Term of Reference (ToR)
Final Evaluation of Project "Responding to Protection Needs and Supporting Resilience in Places of Detentions in Yemen"
Joint Project between UNDP-UN WOMEN-UNICEF

1.Consultancy Information
Project Title: Responding on protection needs and supporting resilience **Contract Type**: Individual Contract (**International Consultant for Project Evaluation**) **Duty Station: Home-based** with travel as needed and subject to the contextual constraints **Duration: 57** Workdays (between January to April 2021)

2.Background and Context

2.1 Country Context

The humanitarian crisis in Yemen remains the worst in the world, driven by conflict, disease, economic collapse and the breakdown of public institutions and services. After five years of continuous war, millions of people are hungry, ill, destitute and acutely vulnerable. A staggering 80 percent of the entire population requires some form of humanitarian assistance and protection. Prior to the escalation of conflict in 2015, development in Yemen was strained. A country of 30 million people, Yemen ranked: (a) 153rd on the Human Development Index (HDI); (b) 138th in extreme poverty; (c) 147th in life expectancy; (d) 172nd in educational attainment; The projections suggest that Yemen would not have achieved any of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030 even in the absence of conflict. The COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 represents a crisis within a crisis in Yemen, with potentially catastrophic effects on already vulnerable populations.

The political and military outlook remains uncertain. Yemen's post-Arab Spring transition spiralled into a full-blown war in March 2015. The armed conflict has persisted ever since, stalling Yemen's political progress. Peacemaking efforts led by the Office of Special Envoy of Secretary-General to Yemen (OSESGY) have yielded rather uneven and fluid results with geographical variances. In December 2018, the Internationally Recognized Government (IRG) and the De Facto Authority (DFA, the "Houthies") signed the "Stockholm Agreement," including a ceasefire in the port city of Al-Hodeidah. Despite the launch of UN Mission to support the Hodeidah Agreement (UNMHA), however, the much-anticipated peace in the west-coast area remains elusive to date. In August 2019, the secessionist Southern Transitional Council (STC) seized control of Aden, splintering IRG-held territories. November witnessed the Saudi-brokered "Riyadh Agreement," but the south continues to fall under multiple armed groups, with a frozen negotiation over a power-sharing cabinet. In 2020, the shifting gravity of fighting on land has engulfed Marib, while the Houthis and Saudi Arabia are continuing retaliatory exchanges with their drone- and air-strikes.

One of the most concerning social and institutional consequences of the armed conflict is the politicization and the decapacitation of rule of law institutions. Arbitrary detention has spread throughout the country, as the investigations by the OHCHR Group of Experts (2018) confirmed. The conflict-induced deterioration of the public services, including the interrupted execution of civil servant salaries and service delivery budgets, may well add a capacity challenge to the political manipulation of the formal institutions. Together with the diminished community protection capacity, the depleted institutional justice capacity has driven vulnerable populations into a greater risk of human rights abuse and violation. Female and juvenile detainees are one of the most vulnerable, suffering from intersecting marginalities. In particular, women in detention risk in-prison Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) and post-prison stigmatization and social ostracization for life, including rejection by their own families due to the same of incarceration. Juveniles also

face grave protection violations when they are held together with adults. Furthermore, COVID-19 pandemic and the pressing need to de-crowd detention facilities have escalated the tension over the distribution of already constrained protection service within the places of detention.

2.2 Peacebuilding Fund Rationale

In response to the challenges to peace and protection in Yemen, the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) has collaborated with country-level UN entities, including OSESGY, to design the current Project jointly with UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women. The project planning process built upon the findings from preliminary assessment exercises in 2016 and multi-stakeholder consultations in 2017, culminating at the PBSO Technical Review Meeting in Amman, Jordan (7-8 November, 2018). To ensure synergies across various rule of law interventions and contribute to the political, security and human rights aspects of OSESGY-led peace processes, the Project was placed as a component within a broader UNDP Rule of Law Project, which has four inter-penetrating Outputs:

1) Local communities in urban settings are more resilient to insecurity and injustice;
2) Community policing approaches improve protection of communities;
3) Justice sector actors have strengthened capacity to deliver services;
4) Protection needs of detainees are met and resilience of detainees is strengthened (the current Project).

