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| 1. **BACKGROUND** | |
| The ASEAN Economic Community is the 7th largest economy with a combined Gross Domestic Product of US$2.6 Trillion, which represents a huge potential for lifting people out of poverty in the region. However poor governance and corrupt practices have been cited as the most significant challenge to doing business, which increases inequalities and threatens the sustainability of economic and social development in the region. There is a momentum created by the ASEAN Vision 2025 and the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development to work jointly with governments and private sector in "instilling a culture of integrity within ASEAN".  The Project "[Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN - FairBiz](https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/fairbiz/en/home.html)" (2018-2021), supported by the UK Government ASEAN Economic Reform Programme, aims to promote a fair business environment in ASEAN by minimizing corruption risks and encouraging sustainable practices.  The Project delivered four outputs, contributing to the outcome of “Improved business practices adopted and corruption risks minimized to create a fairer business environment in ASEAN”:   1. Encourage partnerships between the public and private sectors, as well as civil society and development partners at the regional level, to implement and monitor integrity policies in ASEAN; 2. Improve transparency in government contracts and increase compliance with international procurement and trade standards; 3. Promote business integrity and sustainable practices for private companies and state-owned enterprises; 4. Strengthen anti-corruption strategies, policies and laws and improve redress mechanisms for companies, investors and the broader public.   The Project targets six countries in ASEAN: Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. Viet Nam, Myanmar and Thailand were identified in 2018 as “priority countries”, receiving the most funding. Since February 2021, project implementation in Myanmar has halted due to the military coup. Allocations to countries were in part decided since the planning phase, while in part were assigned through grants (“expressions of interest”) for particular initiatives supporting business integrity and sustainable business practcies. Annual workplans by the COs were presented and approved every year, requiring however periodic updates and adjustments in response to the uncertainty created by the pandemic and subsequent ban to travel, organize meetings, as well as other political and civil unrest in some countries (i.e. Myanmar coup, Thailand protests, Malaysia political changes).  The project is managed by the FairBiz team at UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, and by FairBiz focal points in the Country Offices (not working full time on FairBiz). At the regional level, CoST, the Infrastructure Transparency Initiative, has been selected as a key implementing partner for some activities under Output 2 on transparent public procurement. All the other components are directly managed and implemented by UNDP, in some cases establishing specific partnerships at the country level.  FairBiz adopted a multi-stakeholders approach and worked not only with government counterparts (mainly public procurement agencies, anti-corruption agencies and judicial institutions), but also with business sector and civil society. FairBiz is one of the key projects driving private sector engagement at Bangkok Regional Hub. A [Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG)](https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/fairbiz/en/home/FairBiz-Integrity-Hub.html) was founded in 2019 and comprises experts from within and beyond ASEAN, who participate in their personal capacity, providing advise on the direction and activities our project can take to promote dialogue between public and private sector.  In the course of 2020, the Fairbiz strategy has been defined by setting up the [FairBiz Integrity Hub](https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/fairbiz/en/home/FairBiz-Integrity-Hub.html) and its thematic platforms.  The project was part of several evaluations and reviews to date, whose recommendations were taken into account during project implementation:   * Cycle 1 evaluation of the ASEAN Economic Reform (AER) Programme conducted by independent evaluators of the UK Government Prosperity Fund Evaluation and Learning Unit, in 2019. This focused particularly on design, contextual analysis and alignment with Prosperity Fund thematic objectives. Deep dive on Myanmar and Viet Nam country programmes. Suggestions to edit our Theory of Change were made and accepted by the FairBiz team to better aligned with revisions of the overall AER Programmed revised ToC. * Cycle 2 evaluation of the ASEAN Economic Reform (AER) Programme conducted by independent evaluators of the UK Government Prosperity Fund Evaluation and Learning Unit, in 2020. This focused particularly on implementation and progress towards results. Deep dive on Thailand country programme and CoST partnership’s results. UNDP project was highlighted as having surpassed transparency and anti-corruption targets, leading in gender and inclusion among the implementing partners of the UK Government AER Programme. * [Mid-term Progress Review Report](https://www.undp.org/content/dam/Fairbiz-Asia/docs/undp-fairbiz-Midterm-progress-review-2020.pdf) was commissioned by FairBiz team and published in April 2020 * The [Mid Term Review of the Asia Pacific RPD](https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/documents/download/18441), conducted in November 2020, included also a “deep dive” in FairBiz, and CO stakeholders were also interviewed.   