

Terms of Reference
Final Evaluation
United Nations Development Programme
Community Infrastructure and Livelihood Recovery Programme (CILRP)

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and context

The years of 2015 witnessed large scale devastation in Nepal due to earthquakes, causing adverse impact on life, livelihoods and infrastructures, affecting the most vulnerable and marginalized people in rural areas, who were already living with limited access to basic services. The total value of damage and losses caused by these two massive disasters were reported to be NPR 706 billion (US\$7 billion)¹ from the earthquakes. The substantive damages were on community infrastructures viz. buildings, roads, bridges, culverts, trails and market facilities, irrigation canals, micro-hydro and drinking water schemes. Rapid restoration and rehabilitation of critical and productive community infrastructures and improvement of livelihood interventions are crucial to access the basic services and restore lives and livelihoods of the affected communities.

Aftermath of the 2015 devastation earthquake, UNDP launched Community Infrastructure and Livelihood Recovery Programme (CILRP) from June 2015 to address the urgent needs of the most affected communities with funding support of Government of Mauritius, International Medical Corps (IMC), Bridge Head Limited, Qatar Red Crescent, Royal Thai Government, KOICA and UNDP's core Fund. The project was built on earlier experience of Livelihood Recovery for Peace (LRP) project which was implemented from 2009 to 2015 to improve the socio-economic status of ultra-poor and poor households and communities, enhancing social cohesion, and strengthening local institutions to respond to supporting livelihood initiatives at Mahottari, Sarlahi and Rautahat districts.

CILRP was launched as an initiative for recovery and reconstruction to stabilize livelihoods of the disaster affected vulnerable population. The programme has been implemented in seven earthquake affected districts (Dhading, Dolakha, Gorkha, Kavre, Nuwakot, Rasuwa and Sindhupalchok) since June. The project was directly implemented through the Micro-Capital Grants/Low Value Grants with the local NGO partners.

The main objective of the programme is to contribute in resilient and inclusive economic recovery through the rehabilitation of community infrastructures, improvement of livelihood and provide short term employment. The programme is expected to achieve two interlinked outputs mentioned below:

Output 1: Community infrastructures rehabilitated/ constructed to help restore livelihoods and local economy and create immediate short-term employments.

Output 2: Basic livelihoods of excluded and vulnerable people restored, and their income generation opportunities enhanced.

At national level, the project established strong collaboration and co-ordination with Ministry of Land Management, Co-operatives and Poverty Alleviation (MoLCPA), Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development (MoAD), Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration (MoFAGA) and Ministry

¹ Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) Report 2015; National Planning Commission; Government of Nepal.

of Finance (MoF). Ministry of Land Management, Cooperatives and Poverty Alleviation (MoLCPA) is lead ministry and co-chair the project executive board. At the local level, project has strong collaboration with ward offices, urban/rural municipalities of the programmed districts. Local Farmers' Groups, Women's Groups, Cooperatives, Tole Lane Organizations, relevant NGOs and stakeholders were coordinated and included in the project planning and implementation. Whilst, Handicap International (INGO) was partnered to reach special needs of Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) in 2019. Coordination with local NGOs working in the same area was encouraged for leveraging resources and avoiding duplication. This built synergy among different stakeholders and maximized the benefits to the local people and optimized the resources.

The project has adopted following approaches and implementation strategies for future sustainability:

- The project implementation is led by community (user committee) for leveraging of resources through collaboration with local municipalities/Government line agencies and I/NGO partners in cost sharing modality.
- Strong partnership and collaboration with the local governments for sustainability and additional resources mobilization;
- Community-led decision making and implementation through capacity enhancement on recovery and resilience;
- Integrated approach on small-scale community infrastructure and livelihood recovery
- Cash-injection modality for short-term employment opportunities for local people and migrant workers under Covid-19 pandemic scenario;
- Cost-effectiveness using local resources and materials;
- Promotion of gender equality, women's empowerment and social inclusion, with focus on persons with disability at all levels, leading to better social cohesion.

