



TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs)

Individual Contractor (International) Lead Consultant – Summative Evaluation of Phase I of the Joint Justice Programme in Somalia

A. PROJECT TITLE: JOINT JUSTICE PROGRAMME

B. BACKGROUND INFORMATION, RATIONALE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Somalia Joint Justice Programme (JJP) has a programmatic focus on building the capacity of justice actors and institutions to respond to the needs of the vulnerable, including the provision of gender responsive services and addressing negative social norms through engagement with clan elders and influencers in view of supporting institutional reforms. It addresses both supply demand-side issues and supports legal reform through upstream and downstream measures including: a. legal empowerment through legal aid; support for establishing and operating community-based mechanisms (community capacity enhancement/Community Conversation and non-violent communication) to support women, children, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and members of minority clans seeking justice or redress; b. supporting the establishment of community dispute resolution centres and special prosecution cells for SGBV cases; and c. trainings for judges, prosecutors, court staff and lawyers, and capacity building at community level to promote justice reform.

The JJP interventions include measures to enhance the representation and participation of women in judicial processes (e.g., in the adjudication of cases at community dispute resolution centres), by increasing the number of female personnel in justice institutions and implementing capacity building activities. Trainings include transformational coaching for women leaders and traditional/religious leaders to increase the participation of women in traditional justice mechanisms. The life cycle of the JJP spans 30 months (08/2018-12/2020).

The Federal Government of Somalia Ministry of Justice is the lead implementing agency for this programme, in coordination with all Federal Member State justice and judicial institutions. Other participating entities include the United Nations Assistance Mission to Somalia (UNSOM) Joint Justice and Corrections Service (JJCS), UNDP, UNICEF, UN Women, and International Development Law Organization (IDLO). Donors include the European Union, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK with a total budget of USD 20,299,192 for the first phase of the Programme.

A mid-term evaluation conducted In March 2020 made several strategic, operational, technical, and monitoring-related observations among them:

- The need to emphasise coordination and improve the capacity to achieve evidence-based results.
- Share equitable budget between the formal and traditional justice sectors.
- Design and introduce district level judiciary through cluster approach.
- Accelerate approaches to judicial training and its institutionalization for sustainability.
- Revisit the justice and corrections model to identify and address weaknesses and to embrace strengths and potentialities of current hybrid, plural legal practice.
- Ensure that restorative justice initiatives are taken up on experimental basis and identify avenues of scaling up.
- Strengthen UN-internal programmatic coordination through joint programming, both within Joint programmes of the UN and beyond rule of law.

- Identify areas for building the body of administrative law and building related legal institutional/technical capacity.
- Identify how regular payment of judicial staff can be piloted.

Subsequent discussions with donors in early 2021 resulted in feedback on specific programmatic issues and revealed the need to focus on some key issues, including how the JJP could be better aligned to the political process, improve programme management, and be more focused and agile in a changing political environment. A donor meeting held on 13th July 2021 emphasised the need to base a new phase of the JJP on clear lessons learned from Phase I. Further, a UN virtual mission took place in July to review the Justice and Security Sector Programming and made recommendations for improved programming that responded to at least some of the donor concerns. Reports of these meetings and the Mission will also inform the evaluation.

Against this background, UNDP seeks to engage two consultants to conduct a summative evaluation that builds on the mid-term evaluation and identifies successes and lessons learnt from Phase I of the JJP that can be integrated into Phase II. The lead consultant will provide overall findings of the evaluation whereas the National Access to Justice Expert shall contribute to the portion of the report addressing questions related to access to justice.

C. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

1. Objectives

a) Overall objective

To provide an independent summative assessment of the impact of the UN's support to the justice sector in Somalia in line with national priorities and corporate strategies with reflections on challenges and lessons learned.

b) Specific objectives:

- To assess progress made towards achievement of the objectives of Phase I of the JJP.
- To identify lessons learned and to provide recommendations for future design and implementation of similar programmes, specifically Phase II of the JJP.

2. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the implementation period from August 2018 to June 2021 and will capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to the development of the justice sector. This evaluation is carried out under the UNDP Evaluation Policy¹ and the UNDP evaluation guidelines². The purpose of the evaluation is to provide UNDP, UNSOM-JJCS, the implementing partners (UNICEF, UN Women, and IDLO), and key stakeholders with an independent assessment of the performance of the Joint Justice Programme. This will provide evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the current programme that can be used to strengthen the existing programmes and in, form new initiatives. The evaluation of the JJP will be conducted in the context of the overall security and justice programming environment that includes the police, justice and corrections, and local governance, and assess the programme's contributions towards improving security and access to justice at the community level.

Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

The evaluation will use the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability to answer the following questions:

How has the programme addressed the overall impact of access to justice at the community level at the implementation location?

- Did the theory of change that was developed at the onset of the programme in 2018 and was revised in 2019 prioritize the outcome and the activities?

¹ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>

² <https://www.undp.org/accountability/evaluation>

- How effectively has the JJP contributed to the development of the rule of law and improved access to justice for all in Somalia?
- To what extent has this programme contributed to transformative change in ensuring access to justice for all?
- What was this programme's added value at the Federal Member State level?
- How effectively have the partnerships between FGS-FMS, the UN and international community, police, and Custodial Corp worked?
- What was the impact of the support provided to Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR) Centres? Provide in-depth analysis of the informal justice systems that have been developed in the programme, specifically those that have been supported in the programme and implemented by UNDP and IDLO. One case study shall be undertaken with in-depth analysis on the operational aspects of the ADR centre and whether value for money principles is followed; community access and outreach on whether the most vulnerable are able to access the ADR centre; analyse the government and local ownership of the ADR centre; analyse the interface of the cases supported by the ADR centre with those of the formal justice systems.
- What was the impact of the support provided to legal aid and mobile courts?
- What was the impact of the transformative change initiatives, including nonviolent communication, restorative justice, and community conversations?
- How did the programme address the triple-nexus of development, humanitarian, and peace building?
- How were the audit recommendations of the programme taken up to address specific observations?
- How were the previous recommendations from the UN Rule of Law programme taken onboard of the current programme?

How has the programme contributed to women's empowerment and improved women's access to justice services at the community level?

- How has gender mainstreaming and gender-based programming impacted the overall results in the programme delivery?
- How effective have the gender equality and accountability mechanisms been to ensure gender equality in the programme?
- What impact have the transformative change activities had on increasing women's access to justice?
- The extent to which the gender results planning, and budgetary support contributed to achieving the results outlined in the programme document.

How has the programme contributed to children's rights and juvenile justice?

- Assess/evaluate UNICEF supported interventions in relation to children's access to justice, and more specifically juvenile justice, with a focus on the work carried by the Child Protection Unit at the Ministry of Justice.
- Regular monitoring and follow up of detention facilities including police stations, case management for children in conflict with the law, including legal aid/representation, diversion, release, and family linkages.

How efficiently was the programme delivered?

- How were the mid-term evaluation recommendations implemented by the programme partners and Somali stakeholders?
- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- How effectively did the programme ensure coherence and coordination between the implementing agencies, and what steps can be taken to improve?
- What are the respective strengths of the different agencies in the Programme and to what extent did the Programme maximise their added value?
- Was the frequency and type of engagement/communication with donors, and government and other stakeholders sufficient to ensure strong buy-in to the Programme? How could this be improved?
- How efficiently and cost-effective was the project implementation strategy and execution?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- How effectively is the JJP aligned with other UN joint programmes

- such as the Constitutional Review, Parliamentary Support, Joint Human Rights, and Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism programmes?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent have the M&E systems been utilized to ensure effective and efficient project management and addressing results for the JJP and justice sector development in Somalia?
- How was the learning agenda shared between the implementing partners in the programme?

