UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Partnering Against Violent Extremism (PAVE) Programme
2017 – 2021

Position Information:	Project Evaluation

Title:	Partnering Against Violent Extremism (PAVE)
ATLAS ID	00107381
Corporate Outcome/Output	3.2.1. National capacities strengthened for reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism in response to national policies and priorities.
Country/Duty Station:	Khartoum, Sudan with frequent travel to the field
Type of Contract:	Individual Consultant
Post Level:	National Consultant
Language requirements:	English (Arabic highly desirable)
Starting Date:	02 May 2021
Duration of assignment/Planned end date:	5 weeks (25 working days)
Direct Supervisor:	PAVE Programme Manager
Project Implementing Party	BADYA CENTRE FOR INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT, CHILD DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION (CDF), CAFA DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION RAIRA FOR AWARENESS AND DEVELOPMENT ORG CHILD RIGHT CARE SOCIETY BUILDING RESILIENCE DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZA

1.   Background and Context

The 21st century is experiencing a proliferation of violent extremism and terrorism that is sweeping across the globe, taking the lives of many in different nations. The list of attacks from violent extremists continues and is on the rise. While all persons are impacted, the main victims continue to be Muslims from the Islamic world including Iraq, Nigeria, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria, Somalia, Yemen, Sudan, Central African Republic, Indonesia and Cameroon amongst others. The growth of violent extremism and devastating impact of groups espousing violent ideologies is setting in motion a dramatic reversal of development gains previously achieved and threatening to stunt prospects of development for decades to come. Religious-inspired extremism alone has claimed the lives of more than 18,000 people in Africa in the last several years, according to the Global Terrorism Database.

Radicalization, an important precursor to violent extremism, is also on the rise globally, impacting different age groups regardless of gender, faith, education, employment status, etc. The impact on the lives and livelihoods of those who have lost family members, friends and colleagues in the multiple tragedies in marketplaces, universities, places of worship and schools is immeasurable. As a result of increasing levels of violence and insecurity, many children and students across the African continent are no longer able to attend school or university, undermining their quality of life both now and prospects for the future. Indeed, the phenomenon is disproportionately impacting youth. Marginalized from political processes, lacking viable employment options and suffering from an increasing sense of marginalization and isolation, youth are easy targets for recruiters who lure or coerce boys and girls and young men and women with a diverse mix of religious narratives, financial incentives, a glimmer of hope, a sense of belonging and identity, and often, with violence.

In 2014, the UN Security Council passed a resolution condemning VE calling upon Member States to support efforts to adopt longer-term solutions to addressing underlying causes of radicalization and VE, including by empowering youth. The resolution, which provides a basis for the UN Global Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism presented to the UN General Assembly in 2015, notes effective responses require promoting political and religious tolerance, economic development, social cohesion, inclusiveness, resolving armed conflicts, and facilitating reintegration and rehabilitation. In particular, the PAVE programme will build upon the stage set by the UN system, complementing the work of other actors through partnerships, collaboration and coordination assisting the Government of Sudan's (GoS) efforts to mitigate VE.

The project will be implemented by UNDP alongside a government counterpart, the Sudan National Commission for Counter Terrorism (SNCCT). Linkages with existing UN frameworks globally includes Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 on peace, justice, and strong institutions; specifically, indicator 16.10 aimed to "Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime".
Aligned with the current CPD (2018-2021) Outcome 2: By 2021, community security and stabilization of people affected by conflict is improved through utilization of effective conflict management mechanisms, peace dividends and support to peace infrastructures and durable solutions that augment peaceful coexistence and social cohesion.

Output 2.1. Conflict-affected livelihoods revitalized and stabilized (national).
Output 2.2: Local and national peace infrastructures boosted.