In addition, with KOICA funded interventions, as per the agreed design recommended by Ministry of Health and Population, UNDP succeed to construct 10 disabled friendly health post buildings with facility of birthing centre and hospital waste management in 7 municipalities of Nuwakot district. The construction work was carried through bidding process in coordination with Ministry of Health and Population at national level and District Public Health Office (DPHO) at district level and respective municipalities health management committees (HMC).

The project has been implemented in 48 municipalities of 7 districts (Dhading, Dolakha, Gorkha, Kavre, Nuwakot, Rasuwa and Sindhupalchok). A total of 630,172 earthquake affected people were benefitted from the project interventions.

Schemes Category	# of schemes	Total HH	Beneficiaries		
			Women	Men	Total
Community Infrastructures	565	98,205	253,621	231,053	484,674
Commercialization and Market	34	20,173	55,378	55,036	110,414
Community Building	103	33,337	92,898	77,927	170,825
Drinking Water scheme	110	7,775	18,858	18,369	37,227
Eco-Tourism	66	12,863	26,744	24,635	51,379
Irrigation System	192	14,496	37,245	34,914	72,159
Rural Energy/ MH	26	4,094	8,979	8,212	17,191
Rural Road	34	5,467	13,519	11,960	25,479

Livelihood Interventions	415	32,177	77,292	68,206	145,498
Commercialization and Market	91	6,163	15,546	13,781	29,327
Improved Technology	244	17,910	42,615	39,791	82,406
Livelihood/ Value add assistance	10	99	240	230	470
Production Enhancement	4	15	25	26	51
Skill Development and Production Enhancement	66	7,990	18,866	14,378	33,244
Grand Total	980	130,382	330,913	299,259	630,172

The total approved budget for the project was USD 7.1 million since its commencement of earthquake response activities in June 2015. As of July 2020, the total USD 6.6 million has been spent. The breakdown of donor-wise budget is as follows:

Source of Funding	Budget	Funding period (Start – End Date)
UNDP	2,422,196.00	2015-2019
Mauritius	1,028,936.10	2015-2017
IMC	500,000.00	2016-2017
BHF	180,000.00	2016-2017
Royal Thai Government	2,000,000.00	Sept 2018-Dec 2020
Qatar Red Crescent	150,000.00	Sept 2018-July 2019
KOICA	820,232.00	Oct 2019-Dec 2018
Total	7,101,364.10	

At the time of writing, Nepal has confirmed 22,972 cases of COVID-19 (as of 9th August 2020) of which 16,353 are recovered and 75 are died. The source of the COVID-19 cases is mostly from the arrival of large numbers of returning migrant workers and Nepali students from India, the Gulf, and other Asian and European countries. The government decided to bring the entire nation under lockdown from 24th March 2020. The lockdown has profoundly altered the rhythm of everyday life. After the partial ease of the lockdown, the cases were started to increase and now the spread is widely, and community transmissions are started to be seen in specific locations.

The Covid-19 pandemic crisis further deteriorated livelihoods and impacted badly to the poor daily wage earner migrant workers due to the closure of businesses and prolonged lockdown. The crisis has disproportionately impacted the most vulnerable including informal workers, particularly women and daily wage workers, internal migrants and seasonal migrants to India, who are excluded from any social protection measures, exacerbating social and economic inequalities. Targeting those vulnerable population, CILRP has repurposing its regular activities toward Covid-19 response and providing short-term employment through community infrastructure related support activities in partnership and collaboration with Prime Minister Employment Programme (PMEP) in 11 municipalities (Jiri UM, Ajirkot RM, Dharche RM, Palungtar, Siranchowk RM, Kakani RM, Dupcheshwar RM, Helambu RM, Indrawati RM, Melamchi UM and Lishankhuoakhar) of 4 districts (Dolakha, Gorkha, Nuwakot, and Sindhupalchok). A total of more than 2334 affected people were benefitted from the project interventions, created 25,627 person days of short-term employment from 38 schemes as of 31 July 2020.

As the project is going to end on 31st December 2020, UNDP has planned to commission an evaluation to identify and document the achievements of project interventions, challenges, lessons learned and best practices. The findings of the evaluation will provide guidance for the way forward for future course of action. Thus, the evaluation report is expected to include specific recommendations for future programming/interventions.

