**ToR Evaluation Consultant – International**

**Assignment Title:** Final Project Evaluation: Support to Integrated Reconciliation in Iraq Project (IRP)

**Location:** Home based, with travel to Baghdad and project locations, Iraq

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Level:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English, Arabic

**Starting Date:** 25-August-2021

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 45 working days (between July-September 2021)

1. **Background & Context:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION | | |
| Project title and  Outcome title | Support to Integrated Reconciliation in Iraq Project  2016-2019 Country Programme Outcome:  2020-2024 UNSDCF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #3.2:-People in Iraq, civil society, and communities, particularly women, have improved capacity to lead, participate in and contribute to the design and delivery of equitable and responsive services, especially for the most vulnerable populations (2020-2024 CPD)  SDG Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere[[1]](#footnote-1) | |
| Atlas Project ID | 00100485 | |
| Country | Iraq | |
| Geographical coverage | National Level, and targeted implementation in the governorates of Salaheldin, Anbar and Ninewa. | |
| Beneficiaries | 63,023 direct beneficiaries from activity implementation. Beneficiaries include: Capacity building and establishment of LPCs and CDCs (1,290); Youth Groups and Women’s Groups (86 members and 70 members, respectively); capacity building of young media professionals (124); 3,387 families with perceived ISIS affiliation returned to their communities (16,935 individuals); distribution of life-support packages to 2,700 families during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic (13,500 individuals); training of female social workers (659) who reached women and girls (30,330); Social Cohesion Champions (26); participants of the social media art contest (3). | |
| Date project document signed | 01 August 2017 | |
| Project dates | **Start** | **Planned end** |
| 01 January 2017 | 31 December 2021 |
| Project budget | USD 50,000,000 | |
| Resources mobilized | USD 9,042,447.23 | |
| Project delivery at the time of evaluation | Estimated USD 8,270,990.67 | |
| Funding source | UK, Germany and Denmark | |
| Implementing party | UNDP | |

Since 2003, Iraq has undertaken at least three major national reconciliation programmes: first, there was the Arab League’s attempts at mediation in 2006; second, the former Prime Minister Al-Maliki government’s “Reconciliation and National Dialogue Plan” in 2006; and third the process associated with the former Prime Minister Al-Abadi. For different reasons, these initiatives have not seen the goal of national unity and stability realized. Instead, Iraq has been subjected to a burgeoning insurgency, rising sectarian tensions, increasing political alienation amongst some sections of the population, the victimization of minorities, and of course, the unprecedented rise of ISIS.

Reasons for these challenges and setbacks are complex. Yet, it is clear that too often, previous attempts at reconciliation were fundamentally elite- and/or foreign-driven, and thus devoid of meaningful civic participation. Also, critically important has been the much-neglected relationship between reconciliation on the one hand, and the demand for accountability and transitional justice on the other, which has never received the careful and systematic attention it deserves and requires.

In 2017 UNDP has developed the “Support for Integrated Reconciliation Project” in close partnership with the Government of Iraq through the Implementation and Follow-up Committee for National Reconciliation (IFCNR) located in the office of the Iraq Prime Minister. While ISIS has been militarily and territorially defeated, its impact is long-lasting with the destruction of infrastructure, disruption of services, loss of economic productivity, and heightened social divisions.

The project has been designed to integrate three crucial lines of action in a holistic, integrated effort to promote reconciliation in Iraqi communities—with the initial focus on those areas most directly affected by ISIS and the massive population displacements it had caused. These three lines of efforts, or pillars, are offering support to Iraqi-led programmes focused on:

1. Area-specific community-based reconciliation mechanisms and processes to raise civic awareness of, and participation in, community reconciliation, to monitor and mitigate local conflicts, build trust and enhance social cohesion.
2. Public awareness raising campaigns focused on youth in carefully selected areas to support community reconciliation enlarging the participation of youth (including women and minorities), enhancing their leadership and influencing capacities;
3. Support programmes for victims (especially women) in community reconciliation.