Confronted by the wave of radicalization towards VE in neighboring countries and the region by groups such as the Islamic State, Al-Shabaab, Boko Haram, Al Qaeda and others, Sudan is affected by structural 'push' factors including the perception by youth of their exclusion in the social and political fabric of society, inequalities associated with high unemployment, economic disparities, sub-optimal governance performance and rule of law (RoL), insecurity and social isolation related to the youth of Sudanese origin, who migrated back to Sudan from other countries. The country also harbors 'pull' factors associated with identity and individual motives for radicalizing and joining VE groups, such as attaining a sense of purpose and belonging, a sense of adventure and means to increase status through material and social incentives (marriage, money), material awards in the afterlife and fear of repercussions for disengagement among others. Recalling Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) on peace, justice, and strong institutions, the Partnering Against Violent Extremism (PAVE) firmly positions the GoS in the driver's seat for Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE) efforts with national ownership and capacity development being cornerstone of the PAVE.

As a means to better understand the trends of VE in Sudan, UNDP in coordination with the SNCCT and some civil society actors set precedence by undertaking a ground-breaking gender inclusive study in 2016-17, exploring the drivers behind radicalization and VE in Sudan. Representing a foundational shift in P/CVE for Sudan, 377 key people were interviewed, including former VE group members from the Islamic State and former Guantanamo Bay prisoners, their families, as well as community members and leaders. As is the case in other contexts, evidence suggests several trajectories for radicalization towards VE in Sudan. Specific to Sudan, some persons begin the radicalization process in country. Upon migration into a neighbouring, or non-contiguous country, the process escalates towards VE. A secondary dynamic occurs whereby a person is radicalized towards VE while in Sudan, and then migrates to a foreign country to carry out a violent act. In addition, persons migrating from Sudan are subject to human trafficking where they are coerced into joining VE groups and are subsequently radicalized. The study also suggests that such people move to the Mediterranean coast and onwards to mainland Europe, while some others move into countries such as Libya, Syria and Iraq. The study also showed differences between 'why' people actually associate and join VE groups, and the 'perceptions' of why they join.

Confronted by the wave of radicalization and terrorism in neighboring countries, especially the threats posed by the spread of the Islamic State and other terrorist groups, Sudan currently faces major challenges in addressing radicalization towards violent extremism within its own borders. Sudan is considered an "at risk" country surrounded by violent extremism and affected by push factors that include youth marginalization; social and political inequalities associated with high unemployment, economic disparities, and systematic and institutional corruption. Sudan also harbors pull factors demonstrated by high rates of radicalization, rendering the country particularly vulnerable and a major contributor to violent extremism. While Sudan faces a daunting mix of political, economic, and security challenges, a number of developments and events over the past years represents a potential turning point, notable among them is addressing ongoing conflicts within Sudan, the constitution of the Sudan National Commission for Counter Terrorism (SNCCT), and partial lifting of the sanctions imposed by the United States (US) for the recognition of the efforts made by the Sudanese Government in countering violent extremism and terrorism in Sudan.

Situational Analysis: Sudan's context dynamics of radicalization & violent extremism

Sudan demonstrates several distinct dynamics and characteristics that the PAVE project considers in the formulation of this project document. Currently 46.5% of the population lives below the poverty line. The national Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy (2012) indicates that poverty remains persistent due to inefficient development plans and strategies, reduced public expenditures on basic services and erosion of land and natural resources. Significant disparities between urban and rural areas contribute to an increasingly urban informal sector accounting for more than 60% of Sudan's gross domestic product (GDP). Investments and services are concentrated in and around Khartoum state. This encourages a rural-urban migration weakening agricultural productivity and deepening poverty in both urban and rural areas. (UNDP Sudan website). The net primary school enrollment rate has reached 67% (male 69% vs. female 64%) in 2009, however, regional disparities account for variances in drivers towards violent extremism. The integration of the joint United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and SNCCT evidence-based survey underpinning drivers of radicalization of former violent extremists is contextualized cognizant of these. UNDP's regional PVE project document classifies Sudan an 'at risk' country. Transposing this into a policy framework, strategy and programme response benefits from knowing when interventions can occur for persons on the ladder of radicalization towards violent extremism, what options are available, at which point options are no longer viable.

