International Company on

Final Evaluation of the regional project on Strengthening Arab Economic Integration for Sustainable Development

(October 2017-December 2021)

1. **Background and context**

UNDP’s regional project on Strengthening Arab Economic Integration for Sustainable Development (AEISD) was designed as part of the Regional Programme for Arab States (2018-2021)[[1]](#footnote-2). Namely, the project contributes to Outcome 1 of the Regional Programme Document: “Accelerate the structural transformation of productive capacities in a sustainable and inclusive manner~~”~~, which falls under UNDPStrategic Plan (SP) Outcome 1 on poverty eradication.

The project started in October 2017, principally aiming to strengthen Arab economic integration through a designed and activated new technical framework for the Pan Arab Free Trade Area (PAFTA) upgrading, as well as for Member States’ preparation for the Arab Customs Union (ACU). Support is being provided to policymakers of Member States and officials of the League of Arab States (LAS) through technical and capacity assistance.

As such, the project is geared towards supporting efforts for deepening regional economic integration, connectivity, and competitiveness, based on a rule-based system around an agreed framework of accountability that is inclusive of businesses and industries. The concept of providing opportunities for all with focus on economic empowerment for women is also being addressed through the provision of analysis to promote women’s role in trade, aiming towards the formulation of related trade policies at the regional and national levels.….

By promoting a more integrated Arab Free Trade Area towards a common market and the complementarity of productive capacities of individual countries, the project aim at contributing to achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, specifically Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 8) (decent work and economic growth) and SDG 17 (partnerships for the goals). SDGs 1 (no poverty) and 2 (zero hunger) also benefit from enhanced economic integration, which helps provide disadvantaged people with access to finance, technology, and employment opportunities and boost the fragile food security in a region heavily dependent on food imports. The project also contributes to SDG 5 (gender equality) and SDG 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) through activities that are focused on analysing the linkages between economic integration and issues related to both gender parity and transparency in governance.

The project is being articulated in three outcomes:

* Outcome 1: LAS capacity strengthened to manage regional economic integration related processes;
* Outcome 2: Members States have the capacity and are technically prepared for regional economic integration;

Outcome 3: Engagement of key development actors ensured through inclusive and transparent processes for regional economic integration.

Based on national strategies and priorities, the project assists partners in advancing regional cooperation and policy dialogue on inclusive and sustainable growth, and job~~-~~creation. It counts on Member States political commitment for a more integrated market of PAFTA members, and the Arab Customs Union (ACU). Upon the requests formulated by Member States and LAS, the project designs and implement activities responsive to those inputs, aiming at the progressive alignments of regional instruments on trade and economic integration to global standards.

UNDP-RBAS will conduct a final evaluation to the project as 2021 is expected to be the final year of its implementation, and thus it requires an exit strategy to ensure a sustainable policy framework for Arab economic integration towards a Common Market.

### Brief Regional Context

The Arab region hosts high, middle, and low-income countries, facing different sets of development challenges and diversely affected by conflict and transition dynamics. Besides each country specificity, mounting economic challenges are a regional trend.

The region GDP growth was at 1.5 % in 2019, less than in 2018 (2.1%) and one of the lowest level since the 0.4% in 2008.[[2]](#footnote-3) This has negatively affected an already challenging job market, with adult and youth unemployment rates among the highest in the world at 10% and 27%, respectively. [[3]](#footnote-4)

Reducing trade barriers and regional economic integration are important catalysts to sustain growth. businesses and generate employment. Yet, many countries in the region are slow in capitalizing on the contribution of increased economic integration. Public finance reforms and efforts towards economic diversification and the reduction of costs of doing business progress unevenly among Arab countries, with many affected by sluggish economic reforms, political turmoil in some countries, conflict in others, concerns about debt in non-oil producing middle-income countries, and concerns about oil price volatility in oil producing countries.