These broader programmatic and political goals justified PBSO's approval to fund the Project. The decision also aimed at promoting the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus (HDPN) by supporting a long term-oriented project amid acute humanitarian crisis with a link to peace processes. In terms of the temporal nexus between H-D, the Project's immediate and primary focus is the human rights protection of vulnerable populations in detention, esp. women and juveniles. A more systemic and sustainable reconstruction and reform of rule of law institutions remains as a longer-term and secondary focus, given the constraints of active conflict and the fragmentation of national authorities. Accordingly, the Project is designed as a local-level, area-based pilot to protect vulnerable individuals and maintain institutional resilience. To secure the vertical nexus between D-P, UNDP and OSESGY co-own the broader Rule of Law Project to align development interventions to political processes, both of which aim to build peace. Local capacity building is expected to contribute to national confidence building.

The Project, therefore, should be evaluated not only against its immediate protection focus, but also against its longer-term peacebuilding goals. The foreground of the Project as a local-level pilot should be seen from the background of a phased approach to "early peacebuilding." The Project protects vulnerable individuals in detention in order to contribute to long-term peacebuilding results. Individual-level protection of women, juveniles and other vulnerable groups is an essential factor to maintain horizontal social cohesion at the community level, which is the inner circle in any national peace process. Micro protection is expected to promote macro peace by reducing conflict factors, such as discrimination, exclusion and violence against the vulnerable. Therefore, the evaluation is required to assess the Project's aggregate impact for peacebuilding.

As a peacebuilding initiative, the Project equally complies with Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP). Reported human rights violations in prisons in the North raised concerns during the project planning process. The Project does not provide "support" to security forces running detention facilities, as defined by relevant guidelines.[1] PBSO organized a 2-day workshop on HRDDP in Amman ahead of project approval.

---

[1] According to United Nations (2013) Human rights due diligence policy on United Nations support to non-United Nations security forces (5 March, A/67/775 S/2013/110), "support" does not include: (a) Training or sensitization regarding international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law; (b) Standard-setting (e.g. advice on and review of legislation, codes and policies) and capacity support directly related to the implementation and promotion of compliance with human rights laws and standards and to foster democratic governance of security institutions; (c) Engagement to promote compliance with humanitarian, human rights and refugee law or to negotiate humanitarian access and carry out relief operations; (d) Mediation and mediation-related support; (e) Medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) and casualty evacuation (CASEVAC).

The Project is further justified by its expected contributions to country- and global-level strategic goals as below:

- UNDAF Outcomes
  - Outcome 2. Basic social services continue to be delivered to the general population
  - Outcome 3. Communities are better managing external threats, local risks and shocks with increased economic self-reliance and enhanced social cohesion
  - Outcome 4. Effective leadership, participation and engagement of women, youth and civil society are promoted to strengthen their contribution to peace and security in Yemen
- PBF Focus Areas: Equitable access to social services
- SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies

2.3 Project Outputs

To contribute to peacebuilding goals amid a conflict context, the Project has three components, with a priority on the protection of women and children. Below Outputs summarize the three components.

- **Output 1:** basic humanitarian conditions are improved in places of detention, with particular attention to the special needs of women and children
- **Output 2:** Rehabilitation and reintegration efforts for detainees are strengthened, with particular attention to the special needs of women and children
- **Output 3:** Appropriate diversion options and alternatives to incarceration are available to women and children

First, to improve the humanitarian conditions of places of detention, the Project entails activities to address basic infrastructure needs, such as water and sanitation, and to provide urgent material supplies, e.g. food, blankets and medicines, and to sensitize prison/detention officers to human rights standards. The Project responds to the immediate health and hygienic needs of women in detention and their accompanying minors. Second, the Project strengthens the individual resilience of detainees through psychosocial support, literacy class, vocational training and access to reintegration services. The Project facilitates the meaningful reintegration of women and juveniles into their communities at the conclusion of their incarceration. Third, the Project promotes alternatives to incarceration for children and women, including research on customary laws. Diversion is promoted as the first rather than last resort to enable rehabilitation and reintegration of children within their families and communities.

