

TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME



TERMS OF REFERENCE
MID-TERM EVALUATION FOR THE PRO PALOP-TL SAI (PHASE II) PROJECT

Portfolio: GOVERNANCE**A. GENERAL INFORMATION**

Title: Mid-term Evaluation for the Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II) Project

Project: Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II) – Programme for Consolidating Economic Governance and Public Finance Management Systems (PFMS) in the PALOP-TL (Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II))

Direct Supervisor: Pro PALOP-TL SAI Chief Technical Advisor

Duty Station: Praia, Cabo Verde

Estimated Start Date: 04 June 2021

Duration: 90 working days

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The European Union (EU) is one of the major partners and funders of UNDP's work. Currently, the EU and UNDP are partnering in 140 countries to deepen democratic governance, prevent or recover from conflict and natural disasters, build resilience and adapt to climate change. The EU and its Member States are jointly the world's largest donor of the development aid, with their Official Development Assistance (ODA) having reached €75.5 billion in 2016.

Communications and visibility are key for the EU to mobilize its citizens and governments to remain engaged in development aid and cooperation as well as for the EU - UNDP strategic partnership, including resource mobilization.

In the past decade, the Portuguese-speaking countries of Angola, Cabo Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, and Timor-Leste have experienced significant progress in economic governance. Recent public finance management reforms are the main reason for this success.

However, weaknesses, including inadequate institutional capacity, skills and human resources, continue to hamper their public administration systems. This situation has undermined effective public finance management, budgetary oversight and control of public resources, which has significant adverse impacts on other governance and development sectors.

In order to support the above referred countries addressing such challenges, the European Union, UNDP and the National Authorizing Officers for the European Development Fund (NAO EDF) in the PALOP and Timor-Leste partner to deliver the Project for Strengthening technical and functional skills of Supreme Audit Institutions, National Parliaments and Civil Society for the control of public finances in the PALOP and Timor-Leste (Pro PALOP-TL SAI) .

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI project was fully funded by the European Union to promote economic governance in ACP Portuguese Speaking Countries (5 PALOP countries and Timor-Leste) and strengthened the technical and functional

competencies of the Supreme Audit Institutions, Parliaments, and Civil Society in the field of public financial management.

The project enabled the capacity-building of beneficiary institutions, the development of skills, know-how and knowledge of oversight stakeholders. Therefore, the project had a real impact on people's lives, and the overall framework of public finance management and budget oversight in PALOP and Timor-Leste. The project's implementation started in January 2014 and came to an end in December 2017. The 2017 Edition of the Global Parliamentary Report , produced by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and UNDP has selected the Pro PALOP-TL SAI approach and actions to showcase at global level how to best promote "cooperation between parliament and supreme audit institutions", so that legislatures can engage with SAIs to enhance control and oversight of public expenditure, and accelerate the delivery of SDG 5 and SDG 16 . For more information on the 1st phase of the Pro PALOP-TL SAI, closed operationally in 2017 and evaluated, please refer to the project's [website](#)¹.

Building from the previous success story of the Pro PALOP-TL SAI, the Programme for Consolidating Economic Governance and Public Finance Management Systems (PFMS) in the PALOP-TL (Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II)) covers the second priority area of the 11th EDF PALOP-TL Multi-Annual Indicative Plan (MIP) "Governance capacity Development". The programme intends to improve economic governance in the PALOP-TL, with the specific objective to improve the performance of PALOP-TL countries on Public Finance accountability, effectiveness and transparency.

The proposed programme aims to expand and consolidate Pro PALOP-TL SAI's initiatives and successes of South-South and Triangular Cooperation by supporting capacity development, further develop regional dialogue and deliver technical assistance in the above referred domain. Within this scope, it is proposed to focus the intervention on three domains for consolidating PFMS, where cooperation among PALOP-TL/EU is already underway and showed positive impacts, as well a regional added value, to obtain the following expected results:

1. The executives' capacities to ensure fiscal and budget transparency in the PALOP-TL are improved.
2. The supreme audit institutions and other relevant external control institutions' capacities to ensure external audit/control over PFMS in the PALOP-TL are enhanced.
3. The capacities of Parliaments and CSO to ensure effective legislative oversight and social monitoring of PFMS in the PALOP-TL are strengthened.

