



TERMS OF REFERENCE

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Post Title: | International Consultant to Final Evaluation of UNDP's Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Youth Co:Lab) |
| Agency/Project Name: | UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub (BRH) – Youth Unit |
| Country of Assignment: | Home-based with no travel required |
| Duration of Contract: | 01 December 2021 – 30 April 2022, with maximum 50 days worked |

1) BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The world today is home to the largest generation of young people in history, 1.2 billion people aged 15 to 24. Yet more than one fifth of young people are neither in employment, nor in education or training. At the same time, young people are a tremendous source of innovation, ideas and solutions. Boldly facing the challenges that globalisation, changing labour markets, shrinking civic space and climate change have afforded them, young people are contributing to the resilience of their communities, pushing strongly for climate action, calling for inclusive and just societies and driving innovation and social progress.

700 million young people aged 15 to 24, or approximately 60% of the world's youth, live in Asia Pacific. The region's rate of youth unemployment (10.4 percent) is more than twice the rate for the labour force at large (4.1 percent). The rate of youth unemployment also hides key deficits in terms of job quality. More than two in three workers (68 percent) in the region are in informal employment and a quarter of workers in the region are in working poverty. The challenges of securing decent work are even greater for vulnerable and marginalised youth including young women, youth living in humanitarian settings, youth with disabilities, migrant youth, indigenous youth and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth. COVID-19 has further exacerbated the challenges. In 2020, the crisis resulted in an employment decline for youth of 10.3 percent, as opposed to 2.4 percent for adults¹.

Asia Pacific also faces frontier challenges in the face of fast-paced environmental, technological and societal change. Countries at all stages of development across Asia Pacific need to leverage grassroots solutions to respond to these challenges in order to achieve the vision of the 2030 Agenda.

Youth 2030 – the UN Strategy on Youth launched in 2018 – recognises that to fulfil the 2030 Agenda, young people must be empowered to lead. The Strategy prioritises youth economic empowerment alongside four other closely interconnected priorities. To help deliver this Strategy a multi-stakeholder initiative, Generation Unlimited, was launched to ensure that all young people are in school, training or employment by 2030.

Contributing to this global agenda since 2017, the Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Youth Co:Lab), co-designed and co-led by UNDP and Citi Foundation, has sought to establish a common agenda for Asia-Pacific countries to empower and invest in youth to accelerate implementation of the Sustainable

¹https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_795453.pdf

Development Goals (SDGs). By developing 21st century skills and catalysing and scaling youth-led social enterprises, the project is positioning young people front and centre to address the region's most pressing challenges.

Youth Co:Lab seeks to both support and harness the ability of young people to be the change agents of their societies and communities by taking a leading role in the field of entrepreneurship and social innovation. To this end, the project has prioritised the following five outputs:

- Output 1: Improved ecosystem on youth empowerment in Asia and the Pacific to achieve SDGs.
- Output 2: Empowered Youth (with focus on marginalized groups) avail opportunities for expanding their leadership and entrepreneurship capabilities.
- Output 3: Enhanced learning and skills development programmes for youth entrepreneurship and leadership are designed and delivered through regional dialogues.
- Output 4: Advocacy, research and knowledge exchange initiative informs new youth entrepreneurship initiatives
- Output 5: Innovative financing solutions are leveraged for youth entrepreneurship

The strategy of the Youth Co:Lab is grounded in the UNDP Strategic Plan (SP) 2018-2021 and the Regional Programme Document (RPD) for Asia and Pacific. The project outputs respond particularly to two of the three broad development settings of the Strategic Plan: accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development and building resilience to crises and shocks. In addition, the Project supports implementation of UNDP's Signature Solutions. Social enterprises catalysed and supported by the project provide solutions to Efficient and Responsive Governance, Increased Resilience, Nature Based Solutions, Clean Affordable Energy and Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality.

Youth Co:Lab adopts a rights-based approach, seeking to ensure that that young people, including the most vulnerable and marginalised youth, are empowered to achieve their full potential and recognising young people's agency, resilience and their positive contributions as agents of change. Youth Co:Lab responds to the prioritised areas in the UN Youth Strategy, in particular Youth Economic Empowerment through Decent Work and Youth Engagement, Participation and Advocacy. The project also aligns with the UNDP Youth Global Programme for Sustainable Development and Peace (Youth-GPS 2016-2020) which promotes youth empowerment in the context of sustainable development and peacebuilding.

Youth Co:Lab is also grounded in a strong multi-stakeholder collaboration on youth empowerment. Through its Youth Empowerment Alliance, Youth Co:Lab actively engages ecosystem players from governments, the private sector, youth organisations, academia, and the development sector to connect young social entrepreneurs to finance, mentors, partners and support.

