

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy Information

Project Title: Peace Support Facility

Duty Station: Sana'a, Yemen with field travel to project locations.

Duration: 35 days during the period February April 2021

1. Background and Context

The impact of the conflict in Yemen has been devastating. Tens of thousands of civilians have been killed or injured and public infrastructure throughout the country has been severely damaged or destroyed. Half of the Yemeni population currently lives in areas directly affected by conflict. The conflict has disproportionately impacted women, girls and young people, the vulnerability of this segment of the society placed them under great risk and endangerment.

Prior to the recent conflict, Yemen was already the poorest in the Arab region suffering from weak human development outcomes compounded with a high population growth, repeated local unrest, chronic food insecurity and fragile political transition.

The UN considers Yemen's war the worst humanitarian crisis in the world. An estimated 80 per cent of the population, 24 million people, requires some form of humanitarian or protection assistance, including 14.3 million who are in acute need. More than 20 million Yemenis are food insecure including 10 million who are one step away from famine. Of the 333 districts in the country, 230 are facing pre-famine conditions. At least 238,000 people in 45 districts are currently in catastrophic condition and more will fall into this category unless access is expanded, including through peace consultations. An estimated 3.3 million people remain displaced. As such the conflict, and the acute level of hunger and violence, has hit women and girls in Yemen the hardest.

During peace consultations convened by the Secretary-General's Special Envoy in Sweden in December 2018, the parties to the conflict agreed to redeploy forces in Hodeida, exchange prisoners and move forward with initiatives in Taiz. After endorsing the Stockholm Agreement, the UN Security Council established a new special political mission, the United Nations Mission to Support the Hodeida Agreement (UNMHA), to monitor the parties' compliance with agreements reached in Stockholm.

After more than five years of war, and over two years since the last peace talks, the Stockholm agreement represents a significant step towards a comprehensive peace agreement. Its successful implementation can play a key role in paving the way for further progress on the peace process led by the Special Envoy.

The Facility has been established to support the implementation of the Stockholm agreement with an initial end date of 31 December 2020 and a budget of US\$20M. The PSF is funded by the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden (Sida), the United Kingdom, Norway, France, the European Union, Canada, Denmark, Italy and UNDP, in collaboration with the office of the Special Envoy for Yemen (OSESGY) and the Resident Coordinator for Yemen's office (RCO). The two-year Peace Support Facility with a budget of US\$20M was rolled out in April 2019 to:

- a) Support the peace process by accelerating the implementation of agreements reached by the parties to the conflict during negotiations led by the UN Secretary General's Special Envoy to Yemen.

- b) Build public support for the peace process by achieving tangible, rapid improvement in the daily lives of people in priority areas identified by the UN Special Envoy.
- c) Demonstrate concrete alternatives to conflict and create local demand for peace and incentivize parties to deepen their engagement in the Special Envoy's peace process.

In line with recommendation from a steering committee meeting held on 29 September 2020, the Facility was extended the Facility until 31 December 2022 and increased the Facility budget to US\$30M to allow flexibility in the identification and implementation of the activities. The Facility covers the following geographical areas Hodeida, Salif and Ras al-Issa for window one, whereas window 2 will be implemented in eight governorates across Yemen: Abyan, Aden, Amanat Al-Asimah, Hadramout, Mareb, Sa'adah, Shabwah and Taiz.

The PSF support the peace process, including the agreements reached, by implementing initiatives that deliver improvements in the lives of people affected by conflict. The PSF will also empower the Special Envoy to identify initiatives that support the political process by generating demand for peace, especially in neglected geographic areas and among underrepresented and marginalized groups, including women girls and youth. The initial focus is on the first set of priorities discussed by the parties during the December 2018 peace consultations in Stockholm and will expand to priorities identified in any future UN-led negotiations

Under the overarching output: "The peace process in Yemen is supported with fast, flexible initiatives that deliver tangible, rapid improvements in the daily lives of people, and reinforce and build public support for the political process", the Facility supports implementation of three mutually reinforcing components:

- Component 1: Initiatives to build confidence between the parties, in the peace process and to support the implementation of the Stockholm agreement or any other future agreement.
- Component 2: Discreet activities emerging out of existing Track II initiatives are implemented with the goal of catalyzing the political process.
- Component 3: Transitional governance arrangements are supported as and when a more comprehensive peace agreement is reached by the parties.

To deliver these components, the Facility works closely with the Office of the Special Envoy for Yemen (OSESFY) and the Resident Coordinator for Yemen's office (RCO), relevant government departments, other UN agencies, and civil society organizations to implement the Facility's planned activities. The Facility contributes towards implementation of the Stockholm Agreement on the city of Hodeidah and the ports of Hodeidah, Salif and Ras Issa and achievement of UNDP Country Programme Framework outcome 3: Yemenis contribute to and benefit from peacebuilding processes. At the global level, the initiatives contribute towards Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16; "Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies" with a special focus on target 16.1 - "Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates".