The programme will develop a Facility to support and broker initiatives for capacity development, south-south and triangular cooperation, exchanges of experiences and "peer2peer" learning, with the expectation to foster institutional-based, process-based and human resources-based change and transformational dynamics.

The programme's beneficiaries were identified through the relevant 10th EDF programmes (PALOP-TL RIP and NIPs), as well as by means of a thorough mapping, analysis and diagnostic carried out along the implementation of the Pro PALOP-TL SAI between 2014 and 2017 , complemented by an ad-hoc mapping consultation process in the 6 countries in 2016-2017. Given its successful experience in implementing the Pro PALOP-TL SAI, as well as in developing/providing institutional capacity development tools and processes, the EU and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) have agreed to renew their partnership.

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 all PALOPTL countries was severely restricted in the period from March to April 2020, because all these 6 countries benefiting from the Pro PALOP-TL SAI programme enacted 'States of Emergency'. All PALOP and Timor-Leste adopted measures of social distancing and total limitation of travel, international and national, as part of the national measures to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 world pandemic, as per WHO classification in February 2020.

¹ <http://old.agora-parl.org/pt/pro-palop-tl-sai/>.

As result, the Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II) executive (represented by UNDP Office in Cabo Verde) entered in discussions with the EU Delegation in Mozambique (project main supplier) for the reallocation of the resource balance of the 1st installment disbursed for the implementation to the Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II) to support a comprehensive UNDP and EU-funded response to the crisis unleashed by the COVID-19 pandemic in the PFMS and Economic Governance of the PALOP-TL countries. Such reallocation would align the Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II) with measures UNDP was undertaking at corporate level to reallocate programmatic resources to address the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in all regions, including Africa and Asia.

The reallocation was approved by the EU Delegation in Mozambique and the funds used by the project management unit and UNDP COs in all countries covered to address emergent needs resulting from the socioeconomic impact of the pandemic in the project beneficiaries at national level (MoF, SAI, Parliaments and CSO). The reallocation of the remaining balance was done in line with PAGODA dispositions, without impacting the programme's outcomes, outputs and general activities, thus with no need for the amendment of the Contribution Agreement.

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI COVID19 pandemic Mitigation Plan proposed 3 main types of activities, namely:

1. Short-term activities proposed to adapt the project's initial work plan to the context of the pandemic COVID19 and aimed at strengthening the technical and human capacities in the beneficiary institutions to face and mitigate the socioeconomic impact of the pandemic COVID19. These activities were specially designed to support institutions benefiting from Pro PALOP-TL ISC by exposing decision makers and policymakers in those institutions to very high-quality webinars, *eConferences* and other distance learning initiatives addressing challenges posed to the PFMS in the current context of the COVID19 pandemic. These activities shall be implemented between May and December 2020, through methodologies and intervention logics adapted to national contexts of State of Emergency and social distancing in the PALOP-TL with considerable restrictions on travel and telecommuting methods being used.
2. Ongoing transversal activities (already existing in the Prodoc) adapted now to carry out actions in the context of social distance and in a regime of States of Emergency. These activities were already planned; however, they were adapted to be carried out (or partially carried out) during the States of Emergency and while the social distancing, travel restrictions and telecommuting regimes are in force.
3. National activities to respond to the socio-economic impact of the COVID pandemic19. These activities aim to respond to the specific demands of Pro PALOP-TL ISC beneficiary institutions in the face of the current context of the COVID19 pandemic. This response must be made in a coordinated manner and in line with UNDP Offices planned and ongoing initiatives in the PALOP-TL (aligned with their respective Regional Headquarters guidelines) to mitigate the socio-economic impact of the pandemic COVID19.

These activities were conceived not to change the results and logical framework of the project, as agreed with the EUD. These activities are in line with the general activities foreseen in the project document (Annex I of the contract with the EUD) – they only allow for the reallocation of the resource balance, as referred above, into activities aiming to contribute for the international and national efforts to mitigate the socioeconomic impact of the pandemic COVID19 in the PALOP-TL countries.

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II) intervention in the context of COVID-19 pandemic outbreak was aligned with UNDP corporate response to the crisis in each beneficiary country: i.e. provide support to the beneficiary countries to address the Socio-Economic impact of COVID-19.

