**Terms of Reference (TOR) for Decentralized Evaluation of Youth Empowerment Programme**

1. **Background and context:**

**Table 1: Project/Programme Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project/outcome title | *Kamyab Jawan: Youth Empowerment Programme*  Youth & Social Cohesion | |
| Atlas ID | 00093478 | |
| Corporate outcome and output | **UNSDF** Outcome 6: Enhanced resilience and socioeconomic development of communities  **Country Programme Output 6.2**: Revitalization of productive capacities that are sustainable and generate employment opportunities and improvement in sustainable livelihoods as part of broader stabilization efforts | |
| Country | Pakistan | |
| Region | Asia Pacific Region | |
| Date project document signed |  | |
| Project Dates | Start  **1st January 2018** | Planned End  **31st December 2022** |
| Project budget | USD 8.247 MILLION | |
| Project expenditure at the time of evaluation |  | |
| Funding source | Government of Japan, Royal Norwegian Embassy | |
| Implementing Party | UNDP Pakistan | |

**Background**

Pakistan is one of the youngest countries in the world. Recent estimates indicate that 68% of the Pakistani population is under 29 with the youth bracket representing 27% of the total population[[1]](#footnote-1). A large segment of this youth population is exposed to multidimensional and inter-sectoral vulnerabilities resulting from a lack of opportunities for meaningful social engagement and economic empowerment[[2]](#footnote-2). In spite of these challenges, the NHDR 2017 has highlighted a number of positive aspects of the ‘youth bulge’ which, if harnessed effectively, can lead Pakistan on a path of economic growth and progressive social transformation. In this regard, the Report calls for strategic investments in education, employment, and positive engagement of youth which will enable them to positively contribute to the society, economy, and politics of Pakistan. Unfortunately, lack of youth focused development in Pakistan has made young people vulnerable to violence and conflict, a situation exacerbated by the volatile security situation in Pakistan[[3]](#footnote-3). Therefore, making investment in education, skills development of youth and to provide them employment opportunities will not only help reduce violent terrorism in the country but also help establish a foundation for long term economic growth and prosperity.

The Kamyab Jawan: Youth Empowerment Programme is UNDP’s strategic response to the challenge posed by the ‘youth bulge’ in Pakistan. The Programme is generating routes for empowering Pakistani youth as the engine for greater social cohesion and inclusive and sustainable economic growth; and finds it imperative to provide Pakistani youth with alternative pathways for individual development and enhanced community engagement.

For programme implementation, UNDP collaborated with the government of Pakistan; public and private sector partnerships as well as directly with the youth to ensure that ‘equal opportunities exist for all youth to participate in Pakistan’s social, political and economic development processes so that all youth feel an empowered part of society with a stage in its future’.

The Programme aims at providing opportunities for economic growth and positive social engagement to 100,000 young people in the country under the following three outputs;

* **Output 1:** Sustained and up-streamed interaction and collaboration between youth and key policy actors on civic and social issues leads to better informed youth who can actively participate in and influence inclusive decision making (target 80,000 youth-50% women) (SDG 16.7)
* **Output 2:** Youth in public sector and religious education establishments acquire the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in an inclusive society through the promotion of a culture of peace and tolerance, global citizenship and appreciation of diversity (target 20,000 youth- 50% women) (SDG 4.7)
* **Output 3:** Youth's potential to contribute to inclusive and sustainable economic growth harnessed and catalysed (target 50,000 youth-50% women) (SDG 8.6)

1. **Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives.**

**Evaluation Purpose/Objectives:** This evaluation is being undertaken to;

* Assess the effectiveness of the project and to draw the lessons which will feed into the work plan for the next years
* Responsiveness to address youth challenges
* Explore strategies for replication and link to policy advocacy-i.e. serve as evidence base for policy and institutional reforms

**Scope of Evaluation**

UNDP Pakistan intends to conduct the “youth evaluation” of the youth programs implemented in collaboration with different public and private partners and with the government of Pakistan in different areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Balochistan and Sindh provinces during the year 2018 & 2019. UNDP Pakistan intends to engage an independent service provider to provide evaluation services for evaluating UNDP supported project activities in different project areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Sindh and Baluchistan provinces.

