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# Terms of Reference of the Final Evaluation of The Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin Phase I and Phase II

#  September 2017- April 2020

# June 2020

1. **INTRODUCTION**

UNDP with the support of the German Government developed and implemented ***the Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin project,*** in four countries (Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria) the phase I of the project started in September 2017 and ended in December 2018 with a budget of Euros **5,585,197.10** equivalent of **$ 6,568,646.43**  and the phase II started in January 2019 to end on March 2020 with a budget of **Euro 6,264,726.51.**

The purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the ***Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin project*** results achieved since 2017 and analyse the overall added value to stabilization in the Lake Chad Basin. This evaluation will be used for learning and accountability.

These terms of references outline the work to be undertaken by the consultant for an independent final evaluation of the project, including the progress of the outputs towards the outcomes of the project, institutional arrangements as well as Government stakeholders, expenditure rates, and opportunities for learning.

1. **PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

The final project evaluation aims to assess the overall contribution of the ***Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin project*** in the stabilization of the affected areas of the Lake Chad Basin from September 2017 to April 2020.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the validity of ***the Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin Project*** Theory of Change in fragile affected areas in Cameroon Chad Niger and Nigeria, its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and gender and youth partnership as well as impact and sustainability of the Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin project. The evaluation will assess the intended and unintended outputs, outcomes and (possible) impact of the Stabilization Projects on the target communities and make recommendations to enhance operational and programmatic effectiveness of similar initiatives in comparable situations

**Specific objectives of the evaluation are:**

* To assess the relevance, effectiveness efficiency and sustainability of ***the Integrated Regional Stabilization of Lake Chad Project Phase I and Phase II*** as well as understand the key factors that have contributed to achievement or non-achievement of the intended results;
* To determine the extent to which the ***Integrated Regional Stabilization of Lake Chad Project Phase I and Phase II*** contributed to forging and strengthening of partnerships among key stakeholders including Government, RSS secretariat, LCBC, donors, UN agencies and beneficiary communities;
* To assess the management arrangements and capacity in place by the Integrated Regional Stabilization of Lake Chad Project Phase I and Phase II, Government and the beneficiary communities in sustaining the results achieved;
* To draw lessons learned and best practices and make recommendations for future programming of projects of similar nature.

**Scope of the Evaluation:**

***The phase I started in September 2017 and ended in December 2018*** with Overall Objective of stabilizing the Lake Chad and establishing foundations for recovery and development. The project had three specific objectives:

***Specific Objective 1:*** *A common, regional approach to stabilization launched in the four countries of the Lake Chad Basin ng specific objectives*

***Specific Objective 2:*** *Regional Stabilization promoted through strengthening of community security, local governance and reconciliation*

***Specific Objective 3:*** *Reintegration of former fighters, CJTF members and vigilantes supported*

***The Phase II started in January 2019 and will end in April 2020*** with the same overall objective as phase I the following expected results:

***Specific Objective 1:*** *Coordination and implementation of the Regional Strategy for the Stabilisation, Recovery and Resilience of the Boko Haram-affected areas of the Lake Chad Basin strengthened.*

***Specific Objective 2:*** *Community security, local governance, community-based reconciliation and reintegration in targeted border communities are strengthened, contributing to enhanced regional stability*

 The evaluation findings will be disseminated to all stakeholders upon approval of the final evaluation report by UNDP and the Government of Germany. It will provide UNDP and Germany with a comprehensive assessment of the results, impact, efficiency and effectiveness, gender and youth participation of the Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin project in meeting stabilization and recovery needs of the eight conflict-affected target areas in Cameroon, Chad Niger and Nigeria. In addition, the evaluation will strengthen mutual accountability among all development partners/stakeholders.

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS**

The evaluation questions include, but not limited to the following. Final decision on the evaluation questions will emerge from consultations among Germany and UNDP.

 **Relevance:**

* To what extent was the project in line with the regional development priorities, the Regional programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
* Are the objectives of the projects in line with the Federal Foreign Office’s political aims and does meeting the objectives plausibly contribute to achieving Germany’s foreign policy goals (see e.g. The Guidelines of the Federal Government of Germany on preventing crises, resolving conflicts, building peace)?
* To what extent was the project able to accompany political processes in the four countries/regionally?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the region?
* To what extent do the objectives of the project correspond with the priorities and requirements of the beneficiaries? To what extent were community voices incorporated effectively into local decision-making processes and siting of interventions? How could the project have given stronger voices to the local beneficiary communities?
* To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
* To what extent were the integrated Regional Stabilization Project appropriate in terms of programme conceptualization and design?
* To what extent did the project design contribute toward the overall stabilization objectives and priorities as perceived by the beneficiaries?
* To what extent did the project contribute to enhancing the capacity of government institutions and beneficiary communities?
* How is the project embedded in other activities by national and international actors? Did any coordination take place? Were there any synergies?