Evidence suggests that persons in Sudan may begin the radicalization process in country, and then upon migration into a neighboring, or non-contiguous country, the radicalization process escalates towards violent extremism. This indicates strategic entry points for intervention exist that requires identifying persons on this trajectory and acting prior their physical migration abroad (out-migration), at which point they are no longer accessible by Sudanese partners. This requires a well-structured aspect of regional coordination found embedded towards the end of the PAVE narrative. A secondary dynamic occurs whereby a person is radicalized towards violent extremism while in Sudan, and then migrates to a foreign country to carry out the terrorist act. The programmatic implication within Sudan is that communities and government entities require closer linkages and coordination vertically and horizontally. Meetings with the SNCCT revealed that institutional entities and mechanisms exist to support persons at risk, with a gap being in identification and referral systems. Both cases point towards a PVE response.

A third dynamic addressing persons disengaged from the ISIS, Guantanamo Bay releases, potential Boko Haram members and others – taken together these are referred to as 'formers' – and form the basis from which primary evidence and survey data is derived for violent extremists. This points to the need for rehabilitation, de-radicalization and reintegration. To address these in an inclusive and customized manner, PAVE uses an innovative approach called Reversing Violent Extremism (RVE) to disengage persons, commonly youth, prior to out-migration at which point they are no longer accessible by Sudanese partners. RVE aims to prevent persons from radicalizing into violent extremism by putting in place response measures for persons undergoing rehabilitation, de-radicalization and reintegration following disengagement.

Sudan presents unprecedented opportunities to engage. Comparatively, the government and SNCCT display an open and transparent model for engagement unique for such a security sensitive caseload. Sudan is a stable state in a region beset by fragility, conflict and state failure – all conducive for violent extremist fomentation. The impetus to act cannot be understated. Sudan is a supplier of violent extremism regionally and globally, and while enjoying the luxury of not having terrorist attacks on its soil, this may not last. As a stable state the conditions are ripe to test and pilot programme assumptions based on evidence and analysis and go to scale. The lifting sanctions in January 2017 demonstrate the will of the international community to re-integrate Sudan into the global community while recognizing its unique position in contributing to regional and global P/CVE efforts.

As a follow-up, and in response to the increasing trend of violent extremism in Sudan, the Government of Sudan (GoS) established the SNCCT in 2014. Since then the Commission has made significant strides addressing P/CVE. Noteworthy among them is a study conducted in Sudan by UNDP in coordination with the SNCCT that explores the drivers behind violent extremism in Sudan. Preliminary findings from our statistical analysis indicate that believing in religious ideologies (17.7%) supporting the creation of the Caliphate (18%) and economic factors (18%) are the three main factors why individuals join violent extremist groups in Sudan. The reasons individuals remain within the violent extremist group vary, 9% believe that the violent extremist groups can bring change to their situation as Muslims, and 22% out of responsibility and duty, 44% have faith in the ideology of the violent extremist groups. A further 19% remain for the financial benefit. Another interesting findings concerned emotions associated with joining violent extremist's groups, 51% of respondents cited anger towards international community and GoS as a reason for joining.

2.   Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this Evaluation is to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP-PAVE programme contributions towards preventing conflict and strengthening social cohesion that will contribute to a peaceful community.

The objective of this evaluation is to gain insights into the design and implementation of PAVE as well as identify the programme's shortcomings and recommend timely corrective measures. The review recommendations will be shared with key stakeholders, including government counterparts and funding partners for their endorsement. Such recommendations will be integrated into ongoing PAVE activities to help refine the programme. Therefore, the evaluation is expected to provide an independent assessment of past and ongoing PAVE activity and should provide an opportunity to generate findings and recommendations which are expected to assist in identifying appropriate strategies and operational approaches to strengthen the ongoing programme activity.

The evaluation findings and conclusions must be based on concrete and credible evidence that will support UNDP's strategic thinking for its new programme cycle.

3. Scope and objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation will cover PAVE activities carried out during the last 4 years (2017 - 2021) in Khartoum (Mayo and Haj Yousif communities), Kassala, White Nile state Gedaref and Gazeira states.