Throughout project implementation, gender equality and inclusion of women and girls in activity implementation was mainstreamed. The COVID-19 pandemic had a strong impact on social cohesion, specifically on women and girls leading to a surge of domestic violence in Iraq.[[2]](#footnote-2) As a response to this very specific impact as well as women and girls who may be impacted by community reconciliation, the project trained female social workers to provide psychosocial support to over 30,000 women and girls across Iraq. The project also works to strengthen and empower Women’s Groups in Anbar, Diyala, and Ninewa to proactively engage with their respective communities.

With restrictions in movement and to maintain safe social distancing as a result of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, challenges with delays and difficulties in implementing activities through physical interaction were identified. To accommodate for protocols put in place and ensure participant safety, a restructuring of implementation took place resulting in planned meetings, events, and trainings moving to online platforms. However, to directly respond to the pandemic, the project distributed life-support packages consisting of food items and hygiene products to 2,700 families.

This project did not have a mid-term evaluation, however, has been subject to reviews conducted by UNDP Regional Hub.

1. **Evaluation purpose, scope, and objectives:**
2. **Purpose of the Evaluation**

UNDP proposes to conduct a Final Project Evaluation as part of its commitment to improved results-based management. The Project is proposed to operationally close on 31 December 2021. Therefore, the evaluation findings and recommendations are expected to inform and help improve decision-making relating to implementation for the Iraq Social Cohesion Programme which forms the 2020-2024 programming platform for UNDP Iraq intervention’s to promote social cohesion and reconciliation.

1. **Scope**

*Results Scope*:

The scope of this evaluation is defined by the Results Framework of the Support to Integrated Reconciliation in Iraq Project, which was initiated on January 2017. The Project was initially due to end on 31 December 2019. However its implementation time-frame was extended until 31 December 2021 due to the agreement between the government and donors on the need to support reconciliation and social cohesion agenda for a longer term.

The details of Project expected outputs as per the Results Framework is:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Intended output (s) | Activity Results |
| Support approaches to community reconciliation that characterized as: Locally led, Victim-centered and forgiveness orientated, Inclusive (not partisan or excluding), and Civic-minded (not tribal/sectarian) | **Activity 1 (Awareness)** Youth are successfully involved in community reconciliation processes in selected communities through awareness and education campaigns on reconciliation and peaceful co-existence.  **Activity result 2 (NETWORKING)** Community reconciliation is strengthened in selected communities through creating a critical mass to support the process as well as establishing and maintaining active and effective networks of Local Peace Committees.  **Activity result 3 (TRANSITIONING)** Women and girls take an active role in community reconciliation processes, and these processes adopt gender-sensitive programming and address specific needs of women and girls.  **Activity result 4: (MANAGEMENT)** Effective people management and 100% compliance to UNDP rules and regulations to achieve annual targets |

*Time-Frame:*

The project evaluation will cover the period from August 2017 to July 2021. The Consultant will engage all project stakeholders, beneficiaries, communities/institutions, relevant national institutions, donors, UNDP, UN agencies and CSOs.

*Geographic coverage*: Project support has focused at the National Level and has targeted implementation in the governorates of Salah al din, Anbar and Ninewa.

*Evaluation Audience*: The evaluation will be relied upon by UNDP Iraq to inform is ongoing and future programming under the Iraq Social Cohesion Programme and by project stakeholders such as the donors that are contributing to social cohesion and reconciliation programming in Iraq.