Sustainability and impact

- How has the lack of an agreed Justice model impacted the programme intervention?
- To what extent will financial resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do the interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?
- What were the positive, negative, intended, and unintended effects on peacebuilding and democratic governance, and what were its contributions towards the wider objectives outlined in the project document?

Evaluation Process

Inception Report

A maximum of 15 pages based on understanding of the Terms of Reference and initial meetings with the UNDP and the desk review. It should include the followings.

1. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
2. Evaluation objective, purpose, and scope. A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
3. Evaluation criteria and questions. The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.
4. Evaluation analysis. Illustrate the evaluation analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.
5. Cross-cutting issues. Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered, and analysed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
6. Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources, and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments, and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
7. Evaluation matrix. This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.
8. A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
9. Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting field offices or sites.

10. Outline of the draft/final report as detailed in the guidelines and ensuring quality and usability (outlined below). The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in section 6.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data from the field will be collected to the furthest extent possible through interview, virtual consultations conducted through video and audio conferencing and other IT collaboration tools applicable in a remote work environment.

Draft and Final Evaluation Report

The Consultant shall prepare a report that describes the evaluation, outlines findings, conclusions, and puts forward recommendations and lessons learned. The evaluation report shall be complete, logically organized/structured, clear, and written in easy, simple language that can be understood by the intended audience and must meet the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. The final report shall incorporate stakeholders' input/comments on the draft report and should include the following:

1. *The title and opening pages should provide the following basic information:*
 - a) Name of the evaluation intervention.
 - b) Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
 - c) Somalia as country of the evaluation intervention.
 - d) Names and organizations of evaluators.
 - e) Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
 - f) Acknowledgements.
2. *Project and evaluation information details on second page (as one page)*
 - A. Project Information**
 - i) Project title
 - ii) Atlas ID
 - iii) Corporate outcome and output
 - iv) country
 - v) Region
 - vi) Date project document signed
 - vii) Project dates (start/ planned end date),
 - viii) project budget,
 - ix) Project expenditure at the time of evaluation
 - x) Funding source,
 - xi) Implementing party,
 - B. Evaluation Information**
 - i) Evaluation type (Project evaluation)
 - ii) Final/ midterm review/ other
 - iii) Period under evaluation (start/ end),
 - iv) Evaluators' names
 - v) Evaluators' email addresses
 - vi) Evaluation dates (start/ completion).
3. Table of contents, including boxes, figures, tables, and annexes with page references.
4. List of List of acronyms and abbreviations.
5. *Executive Summary: A Stand-Alone Section of Two to Four Pages That Should:*
 - i) Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation the project
 - ii) Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses,
 - iii) Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods,
 - iv) Summarize principal findings, conclusions, and recommendations,
 - v) Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings.

6. *Introduction Should Include:*

- i) Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated now, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- ii) Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results,
- iii) Identify the intervention of the evaluation the project,
- iv) Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

7. *Description of the Intervention*

Should provide the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:

- i) Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit and the problem or issue it seeks to address
- ii) Explain the expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies and the key assumptions underlying the strategy,
- iii) Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals,
- iv) Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation,
- v) Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles,
- vi) Identify relevant cross-cutting issues addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind,
- vii) Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component,
- viii) Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets,
- ix) Describe the context of the social, political, economic, and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes,
- x) Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).

8. *Evaluation Scope and Objectives.*

The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives, and main questions,

- i) Evaluation scope. The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed,
- ii) Evaluation objectives. The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions,
- iii) Evaluation criteria. The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the criteria used in the evaluation,
- iv) Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

9. *Evaluation Approach and Methods.*

The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods, and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of

the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report. The description on methodology should include discussion of

- i) Evaluation approach
- ii) Data sources: the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions
- iii) Sample and sampling frame. If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); 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, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results,
- iv) Data-collection procedures and instruments: methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness,
- v) Performance standards: the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national, or regional indicators, rating scales),
- vi) Stakeholder participation in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results,
- vii) Ethical considerations: the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>),
- viii) Background information on evaluators: the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation,
- ix) Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

10. *Data Analysis.*

The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

11. *Findings*

Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.