UNDP is committed to putting youth in a leading role in evaluating UNDP’s work, both as participants and beneficiaries. A key component of maintaining meaningful youth participation comes from creating a youth-led participatory evaluation. While traditional evaluation methods are often top-down approaches designed and administered by evaluation professionals, participatory evaluation is a bottom-up approach guided by, shaped by, and administered wholly or in part by the program participants themselves. Within youth programs, this means that youth play a leading role in the evaluation process and are treated as partners throughout. Involving youth in this way means that “providers can benefit from the youths’ opinions about best practices, and the evaluation process itself can be empowering and develop the skills, competence, and autonomy of the youth participants.”

This scope of work includes evaluation of selected project interventions and resources falling under Engagement, Education and Economic components of the programme.

**Scope of Work:**

1. To assess/evaluate the achievements of the project against CPD Outcome/CPD Output/Project indicators and intended and un-intended impacts to the lives of the youth
2. To assess whether the CPD output/Project Output Results have been achieved in a cost-effective and cost-efficient manner
3. To determine whether cross cutting issues such as gender, sustainability, and environment were mainstreamed in the implementation of the project
4. To identify lessons learned on effectiveness of the project design, intervention strategies and implementation
5. To suggest improvements for future and ongoing programmes and suggest replication of the best practices and experiences
6. To assess changes observed regarding improved socio-economic and political status of target groups and how will they feed into the improvement in design for replications
7. The evaluation shall mainly focus on relevance of project activities to needs of the beneficiaries, effectiveness and efficiency of implementation approach, and sustainability and impact of the project interventions
8. **Evaluation criteria and key questions.**

**Evaluation Criteria:** This study requires to assess the impacts of the project intervention in terms of their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, fostering community participation. These are discussed below separately;

1. ***Relevance:***  The relevance of the interventions is seen in terms of the extent to which they are focused on the target group i.e. the youth at risk. It also refers to the extent to which the programme responds to the needs and priorities of the target group.
2. ***Effectiveness:*** The effectiveness of the programme is assessed in terms of the extent to which the objectives of the programme have been attained or are likely to be attained; and the number of youth who have benefitted.
3. ***Efficiency:*** Is the relation between inputs of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?
4. **Impact:** Explore if and how various programme components had a positive/less positive/no impact on each other
5. **Sustainability:** Assess the sustainability of results achieved
6. ***Participation:*** Participation is analysed in the extent to which stakeholders, partners, local authorities are involved in the design, planning and implementation of the programme; and the extent to which the programme has developed the necessary local institutional (government/non-governmental) capacity to respond to the problem.

**Key Evaluation Questions:**

Target groups for the evaluation include individual beneficiaries, communities, development partners, Government counterparts and Implementing Partners (IPs).

Specifically, the evaluation will assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of YEP results achieved through the following questions. This list of questions is representative and not exhaustive and will be further detailed and agreed upon as part of the evaluation inception report:

1. **Relevance:**
2. 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?
3. To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome as well as assess the relevance of the project’s outputs?
4. To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design as well as during its execution between 2015 and 2019?
5. 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 and implementation processes?
6. To what extent does the project contribute to LNOB[[4]](#footnote-4), gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
7. Evaluate the extent to which YEP implementation strategy has been responsive to the emerging needs and priorities of Government counterparts and beneficiary communities; and to the context of the emerging development scenario of Pakistan;
8. What is the stakeholder involvement in the project?

* What is the community’s involvement in planning and implementing this project?
* What is the private sector’s involvement in planning and implementing this project?
* What is the local/provincial & federal government’s involvement in planning and implementing this project?