1. **Objectives**

Specific Project Evaluation objectives are to:

1. Assess the relevance of the project’s results.
2. Assess the efficiency of project implementation, including the operations support.
3. Assess the effectiveness of the project and its activities in reaching the stated objectives.
4. Assess the appropriateness of the project design and management arrangements for achieving the stated objectives.
5. Assess the sustainability of the project results.
6. Outline lessons learned and good practices that can be used in the planning and implementation of the Iraq Social Cohesion Programme, regular review, implementation and monitoring of all UNDP similar interventions.
7. Provide constructive and practical recommendations on factors that can contribute to project sustainability, (if required/where relevant) including for the Country Programme 2020-2024.
8. **Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

The Project Evaluation will generate evidence of progress and challenges, helping to ensure accountability for the implementation of the project, as well as identifying and sharing knowledge and good practices through following standard Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria as revised in 2019[[3]](#footnote-3):

1. **Relevance**: the extent to which the project strategy, proposed activities and expected outputs and outcomes are justified and remain relevant to beneficiaries’ assessed needs, country’s policies and donor’s priorities. More specifically, the relevance of the project should be assessed through the following guiding questions:

* *To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to security, political, economic, institutional and other changes in the country?*
* *To what extent was the project in line with the recovery, national development priorities and policies, the UNDP country programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?*
* *To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant UNDP country programme outcome?*
* *To what extent does the project contribute to the human rights-based approach, gender equality and women’s empowerment? Especially, with regard to the target beneficiary groups including the return IDPs, youth, women, disabled persons, etc.?*

1. Coherence:

* *To what extent did the project complement work among different entities, including civil society and other UN actors?*
* *How were stakeholders involved in the project’s design and implementation?*

1. **Efficiency**: the extent to which the project resources (funds, expertise/human resources, time, etc.) are optimally used and converted into intended outputs. More specifically, the efficiency of the project should be assessed through the following guiding questions:

* *How efficient is the functioning of the project management, technical support, administrative, procurement and financial management procedures? To what extent have the project management structure and allocated resources been efficient in achieving the expected results?*
* *To what extent has the project implementation been efficient and cost-effective?*
* *To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?*
* *What is the visibility and communications strategy adopted by the project? Has it been cost-effective in terms of promoting the project and its achievements?*
* *terms of promoting the project and its achievements?*
* *How is the project keeping track of project progress on expected outputs and outcomes? Does the monitoring and evaluation system put in place allow for continuous collection and analysis of quality and segregated data on expected outputs and outcomes?*

1. **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the project’s expected outputs and outcomes are being achieved or are expected to be achieved. Factors contributing to or detracting from the achievement of the project desired results and objectives should also be included in the assessment.More specifically, the effectiveness of the project should be assessed through the following guiding questions:

* *To what extent are the project outputs and outcomes fully or partly achieved or on-track to be achieved?*
* *To what extent are strategies for gender and women’s empowerment incorporated?*
* *What are the main factors influencing the achievement of project outputs, outcomes, including gender and women’s empowerment results as of July 2021*
* *The extent to which findings of data analysis or project best practices are used for drawing lessons learned, and adjusting implementation?*
* *To what extent have the project’s activities led to improved coordination, cooperation, and capacity as relevant at the National and/or Governorate and/or Municipality levels? To what extent does the project have the support of the government both at national and local levels?*
* *To what extent have the project’s activities led to improved coordination, cooperation and consultation among development partners (including UN agencies, and donors to this project)? How did the project steering committee contribute to a regular gathering of development partners to discuss development priorities?*
* *To what extent has the project been actively seeking partnership with relevant actors in view of strengthening project implementation and/or ensuring project sustainability?*
* *To what extent do the project’s activities/management systems mitigate and address protection concerns of vulnerable populations (returnees, communities that did not leave ISIL controlled areas, minority communities, etc.) in the targeted areas?*
* *What is the level of quality of the project outputs and/or the project activities?*
* *To what extent the project has been able to mobilize financial resources?*
* *To what extent has the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic affected activity implementation and the quality of activities?*

1. **Impact:** analyzing the positive and negative changes produced by the Project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of social and economic conditions.