2. Purpose of the evaluation

The Peace Support Facility, currently at midpoint ends in December 2022. This mid-term evaluation (MTE) is being conducted to assess the Facility's contribution towards a) supporting the peace process; b) building public support for the peace process and c) demonstrating concrete alternatives to conflict, create local demand for peace and incentivize parties to deepen their engagement in the Special Envoy's peace process.

UNDP commissions this mid-term evaluation (MTE) to serve as an important learning and accountability tool, providing UNDP, donors, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results generated to date, including on gender equality and women empowerment. The evaluation will assess the

Facility's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency sustainability and responsiveness; identify and document lessons learned; and provide recommendations to inform the Facility from 2021 through to 2022. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will guide the key stakeholders; relevant Yemeni ministries and institutions, Facility donors, UNDP, UN agencies, civil society organisations towards delivering effective, efficient and responsive interventions.

3. Objectives

Specific Facility Evaluation objectives are to:

1. Determine the relevance and strategic positioning of the Peace Support Facility and whether the initial assumptions are still relevant.
2. Assess a) the progress made towards Facility results and whether there were any unintended results and b) what can be captured in terms of lessons learned for ongoing PSF initiatives.
3. Assess whether the Facility management arrangements, approaches and strategies are well-conceived and efficient in delivering the Facility's output and components.
4. Assess the overall contribution of the PSF to the peace process and whether there are indications of sustaining the results generated by the Facility.
5. Analyse the extent to which the Facility enhanced application of a rights-based approaches, gender equality and women's empowerment, social and environmental standards and participation of other socially vulnerable groups such as children and the disabled.

4. Scope

The Facility evaluation will cover the period of 18 April 2019 to December 2020 in project implementation site(s) assessing programme conceptualisation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of results. The evaluators will engage all Facility stakeholders – benefitting communities/institutions, relevant national institutions, donors, UNDP, UN agencies and CSOs.

The evaluation will also focus on performance of indicators agreed with all funding partners. In addition to assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Facility, the evaluation will; a) explore the key factors that are contributing towards the achieving or not achieving of the intended results; b) determine the extent to which the Facility is contributing to the peace process and confidence-building between the parties to the conflict; c) assess potential sustainability of the Facility for continued realisation of results; and d) draw lessons learned and best practices and make recommendations for the second half of Facility implementation.

5. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

Relevance

1. To what extent is the Facility in line with the national priorities, the country programme's objectives, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
2. To what extent does the Facility contribute to address emerging issues of relevance within the peace process?
3. To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant initiatives considered in the Facility's design?
4. To what extent does the Facility contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

Effectiveness/Impact

5. To what extent has the Facility contributed to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national peacebuilding priorities?

6. To what extent were the Facility's output and components achieved?
7. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
8. To what extent has the Facility contributed to building confidence of the overall peace process and to the Humanitarian Development and Peace Nexus
9. To what extent has the Facility been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing stakeholder priorities?
10. To what extent has the Facility contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

Efficiency

11. To what extent was the Facility management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
12. To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
13. To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (financial, human resources, time etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
14. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

15. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
16. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the Facility?
17. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of Facility's results and the Facility's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
18. To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the Facility team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the Facility?
19. To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?

Human rights

20. To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups included in helping design and prioritize the work of the Facility in the spirit of broad societal inclusion. To what extent have they benefited from the work of PSF?
21. To what extent are the planned project interventions relevant to the overall strategy of inclusivity and empowerment?

Gender equality

22. Did the project clearly define the problems to be addressed and considered the institutional, socio-political, economic and environmental contexts and their gender dimension?
23. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the Facility?
24. Is the gender marker data assigned to this Facility representative of the reality?
25. To what extent has the Facility promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? What are women's role in helping shape and prioritize the work of the Facility.

Guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with UNDP evaluation stakeholders.

6. Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNDP evaluation guidelines and policies, United Nations Group Evaluation Norms and Ethical Standards; OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to and in the country is constrained by a combination of COVID-19 and the ongoing conflict. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

The evaluation will employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods including:

1. Document review of all relevant documentation. This would include a review of inter alia; project document, contribution agreements; theory of change and results framework; programme and project quality assurance reports; annual workplans; progress reports; minutes of steering committee and project coordination meetings; and technical/financial monitoring reports.
2. Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNMHA, Special Envoy, the RC/HC, UNCT members and implementing partners:
 - Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
 - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
 - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report will not assign specific comments to individuals.
3. Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
4. Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
5. Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
6. All analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence, and data. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and generalizable. The broad range of data provides strong opportunities for triangulation. This process is essential to ensure a comprehensive and coherent understanding of the data sets, which will be generated by the evaluation.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation will be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators.