The past evaluation reports are already saved here in the [evaluation folder](https://teams.microsoft.com/_#/files/General?threadId=19%3Ac4ab431e057e40ed9e286375f62a4c4c%40thread.tacv2&ctx=channel&context=Evaluation%2520reports&rootfolder=%252Fsites%252FFairBizproject%252FShared%2520Documents%252FGeneral%252FRegional%2520project%2520document%252C%2520reports%252C%2520workplans%252FEvaluation%2520reports)  in FairBiz public Teams. Access to the folder will be provided to the selected IC. Access to project documents, reports from first and second project board meetings, annual workpland, donor agreement and all necessary documents are stored in Teams folders and access will be provided to the selected IC.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION** | | | | **Project/outcome title** | Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN | | | **Atlas ID** | 00110713 | | | **Corporate outcome and output** | **Contributing to RPD Outcomes**   * Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development   (RPD for Asia and the Pacific 2018-2021, Outcome 2; UNDP SP 2018-2021 Outcome 2)   * Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions   (UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Outcome 1)  **Indicative RPD Outputs**:   * National, local and urban governance institutions are transparent and accountable for equitable access to services.   (RPD for Asia and the Pacific 2018-2021, Output 2.2.; UNDP SP 2018-2021 Output 2.2.2)   * Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti- corruption measures to maximize availability of resources for poverty eradication.   (UNDP SP 2018-2021 Output 1.2.3) | | | **Country** | Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam | | | **Region** | ASEAN | | | **Date project document signed** | 21 May 2018 (Amendment signed on 30 June 2020) | | | **Project dates** | **Start** June 2018 | **Planned end** 30September 2021[[1]](#footnote-2) | |  |  | | **Project budget** | **5,300,000 GBP** (corresponding to 7,312,410 USD at time of signature in 2018) | | | **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** | **6,037,866.03 USD (as at 21 June 2021)** | | | **Funding source** | **UK FCDO** | | | **Implementing party[[2]](#footnote-3)** | **UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub – FairBiz Team** | | | |
| 1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES** | |
| Responding to the Theory of Change (ToC) as described in the project document, the agreed result framework (RRF) and the approved workplans, the final evaluation should look at **the relevance of the project, quality of the project design, effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation to date and sustainability of the overall project results.** To meet these ends, the final evaluation will serve to:   * assess project performance and progress against the expected outcome, expected outputs, targets including indicators presented in the results framework * review and document the success and draw out lessons for deepening impact * assess the effectiveness of the project’s engagement with stakeholders, particularly procurement offices, Chambers of Commerce, business associations, private sector companies. * review role of the project in enhancing the importance of and the space accountability and business integrity at the regional level, including through contributing knowledge, guidance * identify challenges and the effectiveness of the strategic approaches that the project adopted for addressing those challenges, and * ascertain the relevance, effectiveness, coherence, efficiency and sustainability of the project interventions   **The Scope of the Final Evaluation**  The objectives of this final evaluation are threefold:  1. To assess progress of the FairBiz project against the project objectives and evaluate whether the project achieved expected results, as envisioned by the [project document](https://teams.microsoft.com/l/file/7521194E-663E-4B39-BA2A-247F0B840EE2?tenantId=b3e5db5e-2944-4837-99f5-7488ace54319&fileType=pdf&objectUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fundp.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FFairBizproject%2FShared%20Documents%2FGeneral%2FRegional%20project%20document%2C%20reports%2C%20workplans%2FProject%20Document%20FCO%20Revised%2015.8.18.pdf&baseUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fundp.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FFairBizproject&serviceName=teams&threadId=19:c4ab431e057e40ed9e286375f62a4c4c@thread.tacv2&groupId=da51d987-e517-46f7-a821-28fc8b58c098) and [RRF](https://teams.microsoft.com/l/file/1DB5A49C-8B3A-41C1-9603-52B30AE37E7D?tenantId=b3e5db5e-2944-4837-99f5-7488ace54319&fileType=pdf&objectUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fundp.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FFairBizproject%2FShared%20Documents%2FGeneral%2FRegional%20project%20document%2C%20reports%2C%20workplans%2FRRF%20Update%20Jun21.pdf&baseUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fundp.