12. A separate chapter of at least 8 pages shall be devoted to women's access to justice, the ADR centres with case studies and other approaches which have been taken up for access to justice and basic justice services. A separate report shall be provided as annex to the main report which shall provide the full details of stakeholder meetings and responses on case studies on ADR centres and mobile court services. This shall be provided by the Access to Justice expert.
13. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

14. *Recommendations.*

The report should provide practical, actionable, and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.

15. *Lessons Learned.*

The report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

16. *Report Annexes.*

Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report should include

- i) TORs for the evaluation,
- ii) Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate,
- iii) List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited, if any,
- iv) List of supporting documents reviewed,
- v) Project or programme results model or results framework,
- vi) Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators,
- vii) Code of conduct signed by evaluators.

Methodology

The evaluation must provide credible, reliable, and useful evidence-based information. The evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data through but not limited to the following methods:

- Extract the lessons learned and best practices that can be considered in the plan and design of the future project phase and recommendations that can be applied to similar projects.
- Desk study and review of all relevant project documentation including project documents, annual work-plans, project progress reports, project monitoring reports (from third party monitors) annual project reports, minutes of project board meetings, reports of consultancies and events.
- In depth interviews to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology.
- Considering the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, virtual focus group discussions with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders will be conducted.
- Interviews with key informants will be led by the Consultant and, effort will be made to ensure interviews are as comprehensive as possible.

In conducting the assignment, the Lead Consultant shall undertake the following tasks:

- Prepare the draft and final evaluation report based on guidelines provided in the Terms of reference in close collaboration with the National Access to Justice Expert.
- Assess the quality of partnerships, national ownership, and sustainability vis-à-vis the strategy in the project document, identify if (if any) and document lessons learned for future referencing.
- Identify extent of intended and unintended changes in development (condition/outcome) between the completion of outputs and achievement of impacts.
- Review the oversight, reporting and monitoring structures designed to support the project strategies.

D. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

Final Deliverables/Products

Deliverables/Outputs		Estimated Duration to complete	Target Due dates	Review and approvals Required	% of total professional fee
1	An inception report detailing consultant's understanding of the task and the methodology to be employed to complete the assignment and structure.	5 days	22 October 2021	Programme Steering Committee (PSC) UNDP, Evaluation Reference Group	70%
2	Data analysis and review of documents	10 days	3 November 2021		
3	Submission and presentation of the Draft Evaluation Report to key stakeholders for review and feedback/comments.	15 days	24 November 2021		
4	Submission of final report incorporating key stakeholders' input/feedback on the draft report.	10 days	08 December 2021		30%
Total		40 days			100%

E. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. Reporting

a) Reporting Lines

- The assignment will be conducted by two consultants who albeit working as a team, will each have specific deliverables. The Lead consultant will spearhead the assignment and will be responsible for preparation and submission of the final evaluation report whereas the Access to Justice expert shall contribute to the portion of the report addressing questions related to access to justice.
- Contractual arrangements will be the responsibility of UNDP hence, the consultants shall work under the overall supervision of the UNDP Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist in close collaboration with the Project Evaluation Reference Group comprising UNSOM, UNICEF, UN Women, IDLO and the MoJ of the Federal Government of Somalia.
- The UNDP M&E Specialist shall be responsible for accountability of the contract and shall provide guidance throughout all phases of execution including quality control in collaboration with the Project Evaluation Reference Group.
- Review of outputs will be jointly conducted by the, Project Evaluation Reference Group and the UNDP M&E Specialist and the Consultant shall ensure inclusion of stakeholder's input/comments on the draft report in the final report. All deliverables shall be approved by the PSC of the JJP and certified by the designated UNDP Manager.
- All data collected during the evaluation including all interviews, recordings and analyses will be submitted to UNDP and shall remain the property of UNDP.
- The UNDP will provide existing literature or documents to the selected Consultants that will help provider better comprehension of the project situation and the work required.
- The Consultant will be required to have his or her own personal laptop/computer.