For more information on the Pro PALOP-TL SAI 2nd phase, still ongoing, to be covered by this evaluation exercise, please refer to the [website](https://agora-parl.org/pt-pt/pro-palop-tl-sai)².

² <https://agora-parl.org/pt-pt/pro-palop-tl-sai>.

C. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The UNDP is commissioning this evaluation to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of PRO PALOP-TL SAI (PHASE II) PROJECT, which can be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for new initiatives. This evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in this region with an impartial assessment of the results of UNDP support.

Also, the Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE will be carried out in order to provide an independent analysis of the capacities effectively developed, the skills and knowledge transferred, and the change trends resulting from the project actions.

The Midterm evaluation will be conducted during the months of June and September 2021 (90 working days in a 4-months period) and will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the programme, from inception to date, in all 6 beneficiary countries known as the PALOP-TL – Angola, Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique, São Tomé e Príncipe, and Timor-Leste.

The evaluators will compare planned outputs to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the objectives. The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation strategy to come up with recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing the project outputs and outcomes to date. The overall project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework.

Consequently, the Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining implementation period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess signs of the project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

Specifically, The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE will assess progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document (PRODOC), in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE will also address underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE shall cover the programme's COVID19 mitigation plan, a quick impact initiative that benefited all PALOP-TL countries by promoting actions directly implemented by and in support of the project beneficiary, as follows:

1. Executive, in particular, Ministries of Finances (DGOs – Budget Directorates – and IGFs – general inspectorate of finances): facilitate and make available technical support to address jointly and with a common approach the initiatives to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 in the PALOP-TL countries' economies through the consolidation of the economic governance and PFMS.
2. Supreme Audit Institutions and other External Control Independent Institutions (ARAP, in Cabo Verde): facilitate and make available technical support to address jointly and with a common approach the initiatives to ensure independent control and audit the use of public resources and donor contributions used by the executive to fight the COVID-19 pandemic and its impacts.
3. Parliaments and CSO: facilitate and make available technical support to address jointly and with a common approach the initiatives to scrutinized and ensure legislative scrutiny and oversight, as well as the social monitoring, of the use of public resources and donor contributions used by the executive to fight the COVID-19 pandemic and its impacts.

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going projects. The selected team is expected to identify lessons learnt and best practices from other initiatives that could guide technical recommendations and improvements.

In conclusion, the overall objective of the Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE is to:

- a. Make an overall independent assessment of the performance of Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II) with particular focus on the impact in the beneficiary countries related to: 1) transfer of capacities in the field of budget transparency, external control of public finances and legislative oversight/social monitoring of public expenditures and policies; 2) ownership of planning tools and in the implementation of the project initiatives; and 3) south-south and triangular cooperation, peer learning and exchanges in the field of external control of public finances and budget transparency;
- b. Identify key lessons learned and propose practical recommendations in order to further facilitate EC-UNDP strategic partnership globally and the EU-NAO cooperation in the field;
- c. Contribute to the project exit strategy.
- d. Review how the interventions succeeded to strengthen application of a rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming.

D. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability shall be used to frame the questions³. Key questions should be clear, well defined and manageable. At least one evaluation question should address the issue of gender. The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE seeks to answer, among others, the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability:

Relevance:

- ✓ What progress has the project made in achieving the proposed outputs?
- ✓ Are the projects objectives being achieved? Can we see progress at this stage? What needs to change?
- ✓ To what extent are the Project activities relevant to the needs of the Ministries of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), National Parliaments and Civil Society in the six beneficiary countries?
- ✓ Has the project been flexible to adequately respond to changing needs of the Ministries of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), National Parliaments and CSOs based on emerging institutional, legal and other issues through its planning and regular review processes?
- ✓ To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- ✓ To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- ✓ To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- ✓ To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

Effectiveness

- ✓ To what degree has the Project assistance resulted in an improvement in institutional and individual capacity of the skills of Ministries of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), National Parliaments and CSOs in the six beneficiary countries?

³ Access at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance>.