The activation of the Arab Agreement on Liberalization of Trade in Services on October 14th, 2019 and the forthcoming participation of new Member States in the Agreement demonstrates the interest of the region toward a larger and more integrated market. Countries are studying modalities to design and activate the Arab Customs Union as the next stage of regional integration. Related reforms were intended to leverage trade to generate businesses, employment opportunities, together with measures such as the progressive reduction of energy subsidies and the introduction or increase of indirect taxation to widen the fiscal space and invest into infrastructure and facilities.

The spread of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 created additional bottleneck to the implementation of agreed reforms, exposing serious fault lines and vulnerabilities in societies, institutions and economies in the region. Implemented policy responses include lockdown of businesses and activities and movement restrictions in many countries in the region in an effort to curb the spread of the virus, with consequent economic fallout. Due to COVID-19, the Middle East and North Africa region’s economy is expected to contract by 3.5 per­cent.[[4]](#footnote-5)

Countries in the region have uneven capacities to offer stimulus packages, limited by a serious drop in revenues from tourism, remittances, trade and production, exacerbated in oil exporting countries by the drop in oil prices[[5]](#footnote-6). In addition, Arab countries have introduced a number of trade-related measures to respond to the COVID-19 outbreak, including export restrictions and bans, mostly on medical products, personal protection equipment and foodstuffs, and taxes on transit traffic, which further hindered cross-border and supply chain disruption. The project undertook substantial repurposing of activities as a response to COVID-19, including the production of dedicated analysis on the impact of COVID-19 (on the impact to PAFTA countries and on the promotion of notification of new trade regulations), which was introduced into the TORs of technical works for the period of March 2020 until the end of 2020.

|  |
| --- |
| **PROJECT INFORMATION** |
| **Project title** | Strengthening Arab Economic Integration for Sustainable Development |
| **Corporate outcome and output** | RPD Outcome 1: Accelerate structural transformation of productive capacities in a sustainable and inclusive manner. |
| **Region** | Arab Region, with focus on Egypt, Morocco, Sudan and Jordan |
| **Date Project Document signed** | 20 August 2017 |
| **Project dates** | **Start** | **Planned end** |
| 01 October 2017 | 31 December 2021 |
| **Project budget** | USD 6,707,466 (SEK 54,800,000) |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** | USD 4,797,789 |
| **Funding source** | Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida) |
| **Executing agency** | United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) |

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

The purpose of the Final Evaluation is twofold: i) improve future aid policy, programmes and projects through feedback of lessons learned; and ii) provide a basis for accountability.

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

Assess the project performance and results following the OECD/DAC criteria[[6]](#footnote-7): relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, as well as its overall contribution to the ultimate outcome - “Accelerate the structural transformation of productive capacities in a sustainable and inclusive manner”. This includes, *inter alia*, assessing the project design (i.e. intervention logic, Theory of Change, etc.), governance structure, measurable results, financial efficiency, economic sustainability and the project contribution to reducing inequality (i.e gender mainstreaming), as well as the overall impact of the project on gender equality and inclusion. This shall be done in line with project documentation, agreement and subsequent coordination that has taken place between UNDP and the donor, Sida.

To ensure accountability, as well as identify and analyse findings and results to enable the incorporation of lessons learned and prepare recommendations that can be useful for the design of similar projects in the future , organizational learning and enhancing the quality of future aid policy. Recommendations shall be specific and actionable communicating clearly what worked as planned and what did not; including the main reason why that happened and how to mitigate those challenges and improve in the future.

