwest Kenya, Marsabit-Borana & Dawa, and Kenya-Somalia-Ethiopia (SECCCI)
<b>Post Title:</b>	International Consultant (IC) <b>Group of Individuals and/or Firms are not eligible for this consultancy assignment (only at an individual level)</b>
<b>Consultant Level:</b>	<b>Level C</b> (Senior Specialist)
<b>Duty Station:</b>	Home-based with multiple travel to project locations
<b>Expected Places of Travel:</b>	UNDP Regional Service Center for Africa, UNDP Country Offices (CO) in Kenya, Ethiopia and Somalia, Project Clusters: Marsabit – Moyale (at the Kenyan, Ethiopian border), Turkana – Omo (at the Kenyan, Ethiopian border), Mandera – Gedo – Doolow (at the Kenyan, Ethiopian and Somali border)
<b>Duration:</b>	30 working days distributed over 11 weeks not exceeding 3 months
<b>Expected Start Date:</b>	1 February 2020

### I. BACKGROUND / PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Evaluation (MTE) of the EU co-funded project titled **Support for Effective Cooperation and Coordination of Cross-border Initiatives in Southwest Ethiopia-Northwest Kenya, Marsabit-Borana & Dawa, and Kenya-Somalia-Ethiopia (SECCCI)**. The Project is implemented by UNDP in collaboration with UN Environment (UNEP) and working in partnership with IGAD. The project is funded by the European Union, with co-financing contributions from UNDP and UNEP. The project duration period is 36 months, from 22 February 2018 (first day after last signature) to February 2021 (including a 6 months inception phase) and is currently in its second year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE.

The project is intended to address the drivers of conflict and instability, irregular migration and displacement in the cross-border areas of the Horn of Africa through improved cross-border coordination and cooperation. The specific objectives of the Project are:

1. To strengthen regional policy frameworks, structures and protocols for cross-border cooperation between national and local Governments, the private sector, civil society and international technical and financial partners in development;
2. Capacities of communities, local governments and civil society to fully engage in processes for development planning and results are built;
3. To ensure effective cooperation and coordination, monitoring and evaluation of cross-border initiatives including involvement of relevant national and regional actors in these processes.

### **Intended Outcomes**

SECCCI EU co-funded Project is based on the presumption that the complex inter-related development challenges of the Horn of Africa require a coordinated response that partially rests upon improved cross-border cooperation. The EU co-funded Project identifies five inter-linked processes that will significantly contribute to the improvement of cross-border cooperation in the Horn of Africa. Intended Project outputs fall in line with the 5 identified processes, namely:

1. Policy frameworks in place;
2. Enhanced capacities of actors;
3. Development processes strengthened;
4. Improved coordination including monitoring and evaluation; and
5. Knowledge management systematized.

Intended outcomes and outputs under the Project are:

#### **Outcome 1: Policy frameworks in place.**

**Output 1:** Policy development and mechanisms for cross-border cooperation enhanced.

#### **Outcome 2: Enhanced capacities of actors.**

**Output 2:** Coordination mechanisms in support of improved cross-border cooperation in place at all levels.

#### **Outcome 3: Development processes strengthened.**

**Output 3:** Stakeholder capacities developed in support of cross-border cooperation.

#### **Outcome 4: Improved Coordination including monitoring and evaluation.**

**Output 4:** Development planning processes at cross-border level are better understood, more evidence-based, participatory and accountable.

#### **Outcome 5: Knowledge management systematised.**

**Output 5:** Knowledge Management system captures and disseminates results and good practice, facilitates cross-border coordination and cooperation.

### **Project Overview**

European Union (EU) co-funded Support for Effective Coordination and Cooperation of Cross-border Initiative (SECCCI) Project was contracted to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)/Regional Service Centre for Africa (RSCA) at the end of February 2018, following a year of formulation and negotiation

between the UNDP/RSCA, the European Union Delegation (EUD) in Addis Ababa, Intergovernmental Agency for Development (IGAD) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The Project has a total budget of US\$10,050,311 and is co-funded by the European Union (EU): Euro 7,706,082 equivalent to US\$ 9,571,724; UNDP TRAC: US\$ 358,940 and UNEP: US\$ 119,647.