* *What has happened/changed as the result of IRP support in the target locations, as of July 2021?*
* *What real difference have the activities made to the lives of beneficiaries (taking into account gender considerations, such as focus on women-headed households, as well)?*
* *How many people (gender disaggregated) have been affected by the project as of July2021?*

1. **Sustainability:** analyzing whether benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

* *Are suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented?*
* *Are there any financial, social, political or other risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes? To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term after a) completion of activities and handover to end-user, and b) after the closure of IRP? What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will not be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?*
* *What are the major factors (i.e. socio-economic, environmental, legal and institutional framework, governance, security etc.) which have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project, as of July 2021?*
* *To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?*
* *To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?*
* To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies which include a gender dimension?

1. **Methodology**

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNDP evaluation guidelines and policies including Evaluation guidelines during COVID-19, United Nations Group Evaluation Norms and Ethical Standards; OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

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 and in the country is constrained by a combination of COVID-19 and the ongoing conflict. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the Consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account ,and 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 stakeholders 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.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach. The evaluation will employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods including:

1. **Desk review** of project documents, progress reports, monitoring reports, lessons learned reviews, and other relevant documents;
2. **In-depth interviews** with key informants (men and women) such as government officials, and members of local, national, coordination bodies; and **questionnaires**
3. **Focus group discussions** with the targeted beneficiaries (men and women); and Project/UNDP staff
4. **Interviews** with the project team, and UNDP’s Senior Management.
5. **Consultations** with donors/ international partners and as relevant national non-governmental organizations that were directly engaged in project implementation.
6. **Survey with sample and sampling frame**—if a sample is used. This could include the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria; the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population (men and women), including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
7. **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.
8. **Gender and human rights lens.** All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues.

All analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence, and data. Findings should be specific and concise and supported by information that is reliable and valid. Cross-cutting issues and the SDGs should be integrated into the final evaluation report. The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders and the evaluators.

1. **Evaluation Products/ Key deliverables:**

The evaluator is expected to produce the following:

* **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages) and inception presentation:** The inception report should be developed following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP and initial documentation reviews. It should be produced and approved before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to possible country visit in the case of the international consultant. The inception presentation is based on the inception report and provides an opportunity for both the consultant and UNDP to discuss clarifications/concerns.
* **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP will ask for a preliminary debriefing of findings.
* **Draft evaluation report (max 40 pages including Executive Summary).** UNDP will review the draft evaluation report and provide a combined set of comments to the evaluator, addressing the content required (as agreed in the inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in the UNDP evaluation guidelines.
* **Evaluation Report Audit Trail:** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
* **Final evaluation report:** The final report should address the comments, questions and clarification requested in the audit trail. The final report should also contain a stand-alone Executive Summary of no more than five pages.
* **Evaluation brief** and other knowledge products agreed in the inception report.
* **Submission of the raw data/primary data** gathered through the evaluation**.**

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

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by 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 on-going 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 it, due to circumstances beyond his/her control.

1. **Evaluation Team composition and required competencies**

UNDP seeks to recruit an International Consultant with the following profile. The Consultant must have high levels of relevant technical expertise; rigorous research and drafting skills; and the capacity to conduct an independent and quality evaluation. Qualified female candidates are strongly encouraged to apply.

**Required Skills and Experience**

* Minimum Master’s degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant educational background.
* Minimum 10 years’ experience in the design, implementation and management of projects or research in the fields of community security, conflict prevention, PVE, peace building and reconciliation, governance, inclusive participation, gender mainstreaming and human rights promotion.
* At least 5 years of proven experience in conducting evaluations of similar peacebuilding and/or crisis response initiatives.
* Proven experience in data collection, instrument development and data analysis both qualitative and quantitative is essential;
* Experience working in, and knowledge of the Arab region, including Iraq would be an advantage;
* Experience in working with the UN or other international organizations would be an asset;
* Excellent analytical and problem-solving skills and proven ability to draft recommendations stemming from key findings is essential;
* Excellent report writing skills is essential;
* Experience using ICT equipment and office software packages.
* Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views.
* Gender expertise, technical knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such equality, disability issues, rights-based approach, and capacity development are required.