### Scope and objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation will capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of the project’s contributions towards “accelerating structural transformation of productive capacities in a sustainable and inclusive manner”, as articulated in Outcome 1 of the Regional Programme. for Arab States (2018-2021). The scope of the evaluation will focus around the three articulated outcomes of the Project to assess the indicative outputs under each:

* Outcome 1: LAS capacity strengthened to manage regional economic integration related processes.
	+ Output 1: Structured and targeted technical support to LAS secretariat and Arab negotiators on trade policy formulation and reform under PAFTA.
	+ Output 2: Provision of support for the organizational capacity of LAS secretariat to facilitate the regional economic integration agenda.
* Outcome 2: Members States have the capacity and are technically prepared for regional economic integration.
	+ Output 3: Provision of country-based technical assistance to policymakers for their activities related to trade policy reform and coherence.
	+ Output 4: Provision of country-based technical assistance to policy makers for the modernization of the supply/value chain in preparatory process for the Arab Customs Union.
* Outcome 3: Engagement of key development actors ensured through inclusive and transparent processes for regional economic integration.
* Output 5: Improvement of related regulatory frameworks for integrity, aiming for good governance for trade development measures.
* Output 6: Supporting gender responsive mechanisms to ensure systematic integration of gender sensitivities in trade policymaking and negotiations

Worth noting that due to COVID-19, the project has redirected its course of implementation using methods that do not require travelling or physical meetings. Since the outbreak of the pandemic, the project did not engage in any activity that could have placed the staff and stakeholders at risk of being infected by the virus. Hence, team meetings, official events and consultations with stakeholders have been held virtually.

The evaluation will cover the project full duration (2017-2021).

1. **Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

The final project evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must give the intended users the information needed to make decisions, take action and add to knowledge. Hence, the analysis will seek to answer, at a minimum but not limited to, the following questions grouped according to the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability.[[7]](#footnote-8)

**Relevance:**

1. To what Sustainable Development Goals did the project contribute, and to what extent were they mainstreamed?
2. Were the pre-conditions for change, assumptions (context) and risks identified during the development problem analysis phase of this project correct? If not, why and what was missing?
3. To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project design?
4. To what extent was the project in line with regional and national development priorities, and what was the “value added” of targeting this development problem with a regional approach rather than bilateral one? Was a solid theory of change developed, capturing the analysis from the development problem, and were impact, outcomes, outputs and activities mapped? If not, what provisions and changes should have been made?
5. To what extent were perspectives of the target groups and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, considered during the project design processes?
6. To what extent did the project adopt gender-sensitive, human rights-based, inclusion and conflict-sensitive approaches?
7. To what extent did the project assess health and environmental risks (mitigation and adaptation to climate change)? How was that reflected in project activities?
8. Did the project have a solid results framework with measurable key performance indicators, baselines, targets to monitor the progress of the project and aligned to its theory of change? If not, how should that be improved?
9. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, and other changes in the region?
10. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the regional and national constituents and changing partner priorities, and at the same time keeping commitments made and respecting the design of project and subsequent agreement?

**Effectiveness:**

1. Did the project fulfil its contribution (attribution principle) to its theory of change?
2. Has this project achieved its intended outputs and outcomes? Which ones, how and how much (measurably)?
3. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended impact of this project as well as regional programme outcome and outputs?
4. To what extent has the partnership strategy between UNDP and Sida been appropriate and effective?
5. In which areas did the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can future initiatives build on or expand these achievements?
6. In which areas has the project not been successful? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
7. What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
8. To what extent have relevant stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
9. To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards the achievement of the project objectives?
10. How has delivery of the project outcomes / outputs been addressed in light of the challenges imposed by COVID-19? And what can be done better now that biosecurity risks (pandemic diseases) are likely to happen in the future.
11. To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights and inclusion?
12. To what extent has the project contributed to the environment (mitigation and adaptation to climate change) and public health?

**Efficiency:**

1. Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its timeframe?
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 (i.e. staff, external consultants, etc.)?
5. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
6. To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
7. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
8. To what extent did the project adjustments in light of the disruption to major activities imposed by COVID-19 (including envisaged budget implications) yield to the expected results?
9. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by the project ensure effective and efficient project management? How can that system be improved?