The COVID-19 epidemic has impacted the implementation of the project on the ground. All activities at the place of detention since March 2020 have been suspended. The activities resumed in September 2020. In addition, the local authorities restricted movements and public gatherings and suspended commercial flights. Also, UN has reduced the number of in-country staff and UN flights.

2.4 Implementation Approaches

The Project with a budget of **5.68 million USD** was implemented from **1 January 2018 to 1 February 2021** in the following phases:

1) **Inception:** assessments conducted in targeted prisons and detention centres, including assessment on infrastructure and physical conditions.
2) **Roll-out**: activities implemented to support people in detention, including the improvement of physical conditions and the provision of material, psycho-social and legal assistance, and the organization of literacy, educational and vocational training courses.
3) **Future scale-up**: evaluation to be commissioned to compile evidence-base and lessons learned from preceding phases to inform the scope and scale of a successor project. Relationships and credibility established through the Project could be leveraged to engage on more complex issues in the future.

To ensure most effective and efficient achievement of results, the Project introduced a set of criteria to select the sites of intervention. Consideration was given to places of detention comprehensively, rather than focusing exclusively on central prisons with convicted prisoners. In some locations, central prisons may not be accessible to international actors. In other locations, facilities such as police lockups (e.g. CID prisons) may reveal greater needs, such as the high volume of women and juveniles detained, the risks of prolonged arbitrary detention without access to legal assistance and a functional justice system. Following the selection criteria as below, the Project Board decided to target six detention facilities (Sana'a, Aden, Ibb, Dhamar, Hodeidah, Mukalla).

1) Security conditions and accessibility for the UN and CSO partners;
2) Number of women and juveniles detained at each facility;
3) Level of humanitarian needs, such as physical conditions and access to services
4) Willingness of authorities to engage, as the presence of third-party inside the place of detention improves transparency and reduces opportunities for violations;
5) Potential to be catalytic, including significance for OSESGY-led Confidence Building Measures.

To make use of comparative advantages of respective organizations, PBSO selected three UN APFs: UNDP (convening agency), UNICEF (child protection) and UN Women (women protection). Partnership with national counterparts includes Ministry of Interior (MOI), Ministry of Justice (MOJ), Ministry of Human Rights (MOHR) and Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour (MOSAL). International and national CSO partners include Penal Reform International (PRI) and National Prisoners' Foundation (Sajeen).

- UNDP leads the overall coordination of the Project, as UNDP and UNHCR co-chair the Justice and Rule of Law Coordination Group established under the Protection Cluster.[2] UNDP also provides operational support to UN Women, which does not have a full office presence in Yemen.
- UNICEF leads the child protection component of the Project through its Justice for Children (J4C) initiatives, which include the J4C Technical Committee and National Action Plan on Justice for Children in Yemen.[3]
- UN Women leads the women protection component of the Project through its planned Justice for Women (J4W) network.[4]

3. Purpose of the Evaluation

This final evaluation to provide UNDP, UNICEF, UN WOMEN, PBSO, key national stakeholders, civil society partners, governors at the targeted governorates with an impartial assessment of the results generated to date, including on gender equality and women's empowerment. The evaluation will assess the Project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability/catalytic; identify and document evidence-based findings; and provide stakeholders with recommendations to inform the design and implementation of other related ongoing and future projects.

4. Objectives

Specific project evaluation objectives are to:

---

[2] Membership includes UNICEF, UN Women, UNOPS, OHCHR, IOM, OSESGY and ICRC.
[3] J4C Technical Committee is chaired by Ministry of Justice and membered by Attorney General, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Social Affairs Ministry of Human Rights, Higher Council for Motherhood and Childhood; The National Action Plan includes 1) provision of free legal aid to children (partners: Yemen Women Union and National Coalition for Children's Rights), 2) promotion of diversion and non-custodial measures (partners: MOI and MOSAL), 3) rehabilitation and reintegration of children with their families and communities, which entails community awareness-raising and institutional capacity-building and coordination.
[4] Key actors include UNFPA, UNDP, UNHCR, OHCHR, ICRC, PRI, Yemen Women Union, Yemen Red Crescent, National Prisoners' Foundation (NPF), Family Counselling and Development Foundation (FCDF), Maysarah National Foundation for Prisoners Care.