**Language:**

* Fluent English and Arabic (Written **and** Spoken)

**Competencies**

1. Knowledge on UNDP programming principles and procedures; the UN evaluation framework, norms and standards; human rights-based approach (HRBA);
2. Demonstrates commitment to the UN values and ethical standards;
3. Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, and age sensitivity and adaptability;
4. Treats all people fairly and with impartiality;
5. Good communication, presentation and report writing skills including proven ability to write concise, readable and analytical reports and high-quality academic publications in English;
6. Ability to work under pressure and to meet deadlines;
7. Flexible and responsive to changes and demands;
8. Experience managing a small research team;
9. Client-oriented and open to feedback.

The consultant will be required to share samples of their evaluation work

1. **Evaluation Ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’.[[4]](#footnote-4) The consultant 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 with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **Implementation Arrangements**

The Project Evaluation is commissioned by UNDP Iraq’s Social Cohesion Programme Pillar. The Pillar will designate an Evaluation Manager. Project staff will assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, , arranging visits/interviews with key informants, provide comments and clarification on the TOR, inception report and draft evaluation reports etc.).

The Evaluation Manager will convene an Evaluation Reference Group comprising of technical experts from partners and UNDP to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Reference Group 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 Reference Group will also advise on the conformity of processes to the UNDP and UNEG standards.

The consultant be responsible, with assistance from the project team, for setting up meetings and conducting the data collection, subject to advance approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. Project staff will not participate in meetings between the consultant and project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The consultant will report directly to the Evaluation Manager. The consultant will work full time during the time of the consultancy and may be required to travel to the project sites as part of the evaluation based on the proposed methodology. If it is not possible for the International Consultant to travel to Iraq, he/she should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of evaluation virtually and remotely and should accordingly factor in the need for the required tools and also translation capacities. This should be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with the Evaluation Reference Group and the Evaluation Manager.

As part of the assignment;

* UNDP will provide office space with access to the internet and printer when in-country in Erbil or Baghdad, Iraq.
* UNDP will provide the following list of additional documents to the selected Consultant Firm
* Donor Reports
* Relevant Financial Information
* Contact Details of Stakeholders and Partners
* Project Beneficiary Details
* Risk Analyses and Lessons Learned Logs
* Other relevant documents
* The **Evaluation Consultant** is expected to
* Have/bring his/her own laptops, and other relevant software/equipment.
* use his/her own mobile and personal email address during the consultancy period, including when in-country.
* make own travel arrangements to fly in-country and transportation arrangements if based outside Baghdad.

1. **Timeframe for the Evaluation Process (including Key Deliverables and payments)**

The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between the UNDP and the selected consultant. The Project evaluation will take place **between 15 July-15 September 2021**, including a combination of home-based work and one (1) in-country visit, which includes travel to a selected set of project implementation areas (based on sample selection and security situation permitting and COVID 19 restrictions).

The evaluation will be carried during 45 working days over a maximum period of 60 working days :