**Sustainability:**

1. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
2. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
3. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to regional programme outputs and outcomes?
4. Will the level of stakeholders’ ownership (cost-sharing) and strengthened capacities be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
5. To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders? How have these been affected by COVID-19? What other barriers have been seen to the inclusion of vulnerable groups in UNDP’s work and what can be done to improve inclusion of these groups?
6. Has this project contributed to environmental sustainability (mitigation and climate change) in a documented and verifiable manner?
7. To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
8. 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?
9. To what extent this UNDP intervention has a well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
10. What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

The questions should be further adjusted by the evaluator in the Inception report and agreed on with UNDP.

1. **Methodology**

The evaluation will be carried out by an international multidisciplinary company and will engage key stakeholders, which were involved in the delivery process or received advisory support, as well as UNDP staff. The evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change’’ approach to determining causal links between the project and the observed progress against its outputs, starting with the theory of change prepared during the project design phase.

The evidence gathering will closely track the RRF of the project. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results should be gathered from a variety of sources, including data on indicators’ achievement, existing reports, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, or surveys as appropriate. While interviews are a key instrument, 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 range of data should provide good 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 data analysis approach needs to be detailed in the inception report.

The evaluation should, *inter alia,* include:

* **Desk reviews:** The company will review all relevant documentation, including the following: i) Project Document ii) 2017-2020 annual progress reports; iii) 2017-2020 annual workplans; iv) past evaluation report, v) milestone correspondences between UNDP and the donor, etc. (full list will be provided to the evaluator)
* **Interviews and focus group discussions, or surveys as appropriate (focusing on an equal gender representation and inclusion of vulnerable groups):** Stakeholders to be engaged will include: i) UNDP staff ii) the League of Arab States Department of Economic Integration (AEID) iii) target groups, including women; iv) partner UN agencies collaborating in the project, v) national institutions or other stakeholders involved in the project, (full list will be provided to the evaluator)
* **Briefing and debriefing sessions:** Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP staff, Sida and other relevant stakeholders.

It is worth noting that as of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread worldwide. Travel has been restricted since then. Accordingly, the evaluator shall develop a methodology that takes this into account to conduct the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and questionnaires. This should be detailed in the inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

As the evaluation will be carried out virtually, due consideration should be given to stakeholder availability and willingness to be interviewed remotely, their access to the internet/computer, and the possibility that some may be still working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report. Remote interviews will be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc). The evaluation manager will provide the contact details for these stakeholders.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule.

Overall guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP *Evaluation Guidelines.[[8]](#footnote-9)* The evaluator will determine the specific design and provide a complete evaluation methodology to UNDP as part of the evaluation inception report which will include a detailed workplan for this assignment, comprehensive of interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation. Due consideration of COVID-19 implications should also be clearly outlined in the inception report and discussed and agreed with UNDP. More information can be found in the UNDP guidance on "virtual evaluations during COVID-19”.[[9]](#footnote-10)

1. **Evaluation products**

The following deliverables are required to be submitted, while addressing gender, disability and human right issues:

### Evaluation inception report (around 15 pages). The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts.

### Draft evaluation report (refer to report template in the annex). This draft report, excluding annexes, shall be up to 50 pages (including the Executive Summary). The programme unit, Sida and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide a set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in the evaluation guidelines.

### Evaluation report audit trail. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how he/she has addressed comments.

### Final evaluation report, including the executive summary and annexes. The report including executive summary shall be up to 50 pages.

### Evaluation debriefings. Following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing of findings.

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.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by UNDP and/or the evaluation party that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the company invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

1. **Criteria for selection of the best offers**

The project evaluation will be undertaken by an external evaluator party that must be independent and objective. Therefore, the selected vendor should not have participated in the design, implementation, and decision-making of the project itself.