1. **Efficiency:**
2. To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
3. To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
4. 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?
5. To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
6. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
7. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
8. Assess the adequacy of funds for programme implementation up to 2019 and analyse project strategy for resource mobilization for future interventions.
9. **Effectiveness**
10. To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
11. To what extent were the project outputs achieved? If not then reasons why
12. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
13. To what extent has the UNDP partnership and resource mobilisation strategy with Government departments, UN agencies, CSOs and international donors ensured coordinated support for the development of NMDs been appropriate and effective?
14. 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?
15. 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 in the next phase?
16. What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
17. Are the projects outputs clear, practical and feasible in line with project theory of change?
18. Assess how the programme components complemented each other to contribute to the achievement of programme objectives
19. To what extent have stakeholders including beneficiary communities been involved in project implementation?
20. To what extent are project management and implementation participatory, flexible, creative and responsive to respond to emerging needs and priorities of the government and beneficiaries and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project outputs?
21. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
22. To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
23. How effective is the program in reaching out youth from marginalized/at risk communities/households, especially women, youth with disabilities and from minority groups?
24. How effective is the programme’ engagement/job placement strategy? What percentage has been engaged/employed?

* How has the intervention increased the likelihood of securing employment / part-time work?
* How many beneficiaries secured full-time employment vs. how many part-time gigs?
* What percentage of youth have set up micro-enterprises/businesses?
* How effective is the programme in reaching out youth during the selection of beneficiaries, bearing in mind the impact of the initiatives that UNDP is expected to generate through them?

1. Assess the level of effectiveness of the UNDP and YEP oversight and management structures during the review period; Quality and adequacy of programme monitoring and reporting in timely decision making by Project Managers;
2. Assess whether a gender and human rights perspective has been taken into consideration and has been effective for the targeted institutions and communities;
3. **Impact:**
4. Explore if and how various programme components had a positive/less positive/no impact on each other;
   1. What has been the impact of training and grants on the lives of the beneficiaries?
   2. Conduct a tracer of representative sample of skill and entrepreneurship beneficiaries and document the rate of success.
5. Evaluate the impact of the programme on the wider development environment of Pakistan;
6. Assess what changes in the social and economic development at the level of individuals, institutions and communities - intended and unintended, positive and negative – have been brought about by the programme.
7. Were there clear evidence of results and recognition of UNDP support?
8. What impact is the programme having in keeping youth away from negative influences?
9. How is the programme impacting the targeted communities at large?

* How has the level of harmony increased in the targeted communities? Since the start of the project? In comparison with/other areas?
* How has the perception of insecurity changed in target communities? Since the start of the project? In comparison with/other areas?
* Do the intervention results respond to the needs of all stakeholders, youth-men, women, transgender and other key groups, as identified at the design stage?

1. **Sustainability:**
2. Assess the sustainability of capacity building programmes particularly provision of business grants, and skills training to youth;
3. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
4. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
5. 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?
6. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
7. To what extent did UNDP actions pose an social threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
8. What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
9. 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?
10. To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
11. 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?
12. To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategy?
13. What could be done to strengthen exit strategy and sustainability?

**Human rights**

1. To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from YEP interventions?

**Gender equality**

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

The evaluation is designed in line with current research on good practices within youth-led evaluation, and with reference to UNDP’s youth empowerment program. In line with UNDP’s programme Strategy on Youth, which advocates for a more central leadership role for youth in designing and implementing UNDP’s youth projects, youth who have been involved in UNDP’s work over the last two years, youth who have played a key role in UNDP’s projects and interns and other youth working at any UN agency’s youth led programming will be considered for this evaluation.

This evaluation relies on qualitative research tools (Focus Group Discussions and In-depth interviews) to assess the extent to which the strategies and activities undertaken by the UNDP have achieved their objectives; positive achievements of the interventions; challenges faced during implementation and steps taken to address them; lessons learned; and possible recommendations to guide the project in future. In order to get a holistic appraisal of the above mentioned, the evaluation study will engage multiple stakeholders through interviews and FGDs.