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **ESTIMATED # OF DAYS** | **DATE OF COMPLETION** | **PLACE** | **Responsible Party** |
| Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed) | - | At the time of contract signing  *25 August 2021* | Home-based & UNDP CO (online) | UNDP Team  Consultant |
| Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team | - | At the time of contract signing  *25 August 2021* | Via email | UNDP Project Team |
| Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed | 7days | Within 7 days of contract signing  *31 August 2021* | Home- based | Consultant |
| Submission of the inception report  (10-15 pages maximum) | - | Within 7 of contract signing  *31 August 2021* | Via E-mail | Consultant |
| ***Deliverable 1: UNDP* Comments and approval of inception report** | - | Within five days of submission of the inception report  *05 September 2021* | UNDP Country Office | Team Leader Social Cohesion Pillar; Evaluation Reference Group; PMSU |
| Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups | 15 days | Within 25 days of contract signing  *19 September 2021* | In country  (field visits) | Consultants |
| ***Deliverable 2:* Confirmation of completion of Field Work/Data Collection** | 1 day | *20 September 2021* | In country | Consultant |
| Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages) | 7 days | Within 7 days of the completion of the field mission  26 September 2021 | Home- based |  |
| ***Deliverable 3:* Draft evaluation report submission and submission of raw data, and Presentation on the Draft Findings** | - | *26 September 2021* | Via E-mail and Online | Consultant |
| Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report (including from Evaluation Reference Group) | - | Within 7 days of submission of the draft evaluation report  *02 October 2021* | UNDP Country Office | Team Leader Social Cohesion Pillar; Evaluation Reference Group |
| Debriefing with UNDP and the Evaluation Reference Group (including UNDP Senior Management) | 5 day | Within 5 days receipt of comments  *07 October 2021* | Home-based & UNDP CO (online) | Consultant  UNDP  Evaluation Reference Group |
| Finalize the Evaluation Report incorporating additions and comments provided by UNDP and submit Final Report and Audit Trail | 5 days | Within 5 days from receipt of comments  12 October 2021 | Home Based & UNDP CO (online | Consultant |
| ***Deliverable 4:* Final evaluation report (with Audit Trail)** incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office Approved | - | Within 5 days of final debriefing  *16 October 2021* | Home-based  UNDP (online | Team Leader Social Cohesion Pillar  Evaluation Reference Group |
| **Deliverable 5: Final Evaluation Presentation for Stakeholders** (as agreed with UNDP) | 5 days | Within 5 days of UNDP Accepting the Final Evaluation Report  20 October 2021 | Home-based/Online) | Consultant  Stakeholders identified by UNDP |
| **Estimated total workdays for the evaluation** | **45 days** |  |  |  |

Payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by UNDP of the planned deliverables, based on the following tentative payment schedule:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Indicated Timeframe/Duration (Working Days)** | **Place/Location** |  | **Responsible Party** |
| #1. Desk Review and Inception Report: |  |  |  |  |
| Complete the desk review.  Submit a detailed inception report describing initial findings based on the comprehensive documentation review, present the evaluation methodology, detailed work plan and the outline of the final report | 7 days | Home-based | 17% | Team Leader of Social Cohesion Pillar, PMSU |
| Presentation and approval of Team Leader of Social Cohesion Pillar. |
| #2. Data collection by applying all tools and methods agreed in inception report |  |  |  |  |
| Collection and analysis by applying methodologies and approaches presented and approved in the inception report | 16 days | In country | 60% | Team Leader of Social Cohesion Pillar, PMSU |
| #3. Final evaluation report |  |  |  |  |
| A **draft evaluation report** to be prepared based on collected data and information | 22 days | Home-based | 23% | Team Leader of Social Cohesion Pillar, PMSU |
| Incorporation of comments and feedback on draft evaluation report provided by UNDP and other stakeholders |
| Preparation of final evaluation report |
| Validation of the final draft, incorporation of validation comments and preparation and submission of final report |
| Power point for stakeholders |
| Final evaluation report along with audit trail |
| Total | 45 days |  | 100% |  |

### *\*N.B Travel and accommodation:*

*All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel within country or outside duty station/ repatriation travel. In general, UNDP does not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket.*

*In cases where UNDP arranges and provides travel and/or accommodation due to security and other reasons, it should be noted that these costs will be deducted from the payments to the Consultant.*

*In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon in writing, between UNDP and selected Consultant prior to travel and will be reimbursed.*

The international consultant will be responsible for entire evaluation processes and submission of the above-mentioned deliverables.

1. Application Submission Process and Selection Criteria:

**Application Process**

Interested qualified and experienced individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications and interest:

1. Letter of Confirmation of interest and availability using the template provided by UNDP; please see attached template.
2. Most Updated Personal detailed CV including past experience in similar assignment and at least 3 references.
3. UN P11 Form (“CV Form”);
4. A detailed methodology on how the candidate will approach and conduct the work and
5. Two samples of evaluation reports done/authored within the past two years.