7. 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.

8. Evaluation Products/Deliverables

The evaluator will be expected to deliver the following:

- a) Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages). The inception report should be developed following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP and initial documentation reviews. It should be produced and approved before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of the international consultant.
- b) Evaluation debriefings. Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP will ask for a preliminary debriefing of findings.
- c) Draft evaluation report (max 40 pages). UNDP and stakeholders will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within 10 days, addressing the content required (as agreed in the inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in the UNDP evaluation guidelines.
- d) 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.
- e) Final evaluation report.
- f) Presentations to stakeholders and the evaluation reference group.
- g) Evaluation brief and other knowledge products agreed in the inception report.

standard templates that need to be followed are provided in the Annexes section. It is expected that the evaluator will follow the UNDP evaluation guidelines and UNEG quality check list and ensure all the quality criteria are met in the evaluation report

9. Responsibilities and Qualifications

The evaluation will be conducted by two independent consultants - an international consultant and national consultant). The international consultant (team leader) must have extensive experience in strategic programming in peacebuilding and democratic governance in post conflict settings. The consultant must also have proven evaluation experience and substantial knowledge of and experience with the monitoring and evaluation of similar initiatives in volatile environments.

Responsibilities of the international consultant

- Lead the entire evaluation process, including communicating all required information with the Evaluation Manager.
- Lead drafting of the inception report and finalize the evaluation methodology
- Leads data collection and analysis as per the approved inception report
- Draft evaluation with inputs from the national consultant, present preliminary evaluation findings, incorporate inputs from evaluation stakeholders in the final evaluation report, draft audit trail, present final evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation
- Undertake the evaluation team lead role which includes the supervise of the national consultant.

Key Qualifications of the international consultant

- Minimum Master's degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant educational background.
- Minimum 10 years' experience in the fields of community security, conflict prevention, peace building and reconciliation, governance, inclusive participation, gender mainstreaming and human rights promotion.
- At least 7 years (and recent – latest should have been conducted within the past 2 years) of professional experience in conducting evaluations of similar peacebuilding initiatives.
- Excellent writing skills with a strong background in report drafting.

- Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views.

Key Competencies expected of the consultant for the successful delivery of the milestones:

- Extensive national and international experience in assessing Peace Support programmes, humanitarian emergency responses and support.
- Expertise in applying results and human rights-based approaches for assessing Peace operations, humanitarian response actions/programmes.
- Strong familiarity with the international literature and issues related to humanitarian contexts. Solid knowledge and skill on UNDP work in Peace Support Operations, emergencies, and work experience with UNDP is an advantage.
- Familiarity with the socio-cultural context of Middle East and the cultural, political and religious sensitivities relevant to the Yemen crisis.
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English and Arabic, with enough experience in applying all required tools and methods for conducting project evaluation in crisis settings including participatory appraisal techniques in data collection, sensitive to gender issues etc.

The consultant will be required to share samples of their evaluation work

10. Implementation Arrangements

The UNDP Yemen Country Office will select the consultant through a competitive process in line with UNDP's rules and regulations. UNDP will be responsible for the management of the consultants and will in this regard designate an evaluation manager and focal point. Facility staff will assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, constituting the evaluation reference group, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.).

The evaluation manager will convene an evaluation reference group comprising of technical experts from partners and UNDP to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This reference group will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detailed comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The reference group will also advise on the conformity of processes to the UNDP and UNEG standards.

The consultants will take responsibility, with assistance from the Facility team, for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advance approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. Facility staff will not participate in meetings between consultants and evaluations participants.

The consultants will report directly to the designated evaluation manager and focal point and work closely with the Facility team. The consultants will work full time during the time of the consultancy and may be required to travel to the project sites as part of the evaluation. If it is not possible for the International Consultant to travel to Yemen, he/she should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of evaluation virtually and remotely. This should be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with the Evaluation Reference Group and the Evaluation Manager

Office space and limited administrative and logistical support will be provided. The consultants will use their own laptops and cell phones.

11. Evaluation team

The Evaluation Team will consist of experienced multi-disciplinary team of consultants (one international lead consultant and one national consultant) with experience in designing and conducting evaluation for Peace Support project/programme and humanitarian responses/actions in emergency contexts.