### The final project evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation ToR and following the UNDP evaluation guidelines (2019). She/he will perform the following tasks:

* + Conduct a desk review of documents;
	+ Prepare an inception report detailing the evaluation scope, of the proposed methodology, a detailed work plan and the evaluation report outline;
	+ Conduct interviews /focus groups/surveys with regional / national and other identified stakeholders;
	+ Conduct debriefing sessions with UNDP as implementing partner;
	+ Prepare the draft evaluation report;
	+ Present draft findings;
	+ Finalize the evaluation report and submit it together with the duly filled audit trail form to UNDP;
	+ Presentation of the final evaluation report to UNDP and SIDA.

This selection criteria will follow the Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max. of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%; using the following evaluation criteria

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms | Score Weight | Points Obtainable |
|
| 1. | Expertise of Firm / Organization submitting Proposal | 30% | 300 |
| 2. | Proposed Work Plan and Approach | 40% | 400 |
| 3. | Personnel | 30% | 300 |
|  | **Total** | **1000** |

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

**Form 1:** Expertise of Firm / Organization Submitting Proposal;

**Form 2:** Proposed Work Plan and Approach; and

**Form 3:** Personnel

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical Proposal EvaluationForm 1 | Points Obtainable |
|
| **Expertise of firm / organization submitting proposal** |
| 1.1 | Reputation of Organization and Staff (Competence / Reliability) | 40 |
| 1.2 | Litigation and Arbitration history | 15 |
| 1.3 | Quality assurance procedures, warranty | 25 |
|  |  |  |
| 1.4 | General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation: | 90 |
| 1.4.1 | * + - *Loose consortium, holding selected vendor or one firm (10 points);*
 |  |
| 1.4.2 | * + - *Age/size of the firm (10 points);*
 |  |
| 1.4.3 | * + - *Project management controls (10 points)*
 |  |
| 1.4.4 | * + - *Strength of project management support (20 points);*
 |  |
| 1.4.5 | * + - *Financial Stability (20 points);*
 |  |
| 1.4.6 | * + - *Project financing capacity (20 points)*
 |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1.5 | Relevance of: | 130 |
| 1.5.1 | * + - *At least five (05) years of professional working experience in Projects’ Evaluation (40 points);*
 |  |
| 1.5.2 | * + - *Familiarity and knowledge about development issues in the Arab Region, specifically the Middle-East and North Africa (35 points);*
 |  |
| 1.5.3 | * + - *Familiarity with the 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (35 points);*
 |  |
| 1.5.4 | * + - *Proven delivery of at least one successful similar contract with similar level of technical complexity in the last five years, preferably with the UN or any other international organization (20 points).*
 |  |
|  | **Total** | **300** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical Proposal EvaluationForm 2 | Points Obtainable |
|
| **Proposed Work Plan and Approach** |
| 2.1 | To what degree does the Offeror understand the task? | 50 |
| 2.2 | Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail? | 50 |
| 2.3 | Are the different components of the project adequately weighted relative to one another? | 50 |
| 2.4 | Is the proposal based on a survey of the project environment and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposal?  | 50 |
| 2.5 | Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task? | 50 |
| 2.6 | Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR? | 50 |
| 2.7 | Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project? | 100 |
|  | **Total** | **400** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical Proposal EvaluationForm 3 | Points Obtainable |
|
| **Personnel** |
| 3.1 | External Evaluator  | 300 |
|  | General Qualification |  |
|  | Suitability for the Project |  |
| 3.1.1 | * + - *Master’s degree in economics, public administration, political science, regional development/planning, or other social science; at least 6 years of experience in conducting evaluations for international organisations, preferably with direct experience in capacity development (75 points);*
 |  |
| 3.1.2 | * + - *Documented knowledge and experience in project design (development project analysis, Theory of change, Log-frames, etc.) (50 points);*
 |  |
| 3.1.3 | * + - *Documented experience in public sector development, preferably in the area of trade and economic integration (50 points);*
 |  |
| 3.1.4 | * + - *Experience in cross cutting thematic areas such as gender mainstreaming, equality and women empowerment, disability inclusion, human rights, and environmental issues (mitigation and adaptation to climate change) (50 points);*
 |  |
| 3.1.5 | * + - *Adequate experience in programme evaluations in the development field, with proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations (40 points);*
 |  |
| 3.1.6 | * + - *Proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluations in the Arab region (25 points);*
 |  |
| 3.1.7 | * + - *Language proficiency in both written and oral English is required; Arabic language is an asset. (10 points).*
 |  |
|  | **Total** | **300** |