The project information is summarized in below table.

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Community Infrastructure and Livelihood Recovery Programme (CILRP) "Livelihood Recovery for Peace"	
Atlas ID	00057322	
Corporate outcome and output	UNDAF/ CPD Outcome 3: By 2022, environmental management, sustainable recovery and reconstruction, and resilience to climate change and natural disaster are strengthened at all levels <i>CPD Output 3.5: Improved capacities of communities and government for resilient recovery and reconstruction.</i>	
Country	Nepal	
Region	Asia Pacific	
Date project document signed	1 st June 2015	
Project dates	Start	Valid period
	June 2015	31 December 2020
Project budget	USD 7.1 million	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	USD 6.6 million	
Funding source	Government of Mauritius, International Medical Corps (IMC), Bridge Head Limited, Qatar Red Crescent, Royal Thai Government, UNDP	
Implementing party	Action Nepal, CDC-Nepal, CDECF, CDF, CSN, CSRC, ECARDS Dolakha, ICDC, LACCoS, MANEKOR Society Nepal, NFGF, REIS, RUDEC, SDSC, SJASK, SSICDC, SUK Nepal and SWAS,	
Working district	Dhading, Dolakha, Gorkha, Kavre, Nuwakot, Rasuwa and Sindhupalchok	

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the results and approaches of the project interventions. The evaluation should assess results against output targets and project's contribution to higher level outcome results (*changes in socio economic status through the project interventions and*), assess the implementation approaches, and challenges encountered as well as identify the key lessons learnt and make specific recommendations for future course of actions.

Specifically, the objectives are:

- To ascertain the achievements of the project and its relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact including synergies with other UNDP support efforts (coherence).

- To assess the effectiveness of the livelihood recovery activities provided to the poorest and most vulnerable households to enhance their livelihoods and assess how these activities were tied up with the community infrastructure.
- To review and assess the risks and opportunities (in terms of resource mobilization, synergy and areas of interventions) for CILRP in future.
- To assess engagement of the municipal and ward stakeholders in the project, and their understanding, including financial and other commitment for sustainability of activities
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the fund flow mechanism (MCG/LVGs) with the local NGOs and User Committee for implementation of project activities.
- To assess the comparative advantages and disadvantages of two different implementation modalities (fund flow mechanism) i.e. CILRP's general approach (implementation through user committee in cost sharing with local municipalities) vs. open bidding process to select vendor for health post construction (KOICA supported Health post construction approach).
- To appraise the recently repurposing response to COVID-19 affected vulnerable and daily wage earner migrant returnee workers to provide short-term employment as a socioeconomic and livelihood recovery support.

Scope of Work:

The evaluation should assess the relevance, effectiveness, coherence, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project interventions *in seven working districts (Dhading, Dolakha, Gorkha, Kavre, Nuwakot, Rasuwa and Sindhupalchok) between June 2015 and August 2020*. In addition, the evaluation should indicate if the produced results are in the right direction towards contributing to resilient and inclusive economic recovery through the rehabilitation of community infrastructures and improvement of livelihood in the project areas. Particularly, the evaluation should cover but not limited to the following areas.

- Relevance of the project: review the progress against project outputs and contribution to outcome level results as defined in the project's theory of change and ascertain whether assumptions and risks remain valid. Identify any other intended or unintended, positive or negative, results.
- Effectiveness and efficiency of implementation approaches: review project's technical as well as operational approaches and deliverables, quality of results and their impact, alignment with national priorities and responding to the needs of the stakeholders; covering the results achieved, the partnerships established, as well as issues of capacity;
- Review the project's approaches in general including mainstreaming of gender equality and social inclusion, with particular focus on women and marginalised groups;
- Review and assess the sustainability of the results and risks and opportunities (in terms of resource mobilization, synergy and areas of interventions) related to future interventions;
- Review external factors beyond the control of the project that have affected it negatively or positively;
- Review planning, management, monitoring and quality assurance mechanisms for the delivery of the project interventions;
- Review coordination and communication processes and mechanisms with the stakeholders;
- Review how the implementation of project interventions may have been impacted by COVID-19 and how the reprogramming for immediate response be effective and appropriate to respond the pandemic.