Note: Applicants must not have worked in the design or implementation of this project or in an advisory capacity for any of the interventions, directly as consultants or through service providers.

Submitted proposals will be assessed using Cumulative Analysis Method. The proposals will be weighed according to the technical proposal (carrying 70%) and financial proposal (carrying 30%). Technical proposals should obtain a minimum of 70 points to qualify and to be considered. Financial proposals will be opened only for those application that obtained 70 or above in the technical proposal. Below are the criteria and points for technical and financial proposals

1. **Technical proposals (total score: 70 points)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Max score** | **Weight** |
| General adherence to the Term of Reference (ToR) | 5 | 7% |
| Proposed methodology, approach, and workplan (relevance, logic, rigor, practicality, creativity, realism of work plan etc). | 35 | 50% |
| Clarity and relevance of the proposed methodology, to the local context and to achieve the deliverables of the ToR. |
| Realistic and complete work plan which reflects clear and comprehensive understanding of the scope of work in the ToR. |
| Clarity about how gender considerations will be factored into the evaluation. |
| Analysis of risks that can impact the evaluation (including its completion and quality) |
| Clarity on the quality assurance process that will be in place for this assignment |
| Quality of plan to ensure ethics of conducting evaluation with human subjects (methodological component that will be accorded special attention given the project engagement of women, juvenile children, and other targeted groups). | 10 | 14% |
| Technical capacity of the applicant: qualifications, competencies, experience and skills as per the ToR (also assessed against sample of evaluation work done) | 20 | 29% |
| **Total** | **70** | **100%** |

**b) Financial Proposal (total score: 30 points)**

The financial proposal will specify a total lump sum amount and payment terms shall be in line with those that are mentioned in the deliverable table.

Financial proposal will be assessed based on the completeness, clarity and appropriateness. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest Financial Proposal that is opened /evaluated and compared among those technical qualified candidates who have obtained a minimum 70 points in the technical evaluation. Other Financial Proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price applying the formula:

Marks Obtained = Lowest Priced Offer (Amount) / Offer being considered (Amount) X 30 (Full Marks)

11. ToR Annexes:

1. Project Results Framework and Related Documents: <https://open.undp.org/projects/00100485>

1a. Project Document:

1b. Quarterly and/or Annual Reports:

1. Project Key Partners (including locations) and Project Locations:
2. Other Project related Documents (specify):

3.a. UNDP Iraq Country Programme Document 2016-2019: <https://www.iq.undp.org/content/iraq/en/home/library/crisis_prevention_and_recovery/country-programme-document-for-iraq--2016-2020-.html>

3.b. UNDP Iraq Country Programme Document 2020-2024: <https://www.iq.undp.org/content/iraq/en/home/library/iraq-cpd-2020-2024.html>

1. [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100): <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>
2. [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml): <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>
3. [Evaluation Quality Assessment](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml) Guidelines: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>
4. [Evaluation guidelines during COVID-19](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/covid19.shtml)
5. [Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452)

[<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2107>](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2107)

[<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2695>](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2695)

1. [Inception report](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%204%20Evaluation%20Inception%20report%20content%20outline.docx) Template
2. Evaluation Matrix (Sample Evaluation Matrix) – to be included in the inception report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A. Sample of evaluation matrix | | | | | | |
| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific  sub-questions | Data sources | Data  collection methods/tools | Indicators/  success standard | Data analysis method |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



1. [Evaluation report](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%206%20Standard%20evaluation%20report%20content%20full%20details.docx) Template
2. [Audit trail](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%207%20Evaluation%20Audit%20trail%20form.docx) Template
3. Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details (will also be provided at the time of signing the contract)



1. Not specified in the Results Framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Women and Girls in Iraq During the COVID-19 Pandemic, UNDP, December 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, 2020. http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)