Undertaken mainly under through the PAVE programme outcomes and outputs highlighted below:

Outcome I: At-risk youths and vulnerable people detached from extremist movements and reintegrated into society.
<u>Output i.i:</u> Former members and affiliates with violent extremist groups '*disengage*', undergo rehabilitation and become well adjusted, functioning members of their communities of return contributing to peace and security, as well as PVE efforts as part of the reintegration process.
<u>Output i.ii:</u> Those considered vulnerable to the affects of violent extremist groups, including provision of support, sympathizers and under threat of coerced recruitment, eschew violence and are offered viable social, psychosocial and livelihood alternatives to violent extremism.

Outcome II: Communities and institutions resilient to the effects of violent extremism.
<u>Output ii.i:</u> Key persons trained through the PAVE programme are capacitated to identify '*at risk*' behavior associated with the radicalization-escalation process and are further able to identify and prioritize the appropriate blend of programmatic responses and interventions on the PVE process.
<u>Output ii.ii:</u> Relationships become robust in communities where PVE and RVE are being undertaken as demonstrated by enhanced governance and RoL adherence leading to increased trust and confidence between affected communities, state, and local administration officials.

Outcome III: National and State's capacity strengthened to prevent and address violent extremism in Sudan and the region.
<u>Output iii.i:</u> The GoS develops and promulgates a *National PVE Strategy* translated into a national policy for dissemination and rollout to the States that takes into account global, regional and sub-national issues affecting violent extremism and its impact on peace and security.
<u>Output iii.ii:</u> Each of the ten States affected in Sudan is able to translate the *National PVE Strategy* and policy into custom tailored programmatic responses and can effectively report back results of interventions that can be used to modify efforts and inform regional and global practices.

Given the sensitive and complex context of PAVE implementation, it should be seen as a component of a much larger development and peacebuilding strategy with a focus on prevention of violence and community stabilization via creating livelihood opportunities. For this reason, it is prudent that an evaluation be undertaken to understand the extent to which the PAVE process has been successful especially considering its importance in the outreach provided for preventing violence OR stabilizing communities and preventing violence .

The main objectives of the evaluation is to assess the PAVE outreach and activity and the results achieved so far towards meeting the overall objective of the programme ; as well as to generate lessons learned; and best practices and to develop recommendations for future replication of the programme in other parts of Sudan. Special attention will be given to:

1. Contribution of the programme at the community level to improve security through capacity development of community members, establishment of community security committees, and community policing
2. Contribution of the programme to address the economic push factors of VE such as poverty, exclusion and unemployment, and mitigate frustration of youth, women and other vulnerable populations, and reduce risk of joining violent extremism via access to alternative and sustainable livelihood opportunities in the target communities through vocational training and small business support
3. To what extent the workshops, screening of IMAN and discussion created awareness of risk of radical ideas that lead to violent extremism
4. To what extend the programme has promoted women empowerment in the targeted communities

4. Evaluation Criteria and Key Guiding Questions

The evaluation will be conducted based on the assessment PAVEs strategic, conception and theory of change. The evaluation criteria, to be considered by the evaluation, include relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, connectedness, sustainability, and inclusiveness within the framework of the following guiding questions as outlined below.

Relevance

1. Has UNDP been able to help design PAVE processes within the context of local and national recovery and other development strategies in Sudan?
2. Do the partners, target groups and beneficiaries consider that the interventions contributed to community stabilization, peaceful co-existence, social cohesion and local economic development?
3. Have PAVE interventions responded to the needs and priorities identified during the study analysis that was carried out (2017) which informed the design of the programme?

Efficiency

1. Have the resources (funds, human resources, time, etc.) of PAVE interventions been efficiently used to achieve the relevant outputs?
2. Have PAVE interventions been implemented within intended deadlines and cost estimates?
3. What were the strengths and weaknesses of PAVE approach and strategy?
4. Have associated risks of the programme at the national and local levels been anticipated and addressed?
5. Were management capacities of PAVE adequate to deliver activities in a timely and efficient manner? Management capacity should be assessed on all levels: steering committees, UNDP country office and field offices.