A detailed methodology and sampling design will be prepared by the evaluation firm which will be part of the inception report.

It is visualized that the methodology will encompass a number of methods including:

* **Secondary data reviews** - review of the project documents and reports prepared during the project implementation
  + Project document (as well as contribution agreements).
  + Theory of change and results framework.
  + project quality assurance reports.
  + Annual workplans.
  + Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
  + Results-oriented monitoring report.
  + Highlights of project board meetings.
  + Technical/financial monitoring reports.
* **Surveys and Semi Structured Interviews** involving Key Stakeholders Including Key Government Counterparts, Donor Community members, Representatives of Key Civil Society Organizations and Communities: a structured and semi-structured questionnaire that will gather both quantitative and qualitative information
* **Participatory meetings & discussions** by selecting youth from the project areas: Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
* Stories of youth engaged, trained, employed Analysis will be both qualitative and quantitative.

All interviews/FGDs should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should present specific comments without disclosing identity of individuals.

To ensure the quality of reported results, data triangulation will be included as part of the methodology. Based upon the above assessment, the evaluation team will compile lessons learnt and make recommendations for the future.

The qualitative data will be the property of UNDP and will be shared in totality with UNDP as soon as data is recorded and coded. Data will be used while presenting the findings without compromising the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. For this, labels will be used to hide the identities of the participants in the final report however in the first draft to UNDP the evaluation firm will produce the findings with data without labels. The coding and labelling scheme will be discussed and implemented after approval from UNDP.

The findings of the report will be based on concrete qualitative and quantitative data as evidence. The analysis will be an important section of the report which will be based on the findings reported earlier in the report. The conclusions will be rooted in the analysis of the findings. The recommendations will be linked to conclusions.

1. **Evaluation products (key deliverables).**

1. **Evaluation Work plans:** Proposed approach, methodology, timeline, staff composition and estimated budget for completion of the work requested. Workplan drafts for evaluation will be reviewed and approved by UNDP before any work begins on the assignment. The workplan drafts will be revised and finalized during the team planning meeting with the assignment team. The finalized evaluation workplan can be modified with UNDP’s approval throughout implementation of the assignment if conditions or needs change. The finalized plans with attached approved amendments will be used as the basis for assessing completion and quality of the assignment.
2. **Evaluation inception report** including a workplan and evaluation schedule. The evaluation firm will submit an inception report that would reflect the evaluators understanding of the assignment, proposed approach and methodology; and schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables along with assigned responsibilities for the mission members. The inception report will be carried out the following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and will be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits)
3. **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, the contracting firm will deliver a preliminary debriefing and findings. Outputs include a PowerPoint presentation on key findings and a draft report to be circulated in stakeholder meetings
4. **Draft Evaluation Report:** The evaluation firm will submit (i) before the end of the evaluation mission- a *draft evaluation report* of youth engagement, highlighting achievements, constraints, and lessons learnt as well as corrective measures where required and recommendations
5. **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
6. **Final evaluation report:**  within one week after receiving written comments and feedback to the draft evaluation report from UNDP and project Management, the evaluation team will submit the final report addressing the received feedback.
7. Separate 1-2 pager **summary brief** with info graphics summarizing the key findings of the evaluation for sharing with external audiences.
8. **Submission of data to UNDP:** all the primary data (both qualitative and quantitative) collected for this assignment will be submitted to UNDP in electronic form within 30 days of completion

The Evaluation Report should contain the following:

* Title page
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Table of contents, including a list of annexes
* Executive summary
* Introduction: background and context of the programme
* Description of the programme – it's logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect the success
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
* Approach and methodology
* Findings
* Analysis - explanation and interpretation of findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons, generalizations, alternatives
* Annexes

**Related Evaluation Activities**

To achieve the objectives and produce the deliverables of the evaluation, the evaluation firm will be expected to undertake related activities including:

1. **Review existing documentation:** The evaluation firm will conduct a literature review on the history and development challenges of youth engagement.
2. **Prepare Inception Report:** The evaluation firm will present an Inception Report elaborating the evaluation methodology to the stakeholders at the beginning of the evaluation.