3. Evaluation criteria and key questions.

The evaluation will follow the OECD-DAC's revised evaluation criteria - Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. Partnership, GESI and Human Rights will be added as cross-cutting criteria. The guiding questions outlined below should be further refined by the consultant and agreed with UNDP before commencement of the evaluation.

Key Questions

i. Relevance

- How relevant were the overall design and approaches of the project?
- To what extent the project was able to address the needs and priorities of the target groups and communities in the crisis context and changing conditions (both after 2015 earthquake and during COVID-19 pandemic)?
- To what extent did the intervention bring benefits to earthquake affected communities, poor women and people from traditionally excluded groups?
- To what extent were the output level results achieved and how did the project contribute to project outcomes? Does the project contribute to the outcome and output of the CPD? Were there any unintended positive or negative results?
- To what extent the reprogramming of project activities for immediate COVID-19 response are relevant to meet the local needs?

ii. Effectiveness

- To what extent the project activities were delivered effectively in terms of quality, quantity and timing?
- What are the key internal and external factors (success & failure factors) that have contributed, affected, or impeded the achievements, and how UNDP and the partner have managed these factors?
- To what extent have monitoring arrangements been effective and supported adaptive management? What were the lessons and how were feedback/learning incorporated in the subsequent process of planning and implementation?
- How effective has the project been in enhancing the capacity of the communities and local governments to create enabling environment for resilient and inclusive economic recovery?
- To what extent did the project contribute to the CPD outcome and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- How effective has the project been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results were achieved?
- To what extent the project was successful to create employment and income opportunities to the local people?
- What are the comparative advantages and disadvantages of two different implementation modalities and to what extent they have been effective for achievement of intended results?

iii. Coherence

- How well the intervention fit in changed context?
- To what extent the intervention is coherence with Government's policies

- To what extent the intervention addressed the synergies and interlinkages with other interventions carried out by UNDP or Government of Nepal? (internal coherence)
- To what extent the intervention was consistent with other actor's interventions in the same context or adding value to avoid duplication of the efforts? (External coherence)

iv. *Efficiency*

- How efficiently were the resources including human, material and financial resources used to achieve the results in a timely manner?
- To what extent the fund flow mechanism (MCG/LVG) has been appropriate and efficient mechanism to leverage the resources to community?
- To what extent was the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent has the project implementation strategy and its execution been efficient and cost-effective?

v. *Sustainability-*

- To what extent are the benefits of the projects likely to be sustained after the completion of this project?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
- How were capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability of the project?

vi. *Impact -*

- To what extent the project outputs were achieved and contribution to outcome level results?
- To what extent can the program be related to contribute to resilient and inclusive economic recovery through the rehabilitation of community infrastructures and improvement of livelihood?

vii. *Partnership:*

- How the partnerships affected in the project achievement, and how might this be built upon in the future?
- Have the ways of working with the partner and the support to the partner been effective and did they contribute to the project's achievements?
- How does partnership with municipality government and User Committee (UC) work? Does it create synergies or difficulties? What type of partnership building mechanism is necessary for future partnership?
- How the partnership with local government (municipality) deviate from bidding process? What kinds of systems were developed for mutual accountability between partners, user group and UNDP and how well did they work?

viii. *Gender equality and Social Inclusion*

- To what extent have issues of gender and marginalised groups been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- To what extent the project approach was effective in promoting gender equality and social inclusion - particularly focusing on the marginalized and the poor through construction of community infrastructure and livelihood recovery interventions?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes of women, differently abled people and marginalised group? Were there any unintended effects?

ix. *Human rights*

- To what extent have Dalit, ethnic minorities, physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from the work of the project and with what impact?
- To what extent have project integrated Human Rights based approach in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? Have the resources been used in an efficient way to address Human Rights in the implementation (e.g. participation of targeted stakeholders, collection of disaggregated data, etc.)?