**Effectiveness:**

* To what extent did the project contribute to the regional programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and regional development priorities?
* To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended regional stabilization project outputs and outcomes?
* To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* Were there any unintended effects (positive or negative) of the project?
* 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?
* To what extent did the Integrated Regional stabilization Project achieve the intended results and were there any unintended results?
* 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 projects 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 has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national/regional constituents and changing partner priorities?

**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? Are project approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the countries in the project region (political instability, post crisis situations,)
* To what extent did the coordination of activities and engagement among the Projects stakeholders contribute to the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes?
* Did the programme’s implementing partners have the requisite skills/capacity to deliver infrastructure and develop governments’ institutional capacity at local levels?
* How efficiently was the fund flow managed at different levels? Were levels of subsequent fund disbursements comparable to the levels of physical progress made across the project? In other words, to what extent did the fund managers apply payment by milestones arrangement with implementing partners? Was there flow of funds tracking, disbursement triggers and monitoring of physical progress?
* Did the Stabilization Projects provide value for money in terms of costs and benefits?
* To what extent were the projects complementing other interventions in target states?

**Sustainability and Continuity:**

* What is the likelihood that project interventions are sustainable?
* Are efforts being made to establish structures that will remain in place after the project/programme has been completed and which can be maintained without continued funding of the German Federal Foreign Office?
* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
* Is there any exit plan or exit strategies for activities continuity after the project?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to regional programme outputs and outcomes?
* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
* 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 do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
* What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?
* How many target beneficiary communities’ security needs have worsened since implementation of the projects?
* Has the Projects partnership strategy been appropriate, effective and contributed to sustainable impact?
* How strong is the level of ownership of the Joint Stabilization Projects outputs by the Lake Chad Basin Government and beneficiary communities?
* What is the level of stated commitment by the government and beneficiary community in sustaining the Stabilization Projects outputs/outcomes and continue working for sustaining/enhancing the impact?
* Have some lessons learnt been transferred to partners, including local governments, in order to strengthen long-term sustainability?
* What lessons learnt need to inform future stabilization and/or post conflict recovery interventions?
1. **METHODOLOGY**

The project evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments were interventions or advisory support were provided, etc.

The project evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change’’ (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that stabilization project has supported and observed progress at the regional level. The evaluator will develop a logic model of how UNDP RSCA acceleration and ratification interventions are expected to lead to improved service delivery.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of the support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, and other means as far as the current situation allows.

The evaluation is expected to adopt a mix of quantitative and qualitative approaches including document review, stakeholder interviews, site inspections, system analysis, inventory and resource records and cost / benefit analysis. The evaluators will develop a rigorous methodology for the final evaluation and the sampling strategy as part of this assignment with guidance provided by the project team. An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) if possible—consisting of UNDP and Germany—will be established and the ERG will evaluate the proposed methodologies as part of the selection process.

The evaluation process will include but not limited to the following:

* Desk reviews: The evaluation team will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following:
* Project document (contribution agreement)
* regional programme document;
* ii) project documents and activity reports;
* Result Oriented Analysis Report
* v) support services provided to country offices; vi) country office reports; vii) UNDP’s corporate strategies and reports; and viii) government, media, academic publications.
* Theory of change and results framework.
* project quality assurance reports.
* Annual workplans.
* Activity designs.
* Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
* Results-oriented monitoring report.
* Highlights of project board meetings.
* Technical/financial monitoring reports.
* Stakeholder interviews: The evaluator team will conduct face-to-face if applicable and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) at the Regional Center and Country Offices; and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups and donors, including RSS Secretariat, donors, government officials, and other United Nations Organisations;

All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

A case study approach could be used to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the project. Final methodological approach including interview schedule, and data to be used in the evaluation will be outlined in the inception report and discussed UNDP, Germany and the evaluator.

1. **EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES) AND TIMELINES**

The main deliverables of the evaluation are:

Draft and final inception report

Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length).

Final evaluation report including lessons.

Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group through Zoom or Skype can be organized by project team.

Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.