6. What measures were taken to assure the quality of development results and management practices, both in relation to process and products?
7. What monitoring and evaluation procedures were applied by UNDP and partners to ensure greater accountability? Has the M&E set up and capacity been appropriate to deliver information needed for the program?
8. Provide a general description of the program set up to include; the organisation, management, the field offices, the various staffing at UNDP, SNCCT and others, the management steering and decision making model (steering committee, project management etc), the financing from different sources, overview of participating local government offices, NGOs and implementing partners

Effectiveness

1. Have PAVE's expected results been achieved and what were the supporting or impeding factors?
2. Were the programme approaches for the different components (inclusive livelihoods, awareness raising, the social, peacebuilding and women empowerment components) relevant to achieving the intended outcome and outputs in supporting community stabilization, peacebuilding and social cohesion in targeted areas?
3. Have the programme contributed to the capacity building of NGO implementing partners and also Government partners?
4. Have the programme been implemented with appropriate and effective inter-agency and partnership strategies? What has been the nature and added value of these partnerships?
5. Were UNDP's comparative advantages perceived/interpreted well to contribute to community stabilisation reflected in the division of responsibilities in implementing the programme?
6. To what extent has the SNCCT contributed in advancing PAVE programme?
7. To what extent has the capacity development of NGOs and government counterparts strengthened the services delivery?

Connectedness

1. To what extend the PAVE interventions, at the local level, were coordinated with other interventions?
2. Have the programme built on / match the individual and local capacities/ needs?
3. To what extend did the programme formed as part of as integrated package

Sustainability

1. To what extent was sustainability considerations taken into account in the design and implementation of PAVE interventions, results definition and monitoring of reintegration?

2. Were exit strategies appropriately defined and implemented, and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability of results to support community stabilization and women empowerment?
3. How did the development of partnerships at the national and state level contribute to sustainability of the results?
4. Assessed whether the community support given has been able to establish self-sustained development (as regards, CMCs, youth clubs, Peace committees, livelihood activities etc. etc.).
5. How many communities have been "graduated" in that sense of the communities supported? If communities supported have NOT been able to sustain – what are the reasons for that? To me this is a key question

Impact

1. What has been the general effect (both positive and negative) of the programme on its direct and indirect beneficiaries?
2. The PAVE program contain distinct and different programmatic parts (e.g. security committees, livelihood activities, awareness raising). Have all parts been effective in delivering against the objective? If not, why? How can the outcome of help in the design of the next phase of PAVE? What aspects should be included in the next phase, and what could we perhaps leave out?
3. Mention the different forms of impact that can be distinguished: direct and indirect, intended and unintended for project beneficiaries.
4. On trainings offered, what has happened with the knowledge gained in the training initiatives and skills development for project beneficiaries?   How has the advocacy promoted prevention? Will it be recommended for the next phase? What are the lessons learnt and best practices of the screening ?
5. Did project participants usefully apply their knowledge and use it to further develop/improve their role in society?
6. Was there clear evidencing of PAVE results and recognition of the role of UNDP and the donors

5. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation methodology should employ a participatory results-oriented approach that involves project implementers, targeted beneficiaries and other community members and relevant stakeholders and provide evidence of achievement of expected outputs through the use of quantitative and qualitative methods. On the basis of the evaluation objectives and questions, it is expected that the consultant will propose an evaluation methodology and agree on a detailed plan for the assignment as part of the evaluation inception report. This inception report should be finalized and approved in consultation with the project team as well as other relevant UNDP staff. More specifically, the findings of the evaluations and the recommendations will be grounded in evidence and analytical work derived from the following methods at minimum:
- Desk review of PAVE relevant documents and reports
- Meetings/ discussions with Stakeholders including Government partners, NGO Implementing Partners, donors etc.