b) Progress Reporting

- **Inception report:** Each consultant shall prepare a report based on preliminary discussions with UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group which must be submitted prior to undertaking any formal interviews, surveys, or field visits. The report shall outline the methodology, approach and timeline required for specific activities and deliverables (2 to 4 pages)

- **Evaluation debriefings:** On completion of the interviews, the lead consultant will debrief stakeholders, focusing on the main results and recommendations of the evaluation. Both consultants shall be involved in the evaluation briefings.
- **Draft evaluation report:** A draft report informing stakeholders and describing the findings and recommendations for future intervention strategies, lessons learned and best practices (25 - 40 pages including executive summary).
- **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 report shall incorporate all stakeholder input/comments on the draft. The content and structure of the report will be analytical and shall outline findings, recommendations and lessons learned covering the scope of the evaluation. It shall be complete, well-organised/structured, clearly written using easy/simple language for the intended audience and must meet the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. The international consultant will be responsible for the preparation of the final report.

F. DURATION OF THE WORK

Forty working days spread over a period of two months. Estimated lead time for UNDP/Programme implementing partner to review outputs/give comments, approve/accept outputs is five days.

G. DUTY STATION

Home-based.

H. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR

Academic Qualifications:

- Master's Degree or equivalent in law, gender and human rights, political science, social science or in a related field.

Experience:

- At least five years' progressive experience in (results-based) monitoring and evaluation, with specific expertise in the evaluation of gender, human rights, justice sector programmes.
- Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of evaluation of development programme
- Technical knowledge in access to justice, grassroots, and bottom-up approaches.
- Strong understanding of the linkages between access to justice and human rights and women's empowerment issues.
- Familiarity with UN joint programming and experience with UN programmes funded by multi-donor trust funds especially in conflict/post-conflict contexts is an advantage.
- Extensive knowledge and experience in evaluation of development programmes and understanding of political dynamics in Somalia would be an asset.

Language Requirements:

Proficient in spoken and Written English and Somali.

Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity and fairness, by modelling the UN/UNDP's values and ethical standards.
- Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of the UN and UNDP.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Treats all people fairly.
- Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

Functional Competencies:

- Skilled in research methodologies including frameworks, tools, and best practices.

- Excellent analytical and organizational skills with ability to analyse and synthesise information from different sources and to draw key themes and issues from the information.
- Strong communication skills including ability to formulate concise reports/edit texts and to articulate ideas in a clear concise style to cross-cultural audiences.
- Strong interpersonal skills including ability to interact with national and international actors at all levels of organisation with tact and diplomacy.
- Ability to manage complexities and to work collaboratively as part of a team.
- Possesses the ability to convey difficult issues and positions to senior officials and counterparts.
- Knowledge and effective use of computer software, especially MS Word and MS Excel.

I. SCOPE OF PRICE AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

- The maximum number of days payable under the contract is 40. The professional fee shall be converted into an output-based contract and will be paid as an all-inclusive lump sum fixed amount based on the weighted percentage corresponding to each deliverable as outlined in Section D above.
- Payment shall be released in tranches. After review and acceptance of Deliverable(s), the Individual Contractor will submit an invoice (UNDP Certificate of Payment) to the UNDP Evaluation Manager for certification that the Deliverable(s) have been achieved in accordance with the Deliverables Schedule in Section D above.
- Payment will be made within 30 days of submission of invoice and certification of payment by UNDP.

J. RECRUITMENT

The Consultant shall be selected through a desk review of CVs of technically vetted consultants on the UNDP GPN ExpRes roster.