1) Assess the relevance and strategic positioning of the project to respond and provide protection needs and the overall peacebuilding needs in Yemen.
2) Assess a) the progress made towards project results and whether there were any unintended results; b) what can be captured in terms of lessons learned for future institutional capacity enhancement initiatives in Yemen; c) analyse the case of reprograming due to COVID-19.
3) Assess whether the project management arrangements, approaches and strategies, including monitoring strategies and risk management approaches, were well-conceived and efficient in delivering the project.
4) Analyse the extent to which the project enhanced application of a rights-based approach, gender equality and women's empowerment, social and environmental standards, and participation of other socially vulnerable groups such as children and the disabled.
5) Outline evidence-based findings and recommendations that can be used for future programming.
6) Provide constructive and practical recommendations on factors that will contribute to project sustainability, and to inform any course corrections (if required/where relevant).

5. Scope

The Project Evaluation will cover the period **1 January 2018 to 1 February 2021** covering all the project locations – **in southern and northern governorates**. The evaluation will cover programme conceptualisation, design, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of results and will engage all project stakeholders. The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of the project; explore the key factors that have contributed to the achieving or not achieving of the intended results; and determine the extent to which the project is contributing to improving public service delivery; addressing crosscutting issues of gender equality and women's empowerment and human rights; and forging partnership at different levels, including with government, donors, UN agencies, and communities.

6. Review Questions

Referencing and adopting from Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC)[5] evaluation criteria, the project review seeks to answer the following questions, focuses around the evaluation criteria of **relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability**.

Relevance
1. Was the project relevant in addressing conflict drivers and factors for peace identified in a conflict analysis?
2. To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes and the SDGs?
3. Was the project appropriate and strategic to the main peacebuilding goals and challenges in the country at the time of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) project's design? Did relevance continue throughout implementation?
4. Was the project well-timed to address a conflict factor or capitalize on a specific window of opportunity?
5. Was PBF funding used to leverage political windows of opportunity for engagement?
6. Was the project relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries? Were they consulted during design and implementation of the project?
7. Did the project's theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the project approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence?

Coherence
8. To what extent did the PBF project complement work among different entities, especially with other UN actors?
9. If the project was part of a broader package of PBF support, to what degree were the project's design, implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with that of other projects'?
10. How were stakeholders involved in the project's design and implementation?
11. Was project implementation among the three fund recipients done in a coherent and joint manner?

---

[5] https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

Effectiveness

12. To what extent did the project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the project's strategic vision?
13. To what extent did the project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding?
14. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended project outputs and outcomes?
15. To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
16. To what extent has the project succeeded in fulfilling female and male beneficiaries' practical and strategic needs including but not limited improved access to services, enhanced practical capacity, and gaining leadership skills?

Efficiency

17. To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
18. To what extent have the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
19. 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?
20. To what extent have the M&E systems utilized by the UN agencies (UNDP-UN WOMEN-UNICEF) enabled effective and efficient project management?

Impact

21. What are the intended and unintended results of the project? What are the positive and negative results and how do they differ between both sexes?
22. What are the early indications of peacebuilding impact?
23. What measurable changes in women's contribution to and participation in peacebuilding have occurred as a result of support provided by the project to target stakeholders?
24. To what extent did COVID-19 impact positively and negatively to the project implementation?

Sustainability

25. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
26. 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?
27. To what extent have relevant Ministries or national offices integrated project outcomes into ongoing policies and practices?
28. 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?
29. To what extent the interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
30. Were the project's results sustained after the intervention? Did sustainability differ for female and male beneficiaries?
31. Was the project financially and/or programmatically catalytic?
32. Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding

In addition to the above standard OECD/DAC criteria, the following additional Peacebuilding Fund evaluation criteria (e.g. catalytic, time sensitivity, risk tolerance and innovation), human rights cross cutting, and gender equality and empowerment will also be assessed.