1. **Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’.[[10]](#footnote-11) The company 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 company must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **Implementation arrangements**

The company will be reporting to the **Regional Programme Coordinator** of UNDP-RBAS who is located at the Regional Hub, in Amman. The team will work in close coordination with the **Evaluation Manager** (EM) who will oversee the overall evaluation process. The EM will also be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, desk review, conduct the quality assurance of the inception and evaluation reports, etc. Given that the evaluation will be conducted virtually, an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided to the company. An ‘**Evaluation Focal Team’** composed of stakeholders and UNDP relevant staff will be set-up in order to provide technical inputs to enhance the quality of the evaluation. The **Regional Programme Coordinator** will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report.

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

The evaluation is expected to take 30 working days over a period of two months starting 01 September 2021 The following table illustrates a detailed schedule for the process:

**Working day allocation and schedule for the evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **ESTIMATED # OF DAYS** | **DATE OF COMPLETION** | **PLACE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| **Phase One: Desk review and inception report** |
| Meeting briefing with UNDP (Management Support Unit and project staff as needed) | 5 days | At the time of contract signing1 September  | Remotely  | Evaluation manager and Evaluation commissioner |
| Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluator | At the time of contract signing 1 September | Via email / Dropbox | Evaluation manager  |
| Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan, including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed | Within one week of contract signing 8 September  | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Submission of the inception report (15 pages) | Within one week of contract signing8 September  |  | Evaluator |
| Comments and approval of inception report |  | Within one week of submission of the inception report15 September | UNDP | Evaluation manager and Evaluation commissioner |
| **Phase Two: Data-collection**  |
| Virtual consultations, in-depth interviews and focus groups or surveys | 15 days  | Within four weeks of contract signing29 September  | Remotely, via Zoom or Skype | UNDP to organize with partners, project staff, etc. |
| Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders | 1 day | 30 September  | Remotely, via Zoom | Evaluator |
| **Phase Three: Evaluation report writing** |
| Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum, excluding executive summary and annexes)  | 5 days | Within three weeks of the completion of phase II20 October | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Draft report submission |  | Within three weeks of the completion of phase II20 October | Via email / Dropbox | Evaluator |
| Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report  |  | Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report4 November | Remotely | Evaluation manager and evaluation reference group |
| Debriefing with UNDP | 1 day | Within one week of receipt of comments11 November  | Remotely  | UNDP, evaluation reference group, stakeholder and evaluation team |
| Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office | 3 days | Within one week of final debriefing18 November  | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes) |  | Within one week of final debriefing18 November  | Home- based | Evaluator |
| **Estimated total days for the evaluation** | **30 days** |  |  |  |

1. **Application submission process and criteria for selection**

As required by the programme unit.

1. **TOR annexes**
* **Project Document (Annex 1);**
* **List of key stakeholders and partners (Annex 2);**
* **List of documents to be consulted (Annex 3);**
* **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.

**Table. Sample evaluation matrix**

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

* [**Evaluation report**](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%206%20Standard%20evaluation%20report%20content%20full%20details.docx) **template and quality standards (Annex 4);**
* [**UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system**](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100) **(Annex 5);** which would be signed by the evaluator and made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.
* UNEG Guidance on [**Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations (Annex 6)**](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452)
* [**Evaluation Quality Assessment**](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml) **Guidelines pages 8-12; (**[**http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/section-6.pdf**](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/section-6.pdf)**)**
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