1. **Inception report (10 – 15 pages):** The inception report should detail the evaluators understanding of the final evaluation questions and objectives; present the proposed theory of change for UNDPs work on stabilization in the region, detailed methodology including sampling strategy, data collection and analysis plan (based on the guidance given by the ERG). The inception report should also include a refined work plan with clear timelines, detailing key deliverables and a comprehensive evaluation matrix with a detailed list of key questions, sub questions relating to the evaluation criteria; data sources; methods of data collection, indicators/success standards and methods of data analysis.
2. The inception report will be submitted by the consultant one week after the signing of the contract.
3. **Evaluation debriefings. Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings**
4. **Draft evaluation report[[1]](#footnote-1) and a PowerPoint presentation:** The first draft of the report will be completed in-country. The first draft will contain summary of key findings, lessons learned, risk management and recommendations, which will be presented in N’Djamena to the Steering Committee and to other key stakeholders. Feedback from the presentation and reviews by key stakeholders will be shared with the evaluator for finalisation of the report. **(20 days).**

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 of time, 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.

1. **Final evaluation report including lessons:** After incorporating feedback received on the draft report, the evaluator will submit a final report as per the agreed timelines. The evaluator will attach the following annexes to the final report; data collection tools and guidelines, datasets, analysis plans, collation and aggregation tables, risk matrix, etc., if available. Guidance for the outline of the report is contained in Annex 1 below. The evaluator will make a presentation of the evaluation findings to all stakeholders including state government officials. **(10 Days)**
2. **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant**
3. **EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

**Skills and qualifications:**  The evaluator will be an international firm with extensive experience of conducting improvement and accountability evaluations in stabilization and post conflict recovery programmes. The evaluation provider is expected to demonstrate:

* **Excellent value for money**: including competitive consultancy rates, a detailed financial plan, a clear methodology to ensure products will be delivered in line with agreed costs, a mitigation strategy for financial risk, and clear financial reporting processes.
* **An excellent understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies:** including capacity in a range of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods; evidence of research or implementation expertise in stabilization and post conflict recovery; and an awareness of gender, social and conflict analysis in evaluation.
* **Expertise in communications**, dissemination and advocacy around evaluation findings: including a good understanding of the use of evidence-based approaches to influence stakeholders.
* **A high-quality proposal for this assignment:** including a good understanding of these terms of reference; an evaluation methodology which meets international best practice; and a realistic and adequate workplan to deliver outputs.
* **A qualified and structured team:** including demonstrated capacity by the study leader in financial and human resource management, and in the production of timely, high-quality reports; a balance of appropriate skills and expertise within the team in evaluation methodologies, sector expertise, and social analysis; and appropriate involvement of local partners to build evaluation capacity and provide value for money.

It would be up to the firm to propose the optimum team composition and clearly specify the role of each team member required to achieve the objectives of the evaluation. However, it is suggested that the evaluation team must be composed of experts who have proven knowledge and relevant work experience in the field of conflict and community security as well as sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation). The team needs to comprise national Consultant (Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria) and international experts. Given the limited timeframe available, it is expected that (at least) two teams be deployed to cover the field work this is to be followed with the Covid-19 situation and development. Each team should have at least one national consultant of Cameroon Chad Niger and Nigeria as team member.

The independent evaluator should have:

* **At least ten years of experience in programme evaluations**, of which at least five years should be in international settings – preferably in post-conflict or fragile state contexts;
* **Experience in operating in difficult operational environment**;
* **Experience in Lake Chad Basin in Cameroon Chad Niger and Nigeria**, post-conflict areas, and/or other East African countries will be an advantage;
* **Experience in engaging with local community members**, using participatory and consultative approaches;
* **Experience in engaging with government institutions** and Donors handling sensitive information;
* **Experience in Gender, Results Base Management and Human Rights**
* **Experience in monitoring/evaluating conflict prevention, peacebuilding, stabilization** or community security-related programmes or projects will be an advantage; and
* **The evaluation team should be enough technically qualified** to monitor and implement activities and deliver all required outputs. Moreover, the evaluation teams must have:
* Demonstrated strong oral and written communications skills in English and a good knowledge of French;
* Good interpersonal skills and ability to work in a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic environment with sensitivity and respect for diversity;
* Ability to work independently with minimal supervision and maintain flexibility in working hours.
1. **EVALUATION ETHICS**

The evaluation should be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guideline, which is available at

<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/100>

Consultant must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of project strategies and programming relating to the outcome and programme under review. Evaluator’s methodology should ensure independence and impartiality of judgment in assessment findings and recommendations.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

 UNDP will recruit a consultant though a competitive process and inline with UNDP Process. UNDP will be responsible for the management of the evaluator. Senior Advisor Head of Stabilization will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the Evaluation Specialist to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.).The Government of Germany and UNDP will approve the final report.