- Field visit (at least two- States) to meet and consult with beneficiaries and state level stakeholders and to collect quantitative & qualitative data from beneficiaries and community members, partners, implementing partners, government, beneficiary institutions.
- Interviews with key informant and Focus Group Discussions with sample of project beneficiaries
- Assistance will be provided by UNDP in the identification of key stakeholders, and in organizing the schedule of interviews, focus groups, and site visits
- Ensure gender equality and women's empowerment are included in the methodology for addressing gender-specific issues.
- Evaluation cross-cutting issues such as Human rights , Anti-corruption ,Gender Equality ,Climate change , Governance, tolerance and the rule of law sample questions for Human rights; To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, at risk communities and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from PAVE interventions

6. Evaluation products/Tasks and Deliverables

The evaluation shall be led by an independent consultant. The consultant shall have the overall responsibility for conducting the evaluation including the development and submission of the draft and final evaluation reports.

The key tasks of the consultant include:
- Develops an inception report detailing the design, methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis criteria for selection of field locations, required resources), and work plan of the evaluation.

- Advise on the data collection and analysis tools including review of all relevant documentation.

- Oversees and quality assures the preparation of the evaluation and takes a lead in the analysis of the evaluative evidence.

- Takes the lead in the analysis of the evaluative evidence and administrates the analysis of the results of the data collection exercise.

- Leads the stakeholder feedback sessions, briefs UNDP on the evaluation through informal sessions and finalizes the report based on feedback from the quality assurance process.

- Delivers draft and final evaluation reports.

It should be noted that above list of deliverables, together with the implementation time-frame might be subject to review and revision by UNDP in discussion with the consultant in the event of unexpected changes to the context/ working environment in Sudan during the consultancy period, given the operating context of COVID-19, etc

Profile:
- Master's Degree in a relevant discipline
- More than 5 years of relevant international development experience in designing/implementing PVE projects in conflict /post conflict countries.

- 15 - 20 years of relevant experience
- More than 5 years of international experience in the field)
- Experience in reviewing projects/programmes of UN agencies (preferably UNDP).
- Regional expertise in either Africa or Arab countries will be an advantage
- Strong analytical and research skills with experience with participatory approaches
- Facilitation skills and ability to manage diversity of views in different cultural contexts.
- Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking, communication skills and ability to produce a high quality report in a short period.
- Fluent in English language.
- Must be available on the anticipated start date.

Outputs/Deliverables:

The evaluation consultant will produce the following outputs, at minimum:

- Inception Report: at the end of the first week of the assignment, the evaluation consultant will submit an Inception Report, which should include detailed evaluation methodology, and evaluation matrix explaining the methods for assessing each evaluation criteria and the associated evaluation questions including proposed sources of data. The inception report should also include the proposed evaluation work-plan detailing schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, with clear responsibilities in coordination with the CSO supporting in data collection.
- _**Evaluation brief**_: The consultant will be asked to present his/ her preliminary findings, for UNDP staff and major stakeholders, for discussion and validation

- _**Draft evaluations report:**_ _The consultant will provide_ draft report, covering the issues outlined in the terms of reference including evaluation findings and conclusions, lessons, and recommendations, _for review_ by the programme unit and the key stakeholders.

- _**Final evaluation report**_[1]_**:**_ The final report incorporates the inputs resulting from the review of the draft report as relevant.

Timeframe for the evaluation process
The estimated time for conducting this evaluation is 25 working days, starting from the date of commencement mentioned in the contract that will be signed by the consultant, as per the below tentative timetable.
Day 1-2:   Initial desk review (Home based)

Day 3-5:   National consultant meeting and initial consultations
Day 6 :   Submission of the Inception Report
Day 7-10:   Interviews, consultations, and meeting (Khartoum)

- Refer to [1] UNDP Evaluation Report Template.