The SECCCI Project is designed to provide technical support to national governments of Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia at the national level. The overall objective of the project is to address the drivers of conflict and instability, irregular migration and displacement in the cross-border areas of the Horn of Africa through improved cross-border cooperation and coordination. This project is therefore underpinned by a theory of change which maintains that the complex inter-related development challenges of the Horn of Africa require a coordinated response that partially rests upon improved cross-border cooperation. Thus, Cross-border cooperation is increasingly being pursued as a synchronized approach to addressing the root causes of vulnerability and building resilience to recurrent problems among communities in the cross-border areas of the Horn of Africa

The SECCCI Project focuses on three cross border clusters:

1. Marsabit – Moyale at the Kenyan, Ethiopian border (Cluster IV);
2. Turkana – Omo at the Kenyan and Ethiopian Border (Cluster I);
3. Mandera – Gedo – Doolow at the Kenyan, Ethiopian and Somali border (Cluster II).

However, the SECCCI Project also has a coordination role for the Cross-Border collaboration programme in Western Ethiopia and Eastern Sudan called Cluster III, the linking between clusters started in October 2018 and will be operationalised once the three first clusters are up and running.

<b>BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION</b>	
<b>PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION</b>	
<b>Project/outcome title: Support for Effective Cooperation and Coordination of Cross-border Initiatives in Southwest Ethiopia-Northwest Kenya, Marsabit-Borana &amp; Dawa, and Kenya-Somalia-Ethiopia (SECCCI)</b>	
<b>Atlas ID</b>	<b>00110098</b>
<b>Corporate outcome and output</b>	
<b>Countries</b>	<b>Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia</b>
<b>Region</b>	<b>Southwest Ethiopia-Northwest Kenya, Marsabit-Borana &amp; Dawa, and Kenya-Somalia-Ethiopia</b>
<b>Date project document signed</b>	<b>22 February 2018</b>
<b>Planned end</b>	<b>21 February 2021</b>
<b>Evaluation start date</b>	<b>1 February 2020</b>
<b>Duration of Initial Contract</b>	<b>30 days over 11 weeks not exceeding 3 months</b>
<b>Expected Duration of Assignment</b>	<b>February 2020 – April 2020</b>
<b>Project budget</b>	<b>US\$ 10, 050, 311.00</b>
<b>Project expenditure at the time of evaluation</b>	<b>US\$1,549,755.51</b>

<b>Funding source</b>	<b>EU, UNDP, UNEP</b>
<b>Implementing parties</b>	<b>UNDP, IGAD, UNEP</b>

### ***SECCCI Project Partners***

The SECCCI EU co-funded Project is implemented by the UNDP RSCA, in partnership with UNEP, IGAD and UNDP Country Offices of Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia. The implementation is closely coordinated with the national and local Governments of Kenya, Ethiopia and Somalia. The UNDP RSCA is responsible for Project quality assurance. **UNDP RSCA** oversees the management of all aspects of Project implementation, IGAD and UNEP are implementing partners.

**IGAD** facilitates cooperation between Kenya, Ethiopia and Somalia in the implementation of the SECCCI EU co-funded Project:

- An existing Platform Coordination Unit will serve to coordinate the implementation of the cross-boundary interventions; take charge of cluster level cross-border facilitation units; provide a platform for technical assistance and support policy dialogue with countries
- IGAD is also responsible for the establishment of the web-based knowledge management platform;
- IGAD is also undertaking capacity development activities and support the organisation of regular meetings with international donors and implementing agencies to support local and national Governments with resource mobilisation for the area development and cross-border cooperation projects.

**UNEP** takes the responsibility for the EU co-funded Project focussing on transboundary water management. More specifically, UNEP focuses on:

- Building cooperation and a shared vision between Ethiopia and Kenya on the joint management of the Lake Turkana and its river basins in order to develop an effective governance mechanism;
- Improving the scientific understanding of the hydrological regimes and ecosystem services of the lake and its river basins;
- Supporting the establishment of a local system to monitor the quality and quantity of the transboundary water resources;
- Creating awareness among the riparian communities and the county/regional governments on ecosystem restoration and management;
- Exploring the application of lessons learned from the Lake Turkana basin to similar cases of transboundary water resource management;
- Supporting on the sustainable development of the Genale, Dawa, Jubba and Shabelle Basins.

All three parties are responsible for all internal Project monitoring and evaluation activities.

## **II. SCOPE OF THE WORK**

### **Evaluation purpose**

UNDP commissions evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to development results at the regional level as articulated in the Regional programme document (RPD). These are evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the Evaluation Plan of the Regional Bureau for Africa outcome evaluations are being conducted to assess the

impact of RSCA development assistance across the major thematic and cross cutting areas of sustainable and inclusive growth, gender equality and conflict management and use of the environment. The Regional Office in Addis Ababa Ethiopia is commissioning this evaluation to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of current programming, which can be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for new initiatives. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of project implementation progress.