The mid-term review of the project was carried out as part of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Programme Document (RPD) in November 2020².

PROJECT INFORMATION

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Project | Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship |
| Atlas ID | 00110753 |
| Corporate outcome and output | Contributing to RPD Outcomes RPD for Asia and the Pacific 2018-2021: Outcome 2 Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development |

² <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9875>

| | | |
|---|--|--------------------|
| | Indicative RPD Outputs: RPD Output 2.3 Institutions, networks and non-state actors strengthened to promote inclusion, access to justice, and protect human rights (Strategic Plan 2018-2021: 2.2.2 and 2.2.3) RPD Indicator 2.3.1: Number of policies and initiatives that strengthen the enabling environment for youth empowerment (disaggregated by sex) | |
| Region | Asia-Pacific | |
| Project dates | Start | Planned end |
| | January 2017 | December 2022 |
| Total Project Budget (USD) | USD 10,530,000 (total resources required 13,560,000) | |
| Project Expenditures at the time of evaluation (USD) | USD 6,447,163.00 | |
| Funding Sources | UNDP BRH (TRAC), Baoshang Bank, Citi Foundation, CVC Philanthropy Ltd., Islamic Development Bank | |
| Implementation Modality/ Implementing Partner | United Nations Development Programme (Direct Implementation) | |

2) EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The Purpose of the Final Evaluation

The purpose of the final evaluation is to support accountability and facilitate learning and knowledge sharing. The evaluation will inform UNDP, Citi Foundation and key stakeholders of the results of the Youth Co:Lab project, consolidate lessons learnt and provide forward-looking and concrete recommendations. During the past four years of its implementation, the Youth Co:Lab initiative has rapidly scaled up and evolved while responding to changes in the operational context caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The evaluation will provide critical evidence-based information to guide the design of the project's future strategy and support UNDP and Citi Foundation's continued efforts to empower and invest in youth to accelerate the implementation of the SDGs in Asia-Pacific.

The Scope and Objectives of the Final Evaluation

The evaluation will cover project activities and results at regional level and through deep dives in specific countries. The final evaluation will assess the project's progress against the expected outputs and outcomes as defined in the results and resources framework (RRF) and project theory of change (ToC) from January 2017 to January 2022. The evaluation will build on the findings and recommendations of the deep dive analysis of the Youth Co:Lab project conducted during the Mid-Term Review of the RPD of UNDP Asia-Pacific and use the findings of the global evaluation of UNDP's youth portfolio.

The final evaluation will assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project. It will also assess the extent to which the project has adopted human rights-based and gender responsive approaches, identify lessons learnt and provide recommendations to expand and enhance project activities and ensure the sustainability of results.

The key objectives of the final evaluation are to:

- Assess the performance of the project in terms of achieving the intended project output results and contribution to outcomes according to the project's theory of change
- Assess the project's unique value proposition and sources of comparative advantage relative to other initiatives

- Assess the project’s partnership strategies and performance in achieving intended results through collaboration with ecosystem partners
- Assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency and effectiveness of the project activities and the sustainability of the results achieved towards the intended output and outcome level results at:
 - Downstream level: directly empowering young people
 - Midstream level: strengthening the ecosystem to support youth entrepreneurship, innovation, and leadership
 - Upstream level: working with governments to enhance the enabling environment for youth entrepreneurship, innovation, and leadership
- Identify challenges and factors that have affected the achievement of project results and assess the effectiveness of the approaches that the project has adopted to address these challenges
- Assess to what extent the project has adopted human rights-based, gender responsive and leave no one behind (LNOB) / diversity and inclusion approaches
- Identify lessons learnt from the project and provide concrete and forward-looking recommendations to inform the design of the next project cycle
- Assess the project’s alignment with UNDP’s RPD and Strategic Plan and the UN Strategy on Youth and the project’s contribution to the mainstreaming of the youth empowerment agenda.

3) EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. In this evaluation, the questions are structured under the following criteria, defined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC): relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. In addition, the evaluation will address cross-cutting questions related to gender, human rights/leaving no one behind principles.

| Evaluation Criteria | Guiding questions |
|-------------------------|---|
| Relevance and coherence | <p>To what extent have the project design and the project’s implemented activities been relevant for addressing the identified development challenges and advancing youth empowerment in the region?</p> <p>To what extent and in what ways does the project offer a unique value proposition to project stakeholders that distinguishes it from other initiatives in the youth empowerment space?</p> <p>To what extent is the project aligned to the strategic priorities of its key stakeholders, including UNDP Country Offices and private sector partners?</p> <p>To what extent and in what ways has the project evolved to respond to changes in the operational context due to the COVID-19 pandemic?</p> <p>What are the strengths and potential gaps in terms of project design and implementation in responding to the current context in Asia-Pacific? What are the risks and opportunities?</p> <p>To what extent have the project design and implementation been consistent with the gender-responsive, human rights based and LNOB / diversity and inclusion approaches?</p> <p>To what extent have the project activities been relevant for supporting key ecosystem stakeholders, such as governments and the private sector, to advance youth empowerment in the region?</p> |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>To what extent have young people, including young women, vulnerable and minority youth, found the project relevant to their needs?</p> <p>How coherent is the project with the UNDP's RPD and SP and Youth 2030 – the UN Strategy on Youth?</p> |
| Effectiveness | <p>To what extent has the project achieved its expected results? What are the areas of greatest achievements? What are the results achieved against the project RRF indicators?</p> <p>In which areas has the project not achieved its expected results? What have been the main challenges in the achievement of the expected results?</p> <p>What are the key internal and external factors that have contributed to, affected and/or impeded the achievement of expected results?</p> <p>How effective were the project implementation strategies?</p> <p>What is the added value of the project's regional approach and to what extent the project has been able to tap into opportunities provided by the regional approach?</p> <p>Do the project workstreams complement each other effectively? What are the strengths and potential gaps?</p> <p>How effective have the project's partnership strategies been for building the enabling environment and strengthening the ecosystem for youth entrepreneurship, leadership, and social innovation in Asia-Pacific? What are the key lessons learnt from the partnerships and how could these be leveraged in the future?</p> <p>How effective have the thought leadership, advocacy and communications activities of the project been in terms of increasing the visibility of the youth empowerment agenda and influencing decision making among the key stakeholders in the region? What have been the biggest successes and challenges?</p> <p>What have been the most effective strategies in terms of empowerment of young women and vulnerable and minority youth? What have been the key challenges in advancing this agenda?</p> <p>How effective has the project been in mainstreaming youth empowerment in UNDP and UN programming and in different thematic areas of work?</p> |
| Efficiency | <p>Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and utilised efficiently to achieve expected results?</p> <p>Have resources been sufficient for the achievement of results?</p> <p>To what extent and in what ways was the project able to leverage co-investment from other stakeholders to support the achievement of project objectives?</p> <p>To what extent was the project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results at regional and national levels?</p> <p>To what extent did project M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?</p> <p>Has the partnership structure of the project been effective and efficient to support achievement of the intended results?</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | Have the resources been used efficiently to support the empowerment of the most vulnerable youth and young women? |
| Sustainability | <p>To what extent can the achieved results be expected to be sustainable?</p> <p>Which factors are contributing positively to the sustainability of the project's results?</p> <p>What are some of the possible challenges in terms of sustainability of the project results?</p> <p>What kind of factors are contributing to the sustainability of the results achieved in the empowerment of young women and minority youth, such as youth with disabilities, sexual minorities or indigenous youth? What are the key challenges or gaps?</p> <p>To what extent will financial and other resources and institutional structures be available to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project beyond the project period?</p> <p>What can be done to improve the sustainability of the project results?</p> |
| Gender | <p>To what extent has the project been able to mainstream gender throughout the intervention, including design, implementation and monitoring of the project?</p> <p>What are the key project results with regards to direct empowerment of young women and addressing systemic barriers to the empowerment of young women?</p> <p>To what extent has the project been able to strengthen the capacities of the youth entrepreneurship ecosystem in terms of gender-responsiveness?</p> |
| Human rights /Leaving no one behind | <p>To what extent has the project been able to reach the most vulnerable, such as young people with disabilities, indigenous youth, LGBTIQ+ youth, and support the empowerment of minority youth?</p> <p>To what extent has the project been able to empower and support young social entrepreneurs to support vulnerable communities through their business models?</p> <p>To what extent has the project been able to promote structural/institutional changes to advance the inclusion and empowerment of minority youth (e.g., influence policies or regulations)</p> <p>To what extent has the project been able to build the capacities of the key stakeholders to advance the leave no one behind agenda?</p> |
| Lessons Learnt and recommendations | <p>What are the key lessons learnt during the project implementation?</p> <p>What are the recommendations for the future programme design? The recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, clear and result-oriented and realistic in terms of implementation.</p> <p>What could be the potential focus areas or priorities of the project's strategy in its next cycle?</p> |

4) METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will adhere to the UNDP Evaluation Policy and UNDG Norms & Standards (provided in Annexes) with its findings and judgements based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the review report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible,

and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework and analysis should also be discussed in the report.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the evaluation reference group, partners and other stakeholders, and direct beneficiaries, including young women and minority youth.