- The International Consultant will be the **Team Leader** and take a lead role during all phases of the evaluation and coordinate the work of all other team members. He/she will ensure the quality of the evaluation process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products. The Team Leader, in close collaboration with the other evaluation team member, leads the conceptualization and design the evaluation and plays a lead role in shaping the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report.
- **The National Consultant** will be recruited to working closely with the international consultant (Team Leader), be responsible for the overall assistance to the Team Leader including collection and analysis of all relevant data from field and preparation of all consultations and meetings with selected different stakeholders. The National Consultants will contribute substantively to the work of the Team Leader, providing substantive advice and context in the drafting and finalizing the inception and final evaluation reports.

12. Key Deliverables, including payment and Timeframe for the Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be carried out over a period of 35 working days broken down as follows:

Deliverables	Indicated Timeframe/ Duration (working Days)	% of Payment	Document to be Submitted	Approving Officer accepting the milestone
#1. Inception Report:				
A detailed inception report describing initial findings based on the comprehensive documentation review, the evaluation methodology, detailed work plan, the outline of the final report in addition to the inception report. Presentation and approval of IR by the ERG	6 days	17%	A comprehensive Inception Report	Team Leader, MSU
#2. Data collection by applying all tools and methods agreed in inception report				
Collection and analysis by applying methodologies and approaches presented and approved in the inception report A draft evaluation report to be prepared based on collected data and information	21 days	60%	A draft evaluation report	Team Leader, MSU
#3. Final evaluation report				
Incorporation of comments and feedback on draft evaluation report provided by UNDP and other stakeholders Preparation of final evaluation report Validation of the final draft, incorporation of validation comments and preparation and submission of final report Power point for stakeholders Final evaluation report along with audit trail	8 days	23%	Final evaluation report	Team Leader, MSU
Total	35 days	100%		

The international consultants will be jointly responsible for entire evaluation processes and submission of the above-mentioned deliverables.

The 35 working days will be spread over a period of two months to provide for delays and the need for additional time that may be required for implementing evaluations virtually recognising possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19. The consultants will inform the evaluation manager if additional time is needed to complete the evaluation.

13. Application process

Interested qualified and experienced individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications and interest: (i) Letter of Confirmation of interest and availability using the template provided by UNDP; (ii) Most Updated Personal detailed CV including past experience in similar assignment and at least 3 references; (iii) UN P11 Form ("CV Form"); (iii) A detailed methodology on how the candidate will approach and conduct the work and (v) links to at least two samples of evaluation work done/authored within the past two years.

Submitted proposals will be assessed using Cumulative Analysis Method. The proposals will be weighed according to the technical proposal (carrying 70%) and financial proposal (carrying 30%). Technical proposals should obtain a minimum of 70 points to qualify and to be considered. Financial proposals will be opened only for those application that obtained 70 or above in the technical proposal. Below are the criteria and points for technical and financial proposals.

a) Technical proposals (total score: 70 points)

Criteria	Max score	Weight
General adherence to the Term of Reference (ToR)	5	7%
Proposed methodology, approach, and workplan (relevance, logic, rigor, practicality, creativity, realism of work plan etc). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity and relevance of the proposed methodology, to the local context and to achieve the deliverables of the ToR. - Realistic and complete work plan which reflects clear and comprehensive understanding of the scope of work in the ToR. - Clarity about how gender considerations will be factored into the evaluation. - Clarity on the quality assurance process that will be in place for this assignment 	35	50%
Quality of plan to ensure ethics of conducting evaluation with human subjects (methodological component that will be accorded special attention given the project engagement of women, juvenile children, and other targeted groups).	10	14%
Technical capacity of the applicant: qualifications, competencies, experience and skills as per the ToR (also assessed against sample of evaluation work done)	20	29%
Total	70	100%

b) Financial Proposal (total score: 30 points)

The financial proposal will specify a total lump sum amount and payment terms shall be in line with those that are mentioned in the deliverable table.

Financial proposal will be assessed based on the completeness, clarity and appropriateness. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest Financial Proposal that is opened /evaluated and compared among those technical qualified candidates who have obtained a minimum **70 points** in the technical evaluation. Other Financial Proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price applying the formula:

Marks Obtained = Lowest Priced Offer (Amount) / Offer being considered (Amount) X 30 (Full Marks)

14. Payment

Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by UNDP planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

Milestone for payment	Percentage
Inception report	17%
Draft Evaluation Report & presentation of findings	60%
Final Evaluation Report, audit trail and presentation of findings to stakeholders	23%

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid. Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

Documents to be provided by UNDP to successful candidates

1. [Inception report](#)
2. [Evaluation report](#)
3. [Audit trail](#)
4. [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system](#)
5. [Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](#)
6. [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](#)
7. [Evaluation Quality Assessment](#)
8. [UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports](#)