- ✓ what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- ✓ What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs?
- ✓ How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- ✓ To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- ✓ In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- ✓ What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- ✓ Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- ✓ To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- ✓ To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- ✓ To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- ✓ To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
- ✓ To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- ✓ To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities in the beneficiary countries?
- ✓ Are the current monitoring and evaluation tools used by the Project adequate to measure the impact of the Project's activities on skills of Ministries of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), National Parliaments and CSOs capacities?
- ✓ How effective is the project strategy and its approach in the planning and implementation of Project activities and in ensuring achievement of project results?

Efficiency

- ✓ To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- ✓ To what extent have the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- ✓ 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?
- ✓ To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- ✓ To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- ✓ To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- ✓ What indications are there that the project results will be or has been sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (legal frameworks, systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
- ✓ Is the project using appropriate capacity development methodologies to ensure effective transfer of legal, technical (investigative, monitoring, research, communication and education) and management knowledge and skills to skills of Ministries of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), National Parliaments and CSOs staff?
- ✓ To what extent has the project supported skills of Ministries of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), National Parliaments and CSOs in ensuring a gradual decrease on the involvement of international staff/experts to support its work?

- ✓ How and to what extent have the project activities contributed to the increase of ownership and engagement of the Ministries of Finance, Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), National Parliaments and CSOs to the implementation of the Project and its sustainability and ownership?
- ✓ To what extent south-south and triangular cooperation is used in the project's approach and activities? What is its impact in the project's exit strategy and sustainability?
- ✓ Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- ✓ To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- ✓ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and outcomes?
- ✓ Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- ✓ To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- ✓ What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- ✓ To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- ✓ To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- ✓ 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?
- ✓ To what extent do the project interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- ✓ What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

- ✓ To what extent have cross-cutting issues of this project, such as "Gender and Rights-based approach" and "Good Governance", have been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?

E. METHODOLOGY

The mid-term evaluation for the PRO PALOP-TL SAI (PHASE II) project will be carried out in accordance with UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation and Ethical Standards as well as OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and fully compliant with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE will be carried out by an external team of evaluators and will engage the stakeholders and beneficiaries, including government officials, donors, where applicable were programmes or advisory support were provided. This evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments and is expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP/EU has supported, and observed progress in at the country level. However, final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations among the programme unit, the evaluators and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE will provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The selected team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts UNDP Country Office and key stakeholders, including EU Delegations in the 6 countries. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP/EU support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, national documents, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

The evaluation report minimum contents and outline will be discussed with evaluation team at the beginning of their assignment. How the information has been obtained and analyzed should be specifically explained and all statements should be properly detailed and supported. The evaluation team will identify any limitations to the evaluation and propose strategies to mitigate them. The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

- Title
- Table of contents
- Acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive Summary (in Portuguese and English)
- Introduction Background and context
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and methods
- Data analysis
- Findings and conclusions
- Lessons learned
- Recommendations
- Annexes

The steps in data collection are anticipated but not limited to the following:

- Desk reviews: Review of existing documentation including, but not limited to, the Standard Contribution Agreement, PRODOC, Letter of Agreements, Memorandum of Understanding and Grants with implementing partners; various project document including mission reports; project monitoring/evaluation reports and other guidelines; Project quality assurance reports, steering committee meeting minutes, project ToC and results framework, activity design, training materials and training evaluation reports; knowledge products; social networks and communications platforms, among others.
- Stakeholder interviews: Interviews with key stakeholders including, but not limited to, European Commission Delegations, UNDP Country Offices, Supreme Audit Institutions, Parliaments, Ministries of Finances, Civil Society Organizations involved with the project activities, training/workshop participants and resource persons; staff of partner organizations in activities jointly carried out in the field.
- Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions: Its previewed missions to all beneficiary countries to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. A case study approach will be used to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the project.

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

As referred in the background section above, 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. As result, travel to the beneficiary countries has been subjected to severe limitations and travel within these countries likewise.