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2FFairBizproject&serviceName=teams&threadId=19:c4ab431e057e40ed9e286375f62a4c4c@thread.tacv2&groupId=da51d987-e517-46f7-a821-28fc8b58c098)  2. To evaluate the implementation of the project and its capacity to adapt to a rapidly evolving crisis context determined by covid-19 pandemic and in response to recommendations from previous reviews and evaluations  3. To assess the project’s alignment with and contribution to UNDP RPD and Strategic Plan 2018-2021, and provide forward-looking recommendations, lessons learned and good practices, that can inform the development of FairBiz Gen 2.  The final evaluation will be based on a desk review of project related documents, including the FairBiz project document, cost sharing agreement, workplans, result framework, progress reports, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub Regional Programme Document Mid-term review (RPD MTR), and along with relevant communication materials and knowledge products and in depth virtual/online interviews as outlined in the methodology section.  The Final Evaluation will target FairBiz countries in Thailand, Indonesia, the Phillippines, Malaysia, Vietnam and Myanmar. It should also focus on the regionality aspect of the project which covers all the regional interventions led by the service advisory team based at UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub. | |
|  | |
| 1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS** | |
| The Final Evaluation will address the principles of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability as defined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) Evaluation Criteria. The consultant will evaluate the achievements against its objectives and result indicators. The final evaluation should answer the following key guiding questions:  *Table 2 - Criteria and Guiding Questions*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Key Questions** | | **Answers to Key Questions** | | 1. **Relevance** | To what extent the overall design and approaches of the project were relevant? | |  | | To what extent, the inputs and strategies identified were realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? | |  | | To what extent did the Project achieve its overall outputs and contributions to outcomes are clear? | |  | | To what extent the project was/is able to address the needs of the three tiers of governments in the changed context? | |  | | To what extent were the output level results achieved and how did the project  contribute to project outcomes? | |  | | What are UNDP's strengths and comparative advantages in business integrity and anti-corruption work vis-à-vis other partners? | |  | | 1. **Efficiency** | To what extent is the existing project management structure appropriate and  efficient in generating the expected results? | |  | | Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated  strategically to achieve outcomes? | |  | | Was the process of achieving results efficient? Were the resources effectively  utilized? | |  | | Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions funded  nationally and/or by other donors? | |  | | What are the added value of the project’s regionality approach for influencing anticorruption and business integrity at country levels? | |  | | To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents (including private sector), changing partner priorities and  recommendations from previous reviews and evaluations? | |  | | How did factors beyond the control of the programme, for instance the COVID-19 pandemic, affect programme implementation and what remedial measures did the programme adopt to deal with these external factors? | |  | | How did FairBiz manage to incorporate, support and benefit from the stream  of work on judicial integrity, mainly known to the public through the Judicial  Integrity Network in ASEAN, initiative jointly funded by UK Government FCDO  and US State Department, INL? | |  | | 1. **Effectiveness** | How effective was the project's structure, coordination and implementation of  work at the regional and country levels, and how it could be improved to  contribute to the successful implementation of a possible FairBiz Gen2  project? | |  | | How effective is the Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG) for business  engagement? | |  | | How is the FairBiz Integrity Hub Platforms structure effective to drive multi-stakeholders engagement across key thematic areas? How is it integrated in  the project implementation modality and is it understood at the Country Office  level? | |  | | How effective were the partnerships established/supported with governments  and non-state actors (e.g. civil society organisations, private sector, etc.)? | |  | | How effective has been the coordination amongst relevant UNDP teams and  country offices and between UNDP and other international and partner  organisations (OECD, ADB, UNODC, UNGC, UN Women)? | |  | | What are the key internal and external factors (success & failure factors) that  have contributed, affected, or impeded the achievements, and how UNDP and  the partners have managed these factors? | |  | | How effective was the introduction of grants for the support of different  country initiatives on business integrity (EOI 1 and EOI 2), in order to provide  seed funding to support engagement with the private sector. Did this  contributed to achieving impact and results or did it lead to fragmentation? | |  | | 1. **Impact** | What concrete change(s) has occurred as a result of the project? | |  | | What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries? | |  | | Has intra-regional knowledge sharing at the country office level significantly contributed to the corporate results