### **Scope of the MTR**

The outcome evaluation will be conducted during the months of February and March 2020, with a view to enhancing programme implementation and strategic direction for the project. The evaluation will consider the pertinent RSC programme outcomes and outputs focused towards improved cross-border cooperation and coordination, as stated in the Regional programme document of RBA. The MTR will cover the time frame from project start date on 22 February 2018 to 31 January 2020. Interventions to be covered by this evaluation are SECCCI Project activities implemented by UNDP RSCA, in partnership with UNEP, IGAD and UNDP Country Offices of Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia and currently focused on three cross border clusters namely:

1. Marsabit - Moyale at the Kenyan, Ethiopian border (Cluster IV);
2. Turkana – Omo at the Kenyan and Ethiopian Border (Cluster I);
3. Mandera – Gedo – Doolow at the Kenyan, Ethiopian and Somali border (Cluster II).
4. The SECCCI Project also has a coordination role for the Cross-Border collaboration programme in Western Ethiopia and Eastern Sudan called Cluster III but is yet to be operationalised.

### **Objectives of the MTR**

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

- Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.
- Review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability and propose adaptive management to better increase the chances of the project being successful. Part of the adaptive management may involve proposed revisions and amendments to the project results framework.
- Provide evidence of UNDP's contribution to Africa's development effectiveness improved cross-border coordination and cooperation, including the contributory factors and impediments;
- Provide stakeholders in regional programme countries and among development partners with an objective assessment of the development contributions that have been achieved through UNDP RSC support and partnerships with other key players through the regional programme during the given period.
- Determine the strategic positioning and relevance of UNDP in this sector – the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps – especially about the appropriateness of their partnership strategy (including choice of beneficiaries), their ToC, and any need for mid-course adjustments to meet the outcomes
- Distil lessons for future programming, including to inform higher level evaluations and future decision-making and planning for the remainder of the programme cycle
- Contribute substantively to the Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board;
- Facilitate learning to inform current and future programming at the regional and corporate levels

## **Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. Thus, the outcome evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability:

### **Relevance**

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent did UNDP adopt gender-sensitive, human rights-based and conflict-sensitive approaches?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the project's objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

### **Efficiency**

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent did UNDP promote gender equality, the empowerment of women, human rights and human development in the delivery of country programme outputs?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

### **Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why;
- Discuss what needs to be done to ensure the sustainability of the project;
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

### **Financial risks to sustainability**

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?

### **Socio-economic risks to sustainability**

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?

### **Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability.**

- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?

### **Environmental risks to sustainability**

- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?

### **Evaluation cross-cutting issues questions**

The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

#### **Human Rights**

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

#### **Gender Equality**

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

#### **Capacity Building**

- Did the governance programme of the RSCA adequately invest in, and focus on, Regional and national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency
- Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc.) delivered by the governance programme adapted to country needs?

Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on UNDP RSCA results in this area of support, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP RBA could adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the governance portfolio fully achieves current planned outcomes and is positioned for sustainable results in the future. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer lessons for UNDP support in Region and elsewhere based on this analysis.

### **MTR Approach and Methodology**

The outcome evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator, and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments where programmes or advisory support were provided, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives etc.

The outcome evaluation is expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP RSCA has supported and observed progress in democratic governance at the regional level. The evaluators will develop a logic model of how UNDP RSCA governance interventions are expected to lead to improved regional and national and local government management and service delivery.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP RSCA support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

The steps in data collection are anticipated but not limited to the following:

#### **Desk reviews**

The evaluator will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following:



i) regional programme documents; ii) project documents and activity reports; iii) past evaluation/self-assessment reports; iv) deliverables from the regional programme activities, e.g. published reports and training materials; v) client surveys on support services provided to country offices; vi) country office reports; vii) UNDP's corporate strategies and reports; and viii) government, media, academic publications.

### Stakeholder interviews

The evaluator will conduct face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) at headquarters, the Regional Centre and Country Offices; and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups and donors in the countries visited. Focus groups may be organized as appropriate.

### Field Visits

The evaluator will visit programme sites to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. A case study approach will be used to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the programme. Accordingly, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions to the three cross border clusters namely:

1. Marsabit - Moyale at the Kenyan, Ethiopian border (Cluster IV);
2. Turkana – Omo at the Kenyan and Ethiopian Border (Cluster I);
3. Mandera – Gedo – Doolow at the Kenyan, Ethiopian and Somali border (Cluster II).