4. **Methodology**

The consultant should propose detail methodological framework in inception report. The study should undertake a quantitative and qualitative assessment. The consultant will be responsible for designing and conducting the evaluation including proposing appropriate methodology, designing tools, developing questionnaire and other instruments for data collection and analysis. The consultant is responsible (but not limited) to:

- Desk study and review of all relevant project documentation including project documents, annual work-plans, project progress reports, annual project reports, donor report, minutes of the project executive board (PEB), project database.
- Consultations with UNDP CO, CILRP programme staff, officials of MOLMCPA and PEB members, local authorities (Municipalities/Rural Municipalities, Wards) of the project areas. Some of the consultations might be virtual based on the situation.
- Field observations, interactions/interviews (structured, semi-structured) and consultations with the User Committees (UCs) and beneficiaries (community infrastructures and livelihood interventions). Some of the interviews might be virtual based on the situation. The consultant should decide the number of visits and locations in the inception report.
- Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and Project team as well as with other partners will be organised.
- The evaluator should ensure triangulation of the various data sources to maximize the validity and reliability of data. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework should also be spelled out in the review reports.
- In addition, any necessary methodologies for ensuring that the evaluation addresses the needs of vulnerable groups as identified in the project document, employs a rights-based approach and takes questions around gender into consideration

5. Evaluation products (key deliverables).

The evaluator should submit the following deliverables:

- Inception report detailing the reviewer's understanding of what is being evaluated, why it is being evaluated, and how (methodology) it will be evaluated. The inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, evaluation tools, activities and deliverables.
- Evaluation matrix that includes key criteria, indicators and questions to capture and assess them.
- Evaluation debriefing- immediately after completion of data collection, the evaluator should provide preliminary debriefing and findings to the UNDP/Project team.
- Draft Evaluation report for review and comments.
- Evaluation Audit Trail – The comments on the draft report and changes by the evaluator in response to them should be retained by the consultant team to show how they have addressed comments.
- Final report within stipulated timeline with sufficient detail and quality by incorporating feedback from the concerned parties.
- An exit presentation on findings and recommendations.

6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies.

Team of two evaluators (national) is envisaged that include one Socio Economic Expert as a team leader and another Livelihood Expert as subject specialist. Evaluation team should be gender balanced to the extent possible.

I. Team Leader

Responsible for overall lead and management of the final evaluation. S/he should be responsible for the overall quality and timely submission of the evaluation reports and briefing to the UNDP, and for ensuring a gender and social inclusion perspective is incorporated throughout the evaluation work and report.

Major roles and responsibilities include:

- Finalizing and designing the detailed scope and methodology for the evaluation
- Ensure appropriate division of tasks within the team
- Ensure GESI perspectives are incorporated throughout the evaluation process and final report
- Gathering and review of relevant documents
- Prepare inception report, evaluation matrix including the evaluation questions, data collection instruments, etc.
- Conduct field visits in selected communities and conduct interviews with the selected target groups, partners and stakeholders
- Facilitate stakeholders' discussion and focus groups to collect, collate and synthesize information
- Analyse the data and prepare a draft evaluation report in the prescribed format
- Incorporate the feedback and finalize the evaluation report
- Coordinate with UNDP CO for evaluation related information

Qualification and competencies:

- At least Master's degree in International Development, Development Economics/Planning, Economics, Engineering, Statistics, Social sciences or other relevant subjects;
- Demonstrated experience in designing and leading similar kinds of evaluations of development projects related to DRR/reconstruction/EQ safety or related areas
- At least seven years' experience in development projects including in earthquake-affected areas, with particular emphasis on recovery needs, community infrastructures, social mobilization, income and employment generation;
- Adequate knowledge on gender equality and human rights issues;
- Excellent analytical and English report writing skills, knowledge of the political, cultural and economic situation in Nepal, and ability to meet tight deadlines.
- Excellent command in different data collection methods including FGDs, KIIs and Social Surveys

II. Livelihood Expert

Responsible for reviewing documents; analysing the progress, issues and challenges particularly livelihood recovery component of the project. S/he should support the team leader for overall implementation of the evaluation including finalizing the methodology, drafting, editing, supplementing, correcting and/or revising selected chapters of the evaluation report as assigned by the Team Leader; assisting the Team Leader to ensure the overall quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP.