framework? | |  | | 1. **Sustainability** | What tangible results or impact have been achieved through the activities  implemented, and is there evidence of sustainability? | |  | | To what extent are the project approaches in integrating business integrity  measures and learnings into SMEs/ business associations likely to be  institutionalized and implemented after the completion of this project? | |  | | What is the likelihood of the continuation and sustainability of the anticorruption  and business integrity after the completion of the project? | |  | | How were capacities of business associations/SMEs strengthened at the national  levels? | |  | | How did FairBiz contribute to development of knowledge and expertise facilitating advocacy and multi-stakeholders dialogue? | |  | | Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects  of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the  approach? | |  | | Can the FairBiz project methodology and approach be replicated and up-scaled in  its present form? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology and  approach? What would be necessary to support replication and up-scaling? | |  | | 1. **Diversity & Inclusion** | To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality  and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? | |  | | How can the project further broaden in a future phase its contribution to enhancing  diversity and inclusion? | |  | | To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality  and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? How can  the project further broaden in a future phase its contribution to enhancing  diversity and inclusion? | |  | | To what extent have local communities, women, youth, people with disabilities  and other disadvantaged groups benefited from the work of FairBiz? | |  | | **Principled** | | *Has the project applied Social and Environmental Screening checklist of UNDP?* | | | | **Management and Monitoring** | | *Has the project monitored the results of progress against indicators?*  *Has the project established a strong M&E standards?* | | | | |
| 1. **METHODOLOGY** | |
| The final evaluation methodology suggested here are indicative only. The final evaluation consultant should review the methodology and propose the final methods and data collection tools as part of the inception report. The final evaluation should build upon the available programme documents, online interviews with key informants and gathered from focus groups discussion, which would provide an opportunity for more in-depth analysis and understanding of the FairBiz project. The evaluation consultant is expected to frame the evaluation using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The methods and tools should adequately address the issues of the FairBiz project.  The consultant must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, business associations, relevant SMEs, project team, UNDP COs, UNDP BRH and key stakeholders. The final evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data adopting appropriate methods. Some of the data collection methods are listed in below table 3.  *Table 3 – Some Methods of Collecting Data*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review of related literature | The Final Evaluation Consultant is expected to carry out the following activities while reviewing the related literature:   1. Desk study of relevant literature 2. Study and review of all relevant project documentation, including the FairBiz project document, Results and Resource Framework, Annual Workplans, Audit Reports, Results-oriented Analysis Reports (ROARs), project evaluations, quarterly narrative progress and financial reports, etc.) 3. Evidence sources (such as monitoring reports, project studies, guides, , etc.) | | Online Interviews/Consultations | 1. In depth interviews (online) to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology 2. Focus Group discussion (online) with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders. 3. Interviews (online) with relevant key informants 4. Online meetings and or discussions with relevant stakeholders to complement the information received from other sources and for triangulation of information. 5. Online surveys or zoom meetings may be conducted to solicit feedback. |   Gender and Human Rights-based Approach  As part of the requirement, evaluation must include an assessment of the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated gender equality perspective and rights-based approach. The evaluators are requested to review UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation during the inception phase1 . In addition, the methodology used in the evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods should be human rights and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with evaluation data and findings disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, etc – with a focus on people with disabilitites. Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of final evaluation from which findings are consolidated to make recommendations and identify lessons learned for enhanced genderresponsive and rights-based approach of the project. These evaluation approach and methodology should consider different types of groups in the project intervention – women, youth, minorities, and vulnerable groups. | |
| 1. **EXPECTED DELIVERABLES** | |