## III. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, the Evaluator will give a preliminary debriefing of the MTR and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report of a length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group.**
- **Lessons Learned report.** This will also be produced and discussed during the validation workshop. Feedback received should be taken into consideration when preparing the lessons learned report. The lessons learned report should cover the different facets of the governance programme implemented by the RSC. This report should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

No.	Deliverables / Outputs	Estimated Duration to Complete	Review and Approvals Required <i>(Indicate designation of person/Unit who will review output and confirm acceptance)</i>
1	Inception report and evaluation matrix	7 Working days	SECCCI Project

			Manager
2	Draft evaluation report and Stakeholder workshop presentation	16 Working days	SECCCI Project Manager
3	Final evaluation report	7 Working days	SECCCI Project Manager
<b>Total</b>		<b>30 Working days</b>	

#### **IV. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT / REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS**

The UNDP RSCA will select the Evaluator and will be responsible for his/her management. RSCA SECCCI Project Team will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the Evaluator to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Regional Office Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The Management of RSC/RBA will develop a management response to the evaluation within four weeks of report finalization.

The Project Manager will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

#### **V. LOGISTICS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT TO PROSPECT IC (if any)**

The Programme Officer (Quality Assurance)/SECCCI Programme Manager in the RSCA will arrange introductory meetings within RSC and the Cluster Lead or his designate will establish initial contacts with partners and project staff. The consultant will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report.

It will be the responsibility of the Evaluator to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed with the RSCA.

#### **VI. DURATION OF THE WORK<sup>1</sup>**

The evaluation is expected to take 30 working days, over a period of eleven weeks not exceeding 3 months, starting 1 February 2020. A tentative date for the stakeholder workshop is 24 April 2020, and the final draft evaluation report is due the 2nd of May 2020. The following table provides an indicative breakdown of activities and delivery:

Starting Date: 1 February 2020

<sup>1</sup> 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.

Duration of Initial Contract: 30 Days over 11 weeks not exceeding 3 months  
 Expected Duration of Assignment: February 2020 - April 2020

- Desk review
- Briefings of evaluators
- Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report.
- In-country data collection and analysis (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires).
- Preparing the draft report.
- Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance).
- Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report.

In addition, the evaluators may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination. Required formats for the inception reports, evaluation reports and other deliverables are included in the annexes of the TOR for this evaluation.

Activity	Deliverable	Evaluator's work day allocation	Time period (days) for task completion
Review materials and develop work plan	Inception report and evaluation matrix	7	7
Participate in an Inception Meeting with RSCA			
Draft inception report			
Review Documents and stakeholder consultations	Draft evaluation report  Stakeholder workshop presentation	16	16
Interview stakeholders			
Conduct field visits			
Analyse data			
Develop draft evaluation & lesson Learned report to RSCA	Final evaluation report	7	7
Present draft Evaluation and lesson learned Report at Validation Workshop			
Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders			

<b>Total</b>		30	30 days over 11 weeks not exceeding 3 months
--------------	--	----	--

## **VII. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC)**

### **a. Education:**

- Advanced University degree, Masters or preferably a PhD, in Economics, Development Studies, Social Sciences, Environment, Business Administration, or any other relevant discipline;

### **b. Experience:**

- Extensive (at least 10-year) professional experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in transboundary management/coordination (including in project management, preferably with a background on implementation of UNDP and/or EU-funded projects);
- At least 7 years of experience in conducting UNDP evaluations at regional, sub-regional or country level, preferably with direct experience on capacity building;

### **c. Language:**

- Fluent in written and spoken English.
- Working knowledge of other UN language is desirable.
- knowledge of Swahili and Amharic will be an asset

### **d. Functional Competencies:**

- Strong working knowledge of the UN and its mandate in the region.
- Knowledge of the work of UNDP in support of cross-border initiatives in the region is an advantage.
- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies; including experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators;
- Coordination experience working with government, development partners, and international partners would be an asset.
- Excellent knowledge of and extensive experience in the East and Horn of Africa region in the past seven years is desirable (experience in Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia will be an asset);
- Experience working with international technical assistance projects in the African countries would be an asset;
- Excellent reporting and communication skills

### **e. Core Competencies:**

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
- Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

The Evaluator will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the draft and final evaluation report. Specifically, the Evaluator will perform the following tasks:

- Manage the evaluation mission, and liaise with UNDP RSCA on travel and interview schedules.
- Develop the inception report, detailing the evaluation scope, methodology and approach;

- Conduct the project evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines;
- Draft and present the draft and final evaluation reports;
- Lead the presentation of draft findings in the stakeholder workshop;
- Finalize the evaluation report and submit it to UNDP RSCA Management.