If it is not possible to travel to or within the countries 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.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible, then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field, if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

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. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

F. EVALUATION PRODUCTS / DELIVERABLES

Item	Deliverables		Qty	2021		Payments in %
	Products	Services		Due Date	Estimated Time to complete	
1	PRODUCT 1. Evaluation inception report including a workplan and evaluation schedule	An inception report should be prepared based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, by the evaluators before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits). It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.	1		10 working days	11,11%
2	PRODUCT 2. Draft evaluation (within an agreed length) report for comment	. The programme unit and key stakeholders including the evaluation reference group will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated 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 these guidelines.	1		58 working days	65,55%
3	PRODUCT 3. Audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed	The Draft evaluation report with comments and changes shall be submitted by the evaluation team with an audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed.	1		5 working days	5,55%
4	PRODUCT 4. Validation workshop (Presentations and other knowledge products)	The evaluation team shall present the final report conclusions and lessons learnt to the Evaluation reference Group of the mid-term and the programme's stakeholders.	1		1 working day	1,11%

	PRODUCT 5. Final report (submitted in Portuguese and English languages)	A final evaluation report, as outlined in the previous section, shall be submitted addressing comments, questions and clarifications.	1		15 working days	16,66%
5	Evaluation debriefings	Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings	1		1 working day	
					90 working days	100,00%

Important Notice:

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 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 consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

G. DURATION OF THE WORK

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE is expected to have a duration of 90 working days in a period of 4 months, with the estimate start date set for 4th June 2021. The evaluation team shall propose a detailed workplan with the schedule of the activities, as referred in the previous section.

Activity	Responsible party	Timeframe/Deadline
Evaluation inception report including a workplan and evaluation schedule	Evaluation team	10 working days
Field visits, interviews with partners, and key stakeholders	Evaluation team	44 working days
Draft evaluation report for comment	Evaluation team	14 working days
Audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed	Evaluation team	5 working days
Validation workshop (Presentations and other knowledge products)	Partners and the Evaluation team	1 working day
Finalization and submission of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first drafts). Final Report shall be submitted in Portuguese and English languages.	Evaluation team	15 working days
Evaluation debriefings	Evaluation team and UNDP	1 working day
Total No. of Working Days		90

H. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

This section details the technical qualifications of the firm to be recruited and the specific skills, competencies and characteristics required of the evaluator or each member of the evaluation team.

Qualifications of the Firm:

The minimum qualification for firms applying for this assignment will include:

- 1) At least 10 Years of experience in leading complex evaluations, especially in the field of development cooperation or UN agencies (UNDP included) and/or other international organizations evaluations;
- 2) At least 5 years of experience in economic governance, including significant experience in evaluation exercises and experience in advising/implementing/developing strategic and operational plans in the field of economic governance and Public Finance Management Systems;
- 3) Demonstrable experience working with National Government institutions, Parliaments, Supreme Audit Institutions, county governments, civil society institutions and the private sector at national and subnational level;
- 4) Evaluation team should have gender balance.

The Pro PALOP-TL SAI Phase II MTE will be undertaken by an external team of evaluators, hired as consultants, comprising of a Team Leader and Evaluators. The size of team will be proposed by the Contractors according to the needs and scope of this evaluation as stated in this ToR.

Qualifications of the Team Leader and other Evaluators:

Lead Expert

- Master's degree in Public Finances, public administration & organizational development or related social science field;
- Minimum 10 years of professional experience in evaluation exercises, experience in UNDP programmes and projects is an asset;
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience in economic governance and Public Finance Management Systems, experience in the PALOP-TL countries is an asset;
- Minimum 5 years of experience in advising/implementing/ developing strategic and operational plans in the project's main field, experience in the PALOP-TL countries is an asset;
- Knowledge of UN/UNDP and/or EU/EC policy and programming frameworks and work in the project field;
- Fluent oral and written communication skills in Portuguese and English (Portuguese is a requirement).
- Experience in implementing evaluations remotely.

Other(s) Expert(s)

- Master's degree in public administration & organizational development or related social science field;
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience in evaluation exercises, experience in UNDP programmes and projects is an asset;
- Minimum 5 years of professional experience in economic governance and Public Finance Management Systems, experience in the PALOP-TL countries is an asset;
- Minimum 3 years of experience in advising/implementing/ developing strategic and operational plans in the project field, experience in the PALOP-TL countries is an asset;
- Fluent oral and written communication skills in Portuguese and English (Portuguese is a requirement).
- Experience in implementing evaluations remotely.

Core competencies of the team:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN and EU values and ethical standards
- Promotes the mission, vision and strategic goals of the UN and EU
- Displays cultural, gender, age, religion and nationality sensitivity and adaptability
- Demonstrates ability to juggle competing demands, to manage time effectively and adhere to deadlines, and to work flexibly in a multicultural team.
- Demonstrates excellent written, graphical, and oral communication skills.