| In line with the above-mentioned scope of work and methodology, the consultant will provide for the following outputs and deliverables:  *Table 4 - Expected Deliverables and Descriptions*     | **#** | **Deliverables** | **Description** | **Due date** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Workplan and methodology | The workplan should provide clear timeline of how each final evaluation steps will be undertaken. Considering the travel restriction due to COVID 19, the consultant is required to provide clear interview and/or focus group discussion scheduled online as this will required coordination support from the FairBiz project team at BRH. As UNDP BRH just completed the RPD MTR, the consultant is expected to review the RDP MTR findings and methodology used for the process as this will help inform the design of final evaluation approach and methodology. The final evaluation methodology should provide a specific assessment framework, covering both quantitative and qualitative dimensions, with a detailed list of required stakeholders who need to be interviewed for the final evaluation.The draft methodology can be adjusted later once the consultant has completed the desk review of the project related documents. The final evaluation approach and methodology can be presented as a part of the Inception Report. | 10 days after the contract signed | | 2 | FairBiz Inception report | * The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, building on what has been provisionally proposed in this ToR. * It should be prepared by the consultant before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. * It should detail the reviewing approach, proposed format and table of content of the evaluation report. * It must also outline reviewers’ understanding of what is being reviewed and why, showing how each area of inquiry will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. This information should be provided through the preparation of a Final Evaluation Matrix. * The inception report should provide FairBiz team and the Final Evaluation consultant with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the assignment, the same understanding of the ToC and clarify any misunderstandings at the outset.   Inception repo0rt must include a sample evaluation matrix as below:  Table  Description automatically generated | 25 August 2021 | | 3 | Final evaluation matrix | This matrix should include key evaluation criteria, indicators, question and sub-questions to capture and assess them. | 1st September 2021 | | 4 | Final Evaluation evaluation briefing | After completion of data collection or before sharing the draft report, the evaluator should present preliminary debriefing and findings to UNDP Advisory Team and final evaluation reference group at UNDP BRH. | 10th September 2021 | | 5 | Draft Final Evaluation report | * The Final Evaluation Reference Group will review the draft FairBiz Final Evaluationreport to ensure that it meets the required quality standards and covers all agreed components and contents of the final evaluation. Detailed comments and feedback on the draft report will be provided to the evaluation consultant, and discussions may be held to provide clarifications as necessary. * The draft report will also be shared with stakeholders and other partners, including UK government, for additional feedback and inputs. * Evaluator should submit a comprehensive draft report consisting of major findings and recommendations for future course of action. | 22nd September 2021 | | 6 | Final Evaluation report | * The final evaluation report will be produced by the Consultant based on feedback received on the draft report. The final report will be shared with UK government, stakeholders and other relevant partners. * The final draft report should be submitted within the given timeline with enough detail and quality. | 27th September 2021 | | 7 | Audit Trail Form | The comments and changes by the consultant in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator in form of audit trial to show they have addressed comments.  This document can be submitted as an Annex to the final evaluation report. | 28th September 2021 | | |
|  | |
| Evaluation team composition and required competencies | |
|  | |
| The Final Evaluation requires only one international consultant to complete the exercise Following here is the anticipated number of working days required in each final evaluation process with total number of working days not exceeding 30 workings days during 13 August- 15 Oct 2021.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Deliverables/ Outputs** | **Estimated Person days to Complete** | | Final Evaluation inception report (including final methodology, data collection tools and questions, proposed data collection schedules, evaluation matrix, evaluation briefing etc) | 5 days | | Desk review and analysis | 5 days | | Interviews and analysis | 5 days | | Final evaluation draft report | 5 days | | Debrief on draft findings and recommendations to the management | 2 days | | Final Evaluation Second Report | 5 days | | Final evaluation draft[[3]](#endnote-2) | 2 days | | Final Presentation | 1 days | | **Total** | **30 Days** |   The final report is expected to meet IEO’s UNDP guidelines for template[[4]](#footnote-4) and Quality Criteria[[5]](#footnote-5).   | **Who (Responsible)** | **What (Responsibilities)** | | --- | --- | | Governance and Peace Building Team Lead | * Assure smooth, quality and independent implementation of the evaluation with needful guidance from UNDP’s Senior Management. * Prepare and approve ToR and selection criteria. * Hire the national consultant by reviewing proposals and complete the recruitment process. * Ensure the independent implementation of the evaluation process. * Approve each steps of the evaluation including inception report * Supervise, guide and provide feedback and comments to the evaluation consultants. * Ensure quality of the evaluation. * Ensure the Management Response and action plans are fully implemented | | FaiBiz project manager | * Draft ToR to be reviewed and finalized by the *Evaluation Manager* * Support in hiring the consultant * Provide necessary information and coordination with different stakeholders including donor communities * Provide feedback and comments on draft report * Prepare management response and action plan and follow up the implementation | | FairBiz Project Team | * Provide required information, furnishing documents for review to the consultant team. * Logistic arrangements, such as for support in setting up stakeholder meetings, arranging field visits and coordinating with the Government. | | Final Evaluation Consultant | * Review the relevant documents. * Develop and submit a draft and final inception report * Conduct evaluation. * Maintain ethical considerations. * Develop and submit a draft evaluation report * Organize meeting/consultation to discuss the draft report * Incorporate inputs and feedback in draft report * Submit final report with due consideration of quality and effectiveness * Organize sharing of final evaluation report | | Evaluation Reference Group | * The Final Evaluation Reference Group comprised of Programme Team Lead, Head of PMU, Regional M&E Specialist, donors and other stakeholders as relevant. * Review draft report and provide feedback * Participate in debriefing session and provide suggestions |   The Final Evaluation Consultant will be briefed by UNDP Evaluation Manager upon arrival on the objectives, purpose and output of the evaluation. An oral debriefing by the Final Evaluation Consultant on the proposed work plan and methodology will be done and approved prior to the commencement of the process.  The FairBiz final evaluation will remain fully independent. The evaluation Consultant maintains all the communication through the Evaluation Manager during the implementation of the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager should clear each step of the evaluation. Evaluation report must meet the requirements from the Independent Evaluation Office’s guidelines which will be provided as part of the inception meeting.  Contractors will arrange online final presentation with UNDP BRH and relevant stakeholders and noted comments from participants which will be incorporated in the final report.  The final report will be signed off by UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, Manager. | |
| 1. **7. DEGREE OF EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS**   The consultant will have the following experience:  **Education**:   * Master’s Degree in Public Administration, Law, Political Science, Finance, Economics, International Relations, Development Studies, or related fields;   **Professional experience:**   * At least 7 years of professional experience in programme assessment, monitoring and evaluation in a development context, policy support, programme management or design of governance, integrity or anti-corruption projects; * Prior experience in producing research studies (preferably in governance, integrity or anti-corruption) * Proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing * Prior experience in conducting mid-term review or final evaluation preferably related to UN work related to governance, integrity or anticorruption work   **Knowledge and Skills:**   * Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative assessment methods; * Excellent analytical skills; * Strong communication and interpersonal skills and experience in holding consultations, build partnerships and maintain impartiality; * Ability to conduct stakeholder interviews and collect data remotely; * Knowledge of governance, business integrity, transparency and anti-corruption is an asset. * Knowledge of the UN / UNDP system is an asset.   **Language Required**:   * Excellent knowledge, both oral and written, of English with presentational capacities is required;   **Functional Competencies:**   * Ability to work independently; * Ability to perform tasks in a timely manner and produce quality final product; * Strong interpersonal, communication and diplomacy skills; * Openness to change and ability to receive and integrate feedback.   **Corporate Competencies:**   * Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards; * Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP; * Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability; * Treats all people fairly without favoritism; * Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity.   + 1. **SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS**   The contract will be on a Lump-sum basis.  Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, living allowance and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Milestone/ Deliverable**  **(*list of documents or actions expected to be performed by the consultant*)** | **Payment Terms in % of Total Contract Amount** | | 1st instalment:  Upon satisfactory completion of **inception report** | **40%** | | 2nd instalment:  Upon satisfactory delivery of **findings presentation** and completion of **Final evaluation report** | **60%** |   It is important to note that multiple iterations of the report may be required for the satisfactory completion of the report.  In general, UNDP shall 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.  In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant prior to travel and will be reimbursed.  Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. | |