1. **Meetings with stakeholders**
2. The UNDP project team will brief the evaluation firm upon arrival and provide all necessary details and clarifications on the documents made available for the desk review.
3. The evaluation firm will meet with the programme team, Programme Manager, Chief Crisis Prevention and Recovery Unit (CPRU), the Management Support Unit (MSU), the Deputy Resident Representative and Resident Representative UNDP.
4. The evaluation firm will meet with relevant Government counterparts, including the Directorate of Projects, the Planning and Development Department, the Education Department and others.
5. The evaluation firm will meet with bilateral donor representatives present in the country, including Norway and Japan.
6. The evaluation firm will meet with relevant Civil Society Organisations/IPs of youth empowerment programme and document their experience and learnings from the programme.
7. Beneficiary feedback will be sought from the local communities, including females to gauge their feedback on various programme interventions.

1. **Consultation on draft report and recommendations:**

Following the submission of the draft report, undertake consultations with stakeholders to receive their feedback for incorporation into the final report.

1. **Evaluation team composition and required competencies.**

**Team Composition**

It is anticipated that the mission team of the consulting firm for evaluation should include following team members:

* Senior Evaluator (Team leader/evaluation Specialist)
* Field Researchers (one mand and one woman)
* Data Analyst
* Report Writer

**Required Qualification, competencies and skills for an Evaluation Firm:**

The mission will take place in the programme area and will be for a period of three months with the following details:

1. The firm should have extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation of large programmes in developing countries.
2. The firm should have a diverse team composition of both men and women including researchers, data analyst, report writer and a team lead.
3. The team lead should have experience of leading evaluations of development programmes particularly youth-focused/youth-led programs
4. The researcher team should comprise of one man and woman and should have prior experience of designing research methodology and conducting interviews and FGDs at household and individual level
5. The data analyst should be well versed in data management and statistical analysis of data
6. The report writer should be well versed in report writing with proven experience in producing a high-quality evaluation and assessment reports
7. The firm should be familiar with UNDP/UN evaluation policies and procedures, and with the programming principles of the UNDP/UN.
8. Proven experience in evaluation of youth-focused/youth led programmes.
9. The team leader will allocate roles and responsibilities within the team, including meeting schedules and drafting duties and be responsible for timely delivery of the mission reports.
10. The evaluation firm should have proven relevant background and experience in the context of youth engagement.

**Experience and Qualifications of the Evaluation firm**

Qualifications of the evaluation firm:

* Minimum 5 years of experience in evaluations/ preferably some experience of youth led evaluations;
  + Relevant experience and knowledge of the United Nations programmes.
  + Experience in human resources and institutional capacity development, including gender equality.
  + Solid understanding of governance and government structures within the Pakistani context
  + Proven capacity to effectively collect, analyse and evaluate data/information.
  + Ability to organize and synthesize information in a systematic manner
  + Excellence in report writing.
  + Ability to communicate in English, Urdu and local languages (Pashto, Sindhi and Balochi).

Competencies:

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards (human rights, peace, understanding between peoples and nations, tolerance, integrity, respect, impartiality) results orientation;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

**Functional Competencies:**

* Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
* Demonstrates good oral and written communication skills;
* Has the ability to work both independently and in a team, and ability to deliver high-quality work on tight timelines.

**Behavioural competencies:**

* Gender-sensitive;
* Comfortable working in dynamic environments that change frequently;
* Able to perform in a high-stress and difficult security environment, with austere living quarters.

**Computer Skills:**

* Proficiency in MS Office and statistical analysis software

1. **Evaluation ethics.**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. 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.

1. **Management and implementation arrangements.**

Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Pakistan, will be the Evaluation Commissioner (EC) and Head of Management Support Unit will be the Evaluation Manager (EM). EC will be supported by EM in safeguarding the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensure the quality of evaluation in a timely fashion. To ensure independence and impartiality, EM will be the focal person for this evaluation. EM will ensure that the evaluation is conducted as per the evaluation plan and in line with this ToR.