Functional competencies of the team:

- Substantial experience and understanding in evaluation standards and principles and experience/familiarity with EC and UNDP evaluation reporting framework;
- Good knowledge and expertise in economic governance, public finances management systems (PMF), external control and legislative oversight of public finances and expenditures with particular focus on PALOP and Timor-Leste contexts and institutions;
- Experience in providing practical advice to policy makers; be able to work well with counterparts;
- Good communication and interpersonal skills, ability to foster networks and partnerships, and good working knowledge of information and computer technology;
- Demonstrates knowledge of i) UN rules, regulations, policies, procedures and best practices in the project field, if existing; ii) the EC rules and regulations on project cycle management, aid delivery methods, operations cycle and financing modalities;
- Excellent negotiation and representational skills, with international organizations and/or diplomatic missions;
- Displays analytical judgment and demonstrated ability to handle confidential and politically sensitive issues in a responsible and mature manner;
- Demonstrates strong intellectual and operational capacity in providing and coordinating advisory services;
- Builds solid client relationships with strong networking and advocacy skills; focuses on impact and results; and
- Demonstrates the ability to manage complexities;

Performance management:

- Demonstrated ability to multitask under pressure and to meet strict deadlines;
- Excellent organizational skills and ability to work effectively in teams; and Self-management, including conflict management/negotiating skills.

I. EVALUATION ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) ['Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)⁴.

The Consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on its data. The Consultants 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.

J. MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP will select the firm and will be responsible for the management of the consortium of consultants or firm. RSCA the regional coordinator will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the Project Manager to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Office Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The project manager will arrange introductory meetings within UNDP and will establish initial contacts with partners and project implementation staff. The consultants assisted by the project manager/DRR will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The Management of CO will develop a management response to the evaluation within four weeks of report finalization.

⁴ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>.

An Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation will be convened by the CO management. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation reports to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team/firm is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detailed rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

It will be the responsibility of the consultants/firm to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites (if the current situation allows) and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed with the RSC if required.

The Evaluation Manager of this mid-term evaluation will convene an Evaluation reference Group comprising of technical experts (UNDP, EU, Partners and Governments) to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel 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 Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the Evaluation reference Group for any comment that remain unaddressed.

While interviews are an important instrument of this evaluation, all analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence and data. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and generalizable.

Two weeks after contract signing, the evaluation team will produce an Inception Report. The Inception Report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The Inception Report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the Project Unit before the evaluator's team proceed with site mission.

The Consultants will have access to office space, internet access and phone provided by UNDP Country Offices⁵ in the visited countries for undertaking the evaluation. Note that the evaluation foresees missions to all beneficiary countries.

K. SCOPE OF BID PRICE AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

•Lump sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery and approval of the services specified in the TOR.

In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel:

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

⁵ Costed by Pro PALOP-TL SAI resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimburse

L. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL AND OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

Technical proposal and Financial proposal (password protected) must be submitted as separate files with file names clearly indicated

1. Technical proposal with Qualifications of the Service Provider, the Proposed Methodology for the completion of Services; and the qualifications of the team members (composition, profile and CVs). The Technical Proposal shall be prepared using the Standard Form provided by UNDP. The Technical Proposal shall not include any price or financial information. A Technical Proposal containing financial information will be rejected.
2. Financial Proposal based on an all-inclusive lump sum amount. The Financial Proposal shall be prepared using the Standard Form provided by UNDP. It shall list all major cost components associated with the services, and the detailed breakdown of such costs. Any output and activities described in the Technical Proposal but not priced in the Financial Proposal, shall be assumed to be included in the prices of other activities or items, as well as in the final total price. Prices and other financial information must not be disclosed in any other place except in the financial proposal.

Required Documents that must be Submitted to Establish Qualification of Proposers

- Company Profile, which should not exceed ten (10) pages, including printed brochures and product catalogues relevant to the services being procured
- Tax Registration/Payment Certificate issued by the Internal Revenue Authority evidencing that the Bidder is updated with its tax payment obligations
- Certificate of Registration of the business, including Articles of Incorporation, or equivalent document if Bidder is not a corporation
- Statement of Satisfactory Performance from the Top 3 Clients in terms of Contract Value for the past 2 years
- All information regarding any past and current litigation during the last five (5) years, in which the bidder is involved, indicating the parties concerned, the subject of the litigation, the amounts involved, and the final resolution if already concluded;
- Written self-declaration that the company is not in the UN Security Council 1267/1989 List, UN Procurement Division or Other Ineligibility List.