Major roles and responsibilities:

- Gathering and review of relevant documents
- Provide inputs to the team leader in designing the final evaluation including finalizing methodologies and data collection instruments
- Conduct field visits in selected municipalities and conduct consultation and interview with the selected target group, partners and stakeholders
- Facilitate stakeholders' discussion and focus groups to collect, collate and synthesize information especially related to livelihood interventions
- Analyse the data and support the team leader in drafting, edition, correcting and/or revising selected chapters of the evaluation reports particularly livelihood components
- Assist the team leader in finalizing the report and sharing it with stakeholders

Qualification and competencies:

- At least Master's degree in Agriculture, Economy, Rural Development, Sociology or any other relevant subjects.
- At least five years' experience in designing, implementing and/or monitoring livelihoods programmes (including but not limited to social mobilization, micro-enterprise development, employment development, micro-finance, and/or income generation activities) Demonstrated proven experience of conducting similar evaluations of development projects related to reconstruction/EQ safety or related areas;
- Excellent analytical and English report writing skills,
- Adequate knowledge on gender equality and human rights issues;

- Excellent command in different data collection methods including FGDs, KIIs and Social Surveys

7. Evaluation ethics.

“This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultants 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 without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.”

Consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.

8. Management and implementation arrangements.

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Nepal. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely implementation of the evaluation. The team leader will directly report to Evaluation Manager i.e. RBM Analyst in this case. The Evaluation Manager/RBM Analyst will assure smooth, quality and independent implementation of the evaluation with needful guidance from UNDP’s Senior Management. The project team will provide required information for evaluation in leadership of Portfolio Manager of the Inclusive Economic Growth. The project team will arrange all the field visits, stakeholder consultations and interviews as needed.

The lead consultant will maintain all the communication through Evaluation Manager. The Evaluation Manager should clear each step of the evaluation. The final evaluation report will be signed off by DRR. The evaluation team will be briefed by UNDP upon arrival on the objectives, purpose and scope of the Final evaluation.

The evaluation will remain fully independent. A mission wrap-up meeting during which comments from participants will be noted for incorporation in the final report.

9. Time frame for the evaluation process.

The evaluation is expected to start in last week of September 2020 for an estimated duration of 25 days. This will include desk reviews, primary information collection, field work, and report writing.

Planned Activities	Tentative Days	Remarks
Desk review and preparation of design (home based)	2 days	
Finalizing design, methods & inception report and sharing with reference group for feedback (home based)	3 days	UNDP needs at least 3 days to review and provide feedback on the inception report

Stakeholders meetings and interviews in Field and Kathmandu (Virtual and/or field base)	12 days	
Analysis, preparation of draft report and shares for review	5 days	
Incorporate suggestions and comments to finalize the report and submit final report to UNDP	3 days	UNDP needs at least 10 days to review and finalize the report
Total	25 days	

10. Use of Evaluation Results

The findings of the evaluation will be used to analyse the lessons learned and way forward for future course of actions. Therefore, the evaluation report should provide critical findings and specific recommendations for future interventions.

11. Application submission process and criteria for selection

It will be mentioned in Individual Consultant selection criteria.

12. Annexes²

(i) List of relevant documents: Project Documents, Concept papers submitted to donors, Annual Work Plans, Annual Progress Reports, Project Executive Board meeting minutes, Donor Reports, Financial Reports, Knowledge products etc.

(ii) List of key agencies, stakeholders and partners for review

UNDP & Development Partner

- Policy Advisor and Portfolio Manager, UNDP
- Programme Officer, Government of Mauritius, International Medical Corps (IMC), Bridge Head Limited, KOICA, Qatar Red Crescent, Royal Thai Government, UNDP whichever possible
- CILRP Project Manager and other relevant Project staffs as needed

Stakeholders:

- Ministry of Land Management, Cooperatives and Poverty Alleviation
- Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration
- Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development
- Ministry of Finance
- Local Government (Municipality Offices and Ward Offices)
- Local NGO Partners
- User communities

(iii) Inception Report Contents Outline

(iv) Evaluation matrix

(v) Format of the evaluation report

(vi) Evaluation Audit Trial Form

(vii) UNEG Code of Conduct

² These documents will be provided after signing of the contract.