CPRU Unit and Youth Empowerment Programme team will facilitate EM and the work of the consulting firm before and during the assignment period. This ToR shall be the basis upon which compliance with assignment requirements and overall quality of services provided by the evaluation firm will be assessed by UNDP.

1. **Time frame for the evaluation process.**

**Duration of the Work:** The duration of the work is two months: one month in the field and the rest of the time will be dedicated to desk work and report writing. Detailed time frame for evaluation is:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S#** | **Deliverables** | **Description of deliverables** | **Submission timeline** | **Payment Instalment Schedule** |
| **1** | Deliverable 1 | Desk Review and inception report including Evaluation Work plan | 10 days | 15% of the instalment |
| **2** | Deliverable 2 | Data Collection Mission  Consultations, Field visits, FGDs, interviews | 15 Days | 10% of the instalment |
| **3** | Deliverable 3 | Evaluation debriefings | 10 days | 10% of the instalment |
| **4** | Deliverable 4 | Draft Evaluation Report | 10 days | 10% of the instalment |
| **5** | Deliverable 5 | Evaluation report audit trail | 25 days | 20% of the instalment |
| **6** | Deliverable 6 | Final Report | 10 days | 25% of the instalment |
| **7** | Deliverable 7 | Presentation of Summary Brief & Submission of Evaluation data to UNDP | 10 days | 10% of the instalment |

1. **Submission process and basis for selection**

**Recommended Presentation of Offer**

**Documents to be included when submitting the proposals**

|  |
| --- |
| Interested Evaluation firm must submit the following: documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications in **one single PDF document:**   1. Duly accomplished **Letter of the contract of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP (Annex). 2. **Personal CVs or P11 and profile of the evaluation firm**, indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Evaluation firm and at least three (3) professional references. 3. **Technical proposal:**    1. Brief description of why the Evaluation firm is the most suitable for the assignment    2. A methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment. 4. **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided (Annex) |

# **10.2 Evaluation Criteria**

**Preliminary Examination Criteria**

Proposals will be examined to determine whether they are complete and submitted in accordance with RFP requirements as per below criteria on a Yes/No basis:

* Appropriate signatures
* Power of Attorney
* Minimum documents provided- as mentioned in Form-B
* Technical and Financial Proposals and Financial Proposal Submission Form submitted separately
* Bid Validity
* Proposal Security submitted as per RFP requirements with compliant validity period. (Not Applicable)

**Cumulative analysis**

The award of the contract shall be made to the Evaluation firm whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. 70%-30%.

\* Technical Criteria weight: 70%

\* Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

**Technical Criteria – Maximum 70 points**

* Criteria A: Relevance of Education – Max 10 points
* Criteria B: Competencies and Special skills – Max 5 points
* Criteria C: Relevance of experience – Max 30 points
* Criteria D Description of approach/methodology to assignment (if applicable) – Max 25 points

1. **TOR Annexes.** These provide links to supporting background documents and more detailed guidelines on evaluation in UNDP:
   1. Intervention results framework and theory of change.
   2. Key stakeholders and partners.
   3. Documents to be reviewed and consulted.
   4. Evaluation matrix template.
   5. Outline of the evaluation report format.
   6. Code of conduct forms.

1. Pakistan Labour Force Survey 2017-2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. ‘Impact of War in Afghanistan and Ensuing Terrorism on Pakistan’s Economy’ published in the Pakistan Economic Survey 2017-18 (source: <http://www.finance.gov.pk/survey/chapters_18/Annex_IV_Impact%20of%20War.pdf>) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Cordesman, A. H. (2011) ‘Pakistan: Violence vs Stability- A National Net Assessment’ published by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (source: <https://www.csis.org/analysis/pakistan-violence-vs-stability>).  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Leave No One Behind [↑](#footnote-ref-4)