| * + 1. **APPLICATION PROCEDURE**   Interested individuals must submit the following documents mentioned below to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document.  Any individual employed by a company, organization or institution who would like to submit a proposal in response to this Individual Contract notice must do so in their individual capacity.   * **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II (<https://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=78292>) * **A Curriculum Vitae (CV) or P.11 Personal History Form** (available at <http://sas.undp.org/documents/p11_personal_history_form.doc>), stipulating applicant’s official name as shown in identification document, the qualifications and professional experiences (with similar projects) relevant to the assignment/TOR and the contact details (email address, telephone numbers) of 3 professional references * **A signed financial proposal,** quoted in US dollars, outlining the all-inclusive fee, supported by a breakdown of reimbursable – direct and indirect – costs such as travel, lodging, per diem etc.   **Note:** if an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP (Annex II of the Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability).   * **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment (max 1 page).   **Incomplete proposals may not be considered. The shortlisted candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified.**   * + 1. **EVALUATIONP METHOD AND SELECTION CRITERIA**   **Evaluation Methods and Criteria**  Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:  **Cumulative analysis**  The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%), and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.  **Technical Criteria for Evaluation (max 70 points)**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Criteria | Criteria Description | Score  (points) | | 1 | * An advanced university degree (Master’s Degree or higher) in Public Administration, Law, Political Science, Finance, Economics, International Relations, Development Studies, or related fields | 2 | | 2 | * At least 7 years of professional experience in programme assessment, monitoring and evaluation in a development context, policy support, programme management or design of governance, integrity or anti-corruption projects | 30 | | 3 | * Prior experience in producing research studies (preferably in governance, integrity or anti-corruption) | 13 | | 4 | * Demonstrated experience in conducting mid-term review and/or final evaluation related to UN work | 30 | | 5 | * Proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing | 15 | | 6 | * Excellent knowledge of English with presentational capacities is required | 10 | |  | **TOTAL** | **100** |   Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total 100 points in technical evaluation) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation respectively.  For those passing technical and interview evaluation above, offers will be evaluated per the Combined Scoring method:  a) Technical Evaluation (70%)  b) Financial Evaluation (30%)  Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.  **Evaluation Ethics**  To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in a MTR and MTR consultants working for the United Nations system are required to commit themselves in conducting the MTR in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation[[6]](#footnote-6). 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 data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.”  Consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.   * + 1. **ANNEXES**[[7]](#footnote-7)   1. List of relevant documents: Project Document (both first phase and second phase), Prodoc, Annual Work Plans, Periodic Progress Report, Financial Reports, Knowledge products etc.   2. List of key agencies, stakeholders and partners for review   **UNDP & Development Partner**   * \*\*   1. Inception Report Contents Outline   2. Evaluation matrix   3. Format of the evaluation report   4. Evaluation Audit Trial Form   5. UNEG Code of Conduct   **This ToR is approved by:**  Signature  Nicholas Booth  UNDP BRH Governance Team Leader    Date of Signing 12 July 2021 | |

1. Initially set to end in March 2021, in June 2020 it was extended for 6 months to compensate for the delays due to the outbreak of covid-19 pandemic. Currently there are negotiations whether to further extend it until March 2022, in line with the closing of the UK Government financial year and to allow for appropriate evaluation, closure and possible transition to a second phase [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Multiple reiterations may be required prior to approval of the final report which must comply with Independent Evaluation Office’s Quality Standards available [here](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml). [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
4. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP\_Evaluation\_Guidelines.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at: <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. These documents will be provided after signing of the contract. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)