The UNDP focal person will arrange introductory meetings and will establish initial contacts with partners and project implementation IPs. 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. UNDP will develop a management response to the evaluation within four weeks of report finalization.

The selected independent evaluator is responsible for the overall evaluation activities and quality of the evaluation process as well as the products. It will be the responsibility of the evaluator to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites (if the pandemic allows) and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed if required. An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) composed of Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist of UNDP CO’s in Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria, Germany and Capacity Building Specialist for the RSF will be contacted.

The independent evaluator reports to the ERG and the Senior Advisor Head of Stabilization RSS Secretariat. The ERG reviews the deliverables and methodologies proposed by the evaluator and advices on any improvements to ensure the validity and quality of the evaluation, if need be. Moreover, the UNDP Regional Stabilization Secretariat in N’Djamena will:

* Provide the evaluator with appropriate support (in those situations that are beyond the evaluator’s control) to ensure that the objective of the evaluation is achieved with reasonable efficiency and effectiveness;
* Focal point in UNDP Cameroon, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria will support the evaluator during the evaluation process;
* Ensure that relevant documents are available to the consultants upon the commencement of their tasks;
* Coordinate and inform government counterparts, partners and other related stakeholders as needed with the support of UNDP CO’s focal points;
* Support to identify key stakeholders to be interviewed as part of the assessment;
* Help in liaising with partners; and
* Organize inception meetings between the selected evaluator, partners and stakeholders prior to the scheduled start of the evaluation assignment.
1. **TIMEFRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation is expected to take 40 working days, starting 1st July 2020. The report is due the 30th September 2020. The following table provides an indicative breakdown of activities and delivery:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Deliverable** | **Workday allocation** |
| Review materials and develop work plan | Inception report and evaluation matrix(1st July-10 July 2020) | 10 |
| Participate in an Inception Meeting with project staff and M&E of the RSCA and relevant partners |
| Draft inception report |
| Review Documents and stakeholder consultations | Draft evaluation report Stakeholder workshop presentation(20 July-10 August 2020) | 20 |
| Interview stakeholders |
| Conduct field visits  |
| Analyse data  |
| Develop draft evaluation & lesson Learned report to project  |
| Present draft Evaluation and lesson learned Report at Validation Workshop | Final evaluation report(20 September-30 September 2020) | 10 |
| Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders  |
|  | Totals 40 | 7.5 weeks |

The evaluator should provide the detail list of activities and timeframe during the inception report. However, evaluation activities should be carried out and deliverables produced within 40 working days during the period mid-May to July 2020.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITY:**

The payment modality would be based on the following milestones:

* Completion of inception report (20%).
* Submission of Draft Evaluation Report and a PowerPoint presentation (60%).
* Submission of Final Evaluation Report (20%).

**ANNEX I: Application submission process and criteria for selection**

Evaluation forms for technical proposals follow on the next two pages. The obtainable number of points specified for each evaluation criterion indicates the relative significance or weight of the item in the overall evaluation process.

The Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms are:

* Form **1:** Expertise of Firm / Organisation Submitting Proposal
* Form **2:** Proposed Work Plan and Approach
* Form **3:** Personnel

Note: The score weights and points obtainable in the evaluation sheet are tentative and should be changed depending on the need or major attributes of technical proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms | Score Weight | Points Obtainable | Company / Other Entity |
| A | B | C | D | E |
| 1. | Expertise of Firm / Organisation submitting Proposal | 30% | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | Proposed Work Plan and Approach | 50% | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | Personnel | 20% | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Total** | **1000** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Technical Proposal EvaluationForm 1 | Points obtainable | Company / Other Entity |
| A | B | C | D | E |
| Expertise of firm / organisation submitting proposal |
|  |
| 1.1 | Reputation of Organisation and Staff (Competence / Reliability) | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 | Litigation and Arbitration history | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 | General Organisational Capability which is likely to affect implementation (i.e. loose consortium, holding company or one firm, size of the firm / organisation, strength of project management support e.g. project financing capacity and project management controls) | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 | 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 specialised skills. | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 | Quality assurance procedures, warranty | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.6 | Relevance of:* Specialised Knowledge
* Experience on Similar Programme / Projects
* Experience on Projects in the Region