**Consultant Independence**

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

**Important Note:**

The Consultant is required to have the abovementioned professional and technical qualifications. **Only the applicants who hold these qualifications** will be shortlisted and contacted.

**VIII. CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFER**

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly; Individual Consultants 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 weight of the proposals are:
  - a. Technical Criteria weight is **70%**
  - b. Financial Criteria weight is **30%**

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<b>Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))</b>	<b>70%</b>	100
▪ <b>Criteria a.</b> Understanding the Scope of Work (SoW); comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal		50 pts
▪ <b>Criteria b.</b> Minimum 10 years of experience in similar consultancy projects and/or IC contracts		15 pts
▪ <b>Criteria c.</b> Qualifications including UNDP and Africa experience (at least 7 years)		15 pts
▪ <b>Criteria d.</b> Effective communication and coordination skills with different categories of stakeholders (government, private sector, development/international partners and civil society)		10 pts
▪ <b>Criteria e.</b> Experience originating and editing reports/project evaluations and knowledge of results-based management systems, M&E methodologies, including SMART indicators.		10 pts
<b>Financial (Lower Offer/ Offer*100)</b>	<b>30%</b>	30
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30%</b>	

## IX. PAYMENT MILESTONES AND AUTHORITY

The prospective consultant will indicate the cost of services for each deliverable in US dollars **all-inclusive<sup>2</sup> lump-sum contract amount** when applying for this consultancy. The consultant will be paid based on the effective UN exchange rate (where applicable), and only after approving authority confirms the successful completion of each deliverable as stipulated hereunder.

The qualified consultant shall receive his/her lump sum service fees upon certification of the completed tasks satisfactorily, as per the following payment schedule:

Installment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained	Percentage of Payment
1 <sup>st</sup> Installment	MTE Inception Report	Yes	10 %
2 <sup>nd</sup> Installment	Draft MTE Report	"	60 %
3 <sup>rd</sup> Installment	Finalized MTE Report	"	30 %

### Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be "all inclusive" and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term "all inclusive" implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- (Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.)
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

## X. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

For purposes of generating quotations whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, a prospect Individual Contractor (IC) is given a proposed *Table of Contents*. Therefore, prospective Consultant Proposal Submission must have at least the preferred contents which are outlined in the IC Proposal Submission Form incorporated hereto.

Completed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

- **Personal CV and a P11 Personal History form**, 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;
- **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an applicant 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 applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial

<sup>2</sup> The term "All inclusive" implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal

proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

## **XI. CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROPRIETARY INTERESTS**

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service 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.

### **Code of conduct**

UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

### **Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, June 2008' (<http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>). The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners."

## **XII. ANNEXES TO THE TOR (if any otherwise cancel it out)**

Annexes of additional detail about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators:

- **Intervention results framework and theory of change.** Provides more detailed information on the intervention being evaluated.
- **Key stakeholders and partners.** A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted, together with an indication of their affiliation and relevance for the evaluation and their contact information. This annex can also suggest sites to be visited.
- **Documents to be consulted.** A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
  - Relevant national strategy documents,
  - Strategic and other planning documents (e.g., programme and project documents).
  - Monitoring plans and indicators.
  - Partnership arrangements (e.g., agreements of cooperation with Governments or partners).
  - Previous evaluations and assessments.
  - UNDP evaluation policy, UNEG norms and standards and other policy documents.
- **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the

evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

**Table 5. Sample evaluation matrix**

Relevant evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific sub questions	Data Sources	Data-collection methods/tools	Indicators/ success standard	Methods for data analysis
------------------------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

- **Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.** Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.
- **Required format for the evaluation report.** The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports (see annex 7).
- **Code of conduct.** UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

**Annex 1 - Intervention Results Framework and Theory of Change**

**Annex 2 – List of Key stakeholders and partners**

**Annex 3 - Documents to be consulted**

**Annex 4 - Evaluation Matrix**

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

**Name:** Nirina Kiplagat

**Designation:** PVE Project Manager

**Signature:** 

**Date Signed:** 15/01/2020

**Name:** Jide Okeke

**Designation:** Regional Programme Coordinator

**Signature:** 

**Date Signed:** 15/01/2020