Risk tolerance and innovation

33. If the project was characterized as "high risk", were risks adequately monitoring and mitigated?
34. Was conflict sensitivity mainstreamed and included as an approach throughout project implementation?
35. How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere?

Gender equality and empowerment

36. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?
37. To what extend the commitment made to Gender Equality and Women Empowerment (GEWE) provisions of the project were realized in practice?
38. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

7. Methodology

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 evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, survey and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with the Evaluation Reference Group and the Evaluation Manager.

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, with specific reference to the OECD DAC guidance on evaluation of peacebuilding initiatives.

It is expected that the evaluation will employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods. The evaluation team should propose their own methodology, which may include:
1. **Document review of all relevant documentation**. This would include a review of inter alia; project document (contribution agreement); theory of change and results framework; programme and project quality assurance reports; annual workplans; consolidated midyear and annual reports; results-oriented monitoring report; highlights of project board meetings; and technical/financial monitoring reports.
2. **Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders**. This would include a representative sample of project beneficiaries (including prisoners, their families, and prison staff), key government counterparts, -, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners.
   - Development of evaluation questions tailored to the different needs and participation of various stakeholders.
   - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. Prior to engaging in interviews or focus group discussions, the evaluation team must obtain written informed consent from all stakeholders, but especially those from vulnerable categories. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals but indicate patterns according to categories of respondents.
3. **Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions**. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and inclusive consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct male and female beneficiaries.
4. **Survey with sample and sampling frame.** This could include the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria; the process for selecting the sample (e.g., purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, gender representation, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results
5. Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
6. Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.

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 should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed among UNDP-UN Women-UNICEF, PBSO stakeholders and the evaluators.

8. Evaluation Ethics
Evaluations in the UN are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.' [6] The Consultants are required to read the guidelines and ensure a strict adherence, including establishing protocols to safeguard confidentiality of information obtained during the evaluation. The Consultants, upon signing the contract will also sign this guideline which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

9. Review products/Deliverables
In line with UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultants that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactory completed due to impact of COVID-19 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 consultants invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her/their control.

The consultants /evaluation team will be expected to deliver the following:
a) **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages**). The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP-UN WOMEN-UNICEF and PBSO after the desk review. The inception report must be deemed acceptable by the evaluation reference group and other evaluation stakeholders prior to data collection and analysis.
b) **Validation exercise**. Upon completion of the data collection and analysis phase and prior to drafting the final report, the evaluation team should prepare an Aide Memoire and organize a workshop with UNDP-UN WOMEN-UNICEF, PBSO and the evaluation reference group to present their preliminary findings.
c) **Draft evaluation report (max 40 pages).** UNDP, UN WOMEN, UNICEF 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) **Final evaluation report**. The final report should address comments, questions and clarification. The final report should also contain a stand-alone executive summary of no more than five pages.
e) **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.

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

10. Required Qualifications
The project evaluation will be conducted by independent consultants. The consultants must have extensive experience in strategic programming of development assistance in active conflict setting countries within the broader areas of peacebuilding and democratic governance on post conflict settings. Preferably, the consultants also have substantial knowledge and experience of gender and monitoring and evaluation of similar initiatives in volatile environments.

UNDP seeks to recruit **two individual consultants – an international and a national** to conduct a joint independent final evaluation. As part of the two-person evaluation team, the **International Consultant** will oversee, predominantly remote capacities, the methodological approach, ensure the quality assurance and provide technical support to the National Consultant to lead and carry out the necessary fieldwork and complete set of deliverables. The evaluation will be a participatory, consultative multi-stakeholder process focused on assessing results and the process towards the peacebuilding impact of the project implemented.