Day 11- 18:   Field visits for selected states covering institutions and beneficiary communities

Day 19-21:   Follow-up meetings, analysis of the information collected and preparation of a draft report

Day 22:   Presentation of draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders

Day 23-25:   Incorporate/ respond to UNDP/ stakeholders comments on the draft report (if deemed appropriate) and submission of final report. Prepare a PowerPoint presentation of the report, including contents, design and lay-out and conduct presentation/debriefing to UNDP and relevant partners

7.   Implementation Arrangements:

The Programme Manager will oversee all stages of the evaluation conduct to ensure that the process is being conducted as per the agreed plan and guidelines. The PM will coordinate with UNDP Country office team and UNDP senior management on the evaluation process. The PAVE programme staff will provide administrative and logistical support and will facilitate coordination and liaison with key stakeholders in Khartoum and the field.

Additionally, UNDP will constitute evaluation "Reference Group" comprised of key stakeholders and UNDP relevant staff. The Reference Group will guide the evaluation process and will provide methodological and substantive inputs into the evaluation process as well as peer review of the evaluation deliverables. The evaluation is based on the DAC quality standards for development evaluation and will use the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, connectedness, sustainability, and impact.

8.   Evaluation Ethics:

This Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (UNEG 2008) to ensure the credibility and integrity of the evaluation process and products. The consultants must use measures to ensure compliance with the evaluator code of conduct including measures to safeguard the rights, safety and confidentiality of the individual and communities interviewed, particularly permissions needed to interview or gather information about children and young people and provisions to store and maintain security of collected information and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The consultants shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, while applying evaluation methods and tools.

9.   Duty Station

The duty station will be Khartoum with visits to the project sites if the situation allows, however we are flexible in case the situation does not allow the consultant to travel due to COVID-19 restrictions imposed by the government and the consultant can operate remotely.

10. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payment

The consultancy fee will be determined on a lump sum basis. The lump sum amount

must be all-inclusive, and the contract price must be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components. Payment will be made twice, after submission of inception report and after submission of Final Report with confirmation letter from PAVE programme stating satisfaction with work carried by the Consultant.

Deliverables	Deliverable Timeline	Deliverable Due Date	Payment Milestones (%)
Milestone 1 • Meeting briefing with UNDP • Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed. • Submission of the Inception report	6 working days	9May 2021	40%
Milestone 2 • Interviews with UNDP PVE Programme partners, key stakeholder groups and programme beneficiaries. • Site visits to the selected States and collect qualitative and quantitative information • Submission of draft evaluation report • Briefing and validation session with the UNDP PAVE team	14 working days	27 May 2021	30%
Milestone 3 • Recommendations provided by the UNDP PAVE team are embedded. • Submission of the final evaluation report	5 working days	03 June 2021	30%

11. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The offers received from the candidates will be evaluated using combined scoring method. The combined scoring method assesses the offers with technical merits of the proposals – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70%, and later combined with the price offer which will be weighted a

max of 30%.

12. Award of the Contract/Award Criteria

The contract will be awarded to the candidate (bidder) whose proposal obtains the highest cumulative marks (points) when the marks obtained in technical and price proposals are aggregated together.

13.   Reference Materials

Documentation to be reviewed/ referred to includes but is not necessarily limited to the following:
- United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Sudan (Current edition).
- UNDP Country Programme Document and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (Current edition).
- The PAVE Project Document, project AWPs and quarterly and annual reports of the project.
- Community perception survey reports
- Any other documents and materials related to PAVE (from the government, donors, etc.).
- UNDP Evaluation Report Template.
- UNDP Evaluation Policy (2011)
- Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (UNEG 2008).
- UN Evaluation Norms.
- UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Results.

14. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Name and Designation: Tomokazu Serizawa, PAVE Programme Manager, a.i.

Signature:

Date: 26 April 2021

TOR Annexes:
1. Intervention results framework and theory of change (PAVE approved/signed Prodoc).
2. Please list the project' partners, stakeholders and donors' names.
3. Documents to be reviewed and consulted.
4. Evaluation matrix template.
5. Outline of the evaluation report format required for the evaluation report (example: content and length, etc).
6. UNDP evaluation guidelines and the evaluation guidelines during COVID-19.
7. Code of conduct forms.
8. Please use the evaluation quality checklists attached to ensure good evaluation product/s.