Work for UNDP/ major multilateral/ or bilateral programmes | 160 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 340 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Technical Proposal EvaluationForm 2 | Points Obtainable | Company / Other Entity |
| A | B | C | D | E |
| Proposed Work Plan and Approach |
|  |
| 2.1 | To what degree does the Offeror 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 400 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Technical Proposal EvaluationForm 3 | Points Obtainable | Company / Other Entity |
| A | B | C | D | E |
|  |
| 3.1 | Task Manager |  | 130 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sub-Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | General Qualification | 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Suitability for the Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - International Experience | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Training Experience | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Professional Experience in the area of specialisation | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Knowledge of the region | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Language Qualifications | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 3.2 | Senior Expert |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub-Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | General Qualification | 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Suitability for the Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - International Experience | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Training Experience | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Professional Experience in the area of specialisation | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Knowledge of the region | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Language Qualifications | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 3.3 | Junior Expert |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub-Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | General Qualification | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Suitability for the Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - International Experience | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Training Experience | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Professional Experience in the area of specialisation | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Knowledge of the region | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Language Qualification |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  | **Total Part 3** |  | 260 |  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX II: Evaluation Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key questions** | **Specific sub questions** | **Data sources** | **Data collection methods/tools** | **Indicators/ success standards** | **Methods for data analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX III: SUGGESTED REPORT STRUCTURE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicative Section** | **Description and Content** |
| **Title and opening pages** |  |
| **Table of contents** |  |
| **List of acronyms and abbreviations**  |  |
| **Executive summary**  | This should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. Often, readers will only look at the executive summary. It should be prepared after the main text has been reviewed and agreed and should not be circulated with draft reports.  |
| **Chapter 1: Introduction (Background and approach/methodology)** | Introduce the rationale for the evaluation, including mandate, purpose and objectives, outline the main evaluation issues including the expected contribution at the outcome level, address evaluability and describe the methodology to be used.  |
| **Chapter 2: The development context and challenges of the Affected Areas of the Lake Chad Basin**  | In addition to providing a general overview of historical trends and development challenges, specifically address the evaluation theme. Explain how the theme is addressed by government in Cameroon Chad Niger and Nigeria, and how it is reflected in national policies and strategies and regional institutions as LCBC and African Union Commission. Also provide information on the activities of other development partners in the area.  |
| **Chapter 3: Integrated Regional Stabilization Projects Phase I and Phase II responses and challenges in the Lake Chad Affected Areas** | Against the background of Chapter 2, explain what the Integrated Regional Stabilization Project Phase I and Phase I achieved stabilization in affected areas of the Lake Chad Basin (purely descriptive, not analytical). Provide the overarching outcome model, specifying the results frameworks for the projects, as well descriptions of some of the main Stabilization Project activities.  |
| **Chapter 4: Development results (Presentation of findings based on the evaluation criteria, questions and other cross-cutting issues).**  | Against the background of Chapters 2-3, analyze findings without repeating information already provided. Also, minimize the need to mention additional information regarding projects (these should be described in Chapter 3). Focus on providing and analyzing evidence relating to the evaluation criteria. Preferably, structure the analysis based on the main evaluation criteria: • Relevance • Effectiveness • Efficiency • partnership Sustainability. In addressing the evaluation criteria, the narrative should respond to the corresponding evaluation questions identified and agreed on during the inception stage. It should also provide a summary analysis of the findings.  |
| **Chapter 5: Conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations** | Conclusions are judgments based on evidence provided in Chapter 4. They are pitched at a higher level and are informed by an overall, comparative understanding of all relevant issues, options and opportunities. Do not provide new evidence or repeat evidence contained in earlier chapters. Lessons learnt and recommendations should be derived from the evidence contained in Chapter 4. They may also, but need not necessarily, relate to conclusions.  |
| **Annexes** | * TOR
* Data collection tools
* Questionnaires
* List of interviewed Persons
* Other key documents
 |

**ANNEX V: EVALUATION DOCUMENTS**

* Project document Integrated Regional Stabilization Phase I
* Project document Integrated Regional Stabilization Phase II
* Progress report phase I
* Progress report Phase II
* Final Report phase I
* Signed CDR
* Field visits/monitoring reports
* Other relevant documents.
* Steering committee/ Board meeting reports
* ROAR
* Financial reports (Atlas)
* IP reports
* Regional programme report

**Annex VI:** **The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by consultant**

1. A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested [↑](#footnote-ref-1)