---

[6] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/547

Responsibilities and Qualifications of **International Consultant**:

a) **Responsibilities**
   ▪ Lead the entire evaluation process, including communicating all required information with the Evaluation Manager.
   ▪ Finalize the research design and questions based on the feedback and complete inception report.
   ▪ Leads the process of data gathering and analysis: Key Information Interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions etc.
   ▪ Data analysis, draft and final report preparation, consolidation and submission, and presenting the findings.

b) **Profile – Education and Experience**
   ▪ Minimum Master's degree in relevant disciplines (gender, conflict studies, peacebuilding, international development, social sciences, or related fields).
   ▪ At **least 7 years** of experience in designing and leading program evaluation in a peacebuilding context, including with programming in relation to stabilization, recovery, peacebuilding or social transformation projects in ongoing-conflict and/or post conflict environments.
   ▪ Experience in gender equality related projects.
   ▪ At **least 7 years** of experience and substantive knowledge on project design, results-based management (RBM) and participatory monitoring and evaluation methodologies and approaches is essential.
   ▪ Proven experience in data collection, instrument development and data analysis both qualitative and quantitative is essential.
   ▪ Proven experience in conducting evaluation for large, and complex projects would be an added advantage.
   ▪ Experience working in, and knowledge of the Arab region, including Yemen would be an advantage.
   ▪ Experience in working with the UN or other international organizations would be an asset.
   ▪ Excellent analytical and problem-solving skills and proven ability to draft recommendations stemming from key findings is essential.
   ▪ Excellent report writing skills is essential
   ▪ Fluent in English (written and spoken)

11.Implementation Arrangements

The UNDP Yemen Country Office will select the consultants through an open process in consultation with the partners. UNDP will be responsible for the management of the consultant and will in this regard designate an evaluation manager and focal point. Project staff from UN WOMEN and UNICEF will assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.).

The evaluation manager will convene an evaluation reference group comprising of technical experts from UNDP, UN WOMEN and UNICEF as well as PBSO and the implementing partners. This reference group will review the inception report and the draft review 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 project team, for setting up meetings subject to advance approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The consultants will report directly to the designated evaluation manager and focal point and work closely with the project team. The consultants will work full time and the National Consultant may be required to travel to the targeted areas for the purpose the evaluation. Office space and limited administrative and logistical support will be provided as needed. The consultants will use their own laptops and cell phones.

Support during the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings will be provided by the evaluation manager and focal point. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided to the consultants. UNDP

with support of UN WOMEN and UNICEF will develop a management response to the evaluation within 2 weeks of report finalization.

12. Key Deliverables and Payment including Timeframe for Evaluation Process

The project evaluation will be carried out over a period of **57** working days broken down as follows:

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated	% of Payment	Approval by
Evaluation inception phase	Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages)	15 days	15%	Management Support Unit (MSU)
Data collection analysis and validation exercise	- Power point presentation for initial findings immediately after the field visits - An Aide Memoire	21 days	25%	Management Support Unit (MSU)
Drafting an evaluation report	- Draft evaluation report (max 40 pages)	14 days	30%	Management Support Unit (MSU)
Review the report and incorporation of inputs from evaluation stakeholders and drafting the audit trail.	- Final evaluation report - Evaluation report audit trail	7 days	30%	Management Support Unit (MSU)
Total		**57 days**	**100%**	

13. Assessment and Weighting Criteria of the Proposals

Required mentioned documents to be included when submitting the Proposal: Interested 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) A detailed Methodology on how the candidate will approach and conduct the work.

The received proposals will be weighed according to the technical assessment criteria (**70%** weightage) and financial assessment criteria (**30%** weightage). The proposals will be assessed using Cumulative Analysis Method. 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 secured 70 points or above. Below are the criteria and points for assessing technical proposals:

a) Technical proposals (total score: 70 points)

Criteria	Maximum obtainable points	Weighting (%)
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).	35	50%

- 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.		
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.	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 aligned with those in the deliverable table (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables. Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified milestones in the ToR.

Financial Proposal, providing a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems) is to be provided by the offeror using the Offerors Letter template provided by UNDP.

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 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)

Documents to be provided by UNDP to successful candidates

1. Intervention results framework and theory of change
2. Key stakeholders and partners
3. Documents to be reviewed and consulted
4. Inception report
5. Evaluation report
6. Audit trail
7. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system
8. Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices
9. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines
10. Evaluation Quality Assessment
11. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
12. **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

13. Sample evaluation matrix

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