The selected consultants will have the obligation to:

1. Before any travel, obtain the security permits for traveling to the countries where the services will be required. These permits may be obtained at www.undss.org.
2. Have the contract signed by the country office and the expert before starting the work and before starting any travel. If the expert travels and starts the work without having signed the contract, the work and travel will be at the expert's own risk and responsibility.
3. All background compiled and deliverables produced by the expert are the property of the UN agency. The expert must obtain written permission from the UN agency to use all or part of the documents for any other consulting or work.

M. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE BEST OFFER

The best offer will be selected using the Combined Scoring method (cumulative analysis) – where the Technical proposal will be weighted a max. of 70%, and the Financial proposal which will be weighted a max of 30%.

Financial Proposal (30%)

To be computed as a ratio of the Proposal’s offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.

Only Bidders obtaining a minimum of 490 out of 700 points at the technical evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

The financial score for the financial proposal will be calculated in the following manner:

- $S_f = 300 \times F_m/F$, in which S_f is the financial score, F_m is the lowest price and F the price of the proposal under consideration.
- (Total Financial Maximum points = 300 points);
- Total Score.

The technical score attained by each proposal will be used in determining the Total score as follows:

The weights given to the technical and financial proposals are: $T= 0.7$, $F=0.3$

The Total score will be calculated by formula: $TS = T \times 0.7 + F \times 0.3$

- TS - Is the total score of the proposal under consideration;
- T - Is technical score of the proposal under consideration;
- F - Is financial score of the proposal under consideration.

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable
1	Expertise of Firm / Organization & proposed team	50%	350
2	Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan	36%	250
3	Project Management Structure and Key Personnel	14%	100
T O T A L		100%	700

Technical Proposal Evaluation (Form 1)		
Expertise of the Firm / Organization		Points Obtainable
1.1	Reputation of Organization and Staff / Credibility / Reliability / Industry Standing	25
1.2	General Organizational Capability, which is likely to affect implementation, Quality Assurance Procedure	25
1.3	Expertise / Experience of the firm and organization:	100

	Experience in leading complex evaluations, especially in the field of development cooperation or UN agencies (UNDP included) and/or other international organizations evaluations	40
	Experience in economic governance, including significant experience in evaluation exercises and experience in advising/implementing/developing strategic and operational plans in the field of economic governance and Public Finance Management Systems	35
	Demonstrable experience working with National Government institutions, Parliaments, Supreme Audit Institutions, county governments, civil society institutions and the private sector at national and subnational level;	15
	Evaluation team should have gender balance.	10
	SUB TOTAL	150

Technical Proposal Evaluation (Form 2)		
Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan		
2.1	To what degree does the Proposer understand the task and propose a consistent methodological and approach	100
2.2	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task and corresponding to the TOR?	150
2.3	Innovation and relevance of the proposed methodology, including capacity building approach and specialist contributions and working plan	100
2.4	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation of the evaluation?	100
	SUB TOTAL	450

Technical Proposal Evaluation (Form 3)		
Management Structure and Key Personnel		
3.1	Team Leader	
	- Academic Qualification	30
	- Team Leader/coordination experience	50
	- Language qualification	20
	Sub-total	100
Additional Evaluation Team Members (For evaluation purposes the average score of the additional members will be applied)		
3.2	Evaluator(s) and other members	
	- Academic Qualification	100
	- Professional experience in the relevant area (evaluation)	100

	- Technical experience with provision of public finances management systems and external control of public finances' assistance by UN/UNDP and/or the EU/EC	100
	<i>Sub-total</i>	300
SUB TOTAL		400
Total Technical Proposal Points		1000

This TOR is approved by:

Signature: *Ricardo Godinho Gomes*

Name and Designation: **Ricardo Godinho Gomes,**
Chief Technical Advisor, Pro PALOP-TL SAI (Phase II)

Date of Signing: 28.04.2021