The final evaluation should employ a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods and instruments. The final methodology and data sources will be agreed upon in the inception report of the final evaluation. Some of the possible methods and data sources are provided in the table below.

| | |
|--|---|
| Desk review | <p>Review of relevant documents including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Document, Annual Work Plans, results and resources framework (RRF) and Theory of Change (ToC) - Project Monitoring and Evaluation Data - Survey data - Project progress and activity reports - Third party feedback on the project - Knowledge products, advocacy and communication materials and content - Youth and stakeholder consultation data collected during the project implementation - Financial and management information - Relevant global, regional, and national research studies - RBAP Regional Programme Document, RBAP Regional Programme Document Mid-Term Review, UNDP Strategic Plan, Youth 2030 – UN Strategy on Youth - Citi Foundation guidelines |
| Interviews and focus group discussions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with UNDP senior management, Citi Foundation, selected government counterparts and private sector partners, project stakeholders, entrepreneurs, youth participants, others - Focus group discussions with youth participants, Youth Co:Lab partners, UN partners, others. - Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and Project team as well as with other partners will be organised to ensure triangulation of the various data sources to maximise the validity and reliability of data. |
| Case studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Case studies on youth-led social enterprises / young entrepreneurs (selection to be determined) - Case studies on specific Youth Co:Lab country programmes (country selection to be determined) |
| Surveys | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Of youth, youth entrepreneurs, partners - Tracer surveys of participants in Youth Co:Lab activities |

Gender and Human Rights-based Approach

Evaluation must include an assessment of the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated gender equality perspective and rights-based approach. The evaluators are requested to review UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation during the inception phase. The methodology used in the evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods should be human rights and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with evaluation data and findings disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, dis/ability, etc.

Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of final evaluation from which findings are consolidated to make recommendations and identify lessons learned for enhanced gender responsive and rights-based approach of the project and future initiatives.

5) EXPECTED OUTPUTS and DELIVERABLES

In line with the above-mentioned criterion of work, methodology, associated with this Terms of Reference, the consultant is responsible for the following deliverables:

| # | Deliverables | Description | Estimated Duration to Complete | Tentative date of completion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------|------------------|
| All deliverables will be reviewed and approved by the Evaluation Manager. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Draft and Final Inception Reports and Evaluation Matrix. | <p><u>Inception Report</u></p> <p>The inception report will be prepared based on the first briefing meetings with the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Reference Group and on the desk review and preliminary analysis of the secondary data provided by the Youth Co:Lab project.</p> <p>The inception report includes understanding of the evaluations' objectives and initiative's theory of change, finalised evaluation design, workplan, time frame, activities and schedule, and final methodology and a detailed plan for data collection, including a list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted</p> <p>The inception report must explain how gender and human rights as cross-cutting areas are addressed in the methodology, including data collection and analysis methods.</p> <p>Detailed information on the required content of the inception report is provided in the annexes. The report must include the elements outlined in the annex and follow UNDP IEO's evaluation guidelines.</p> <p><u>Evaluation Matrix</u></p> <p>An evaluation matrix will be submitted as part of the inception report. The matrix should include evaluation questions that the evaluator will answer, data sources, data collection and analysis tools and methods appropriate for each source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated. Suggested format of the matrix is provided below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="379 1585 1118 1693"> <thead> <tr> <th>Relevant evaluation criteria</th> <th>Key questions</th> <th>Specific sub-questions</th> <th>Data Sources</th> <th>Data Collection methods/tools</th> <th>Indicators/success standards</th> <th>Methods of data analysis</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Approval</u></p> <p>The Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Reference Group will review the draft inception report, provide feedback and assure its quality.</p> <p>An oral debriefing by the Evaluation Consultant on the proposed work plan and methodology will be done and approved prior to the commencement of the evaluation process.</p> <p>The final inception report and evaluation matrix will be</p> | Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific sub-questions | Data Sources | Data Collection methods/tools | Indicators/success standards | Methods of data analysis | | | | | | | | 10 Days | 21 December 2021 |
| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific sub-questions | Data Sources | Data Collection methods/tools | Indicators/success standards | Methods of data analysis | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------|-----------------|
| | | submitted to and approved by the Evaluation Manager. | | |
| 2 | Data Collection and Analysis and the First Draft of the Final Evaluation Report | <p><u>Data collection and analysis (estimated duration: 20 days)</u></p> <p>The data collection and analysis will be conducted following the methodology and data sources outlined in the inception report.</p> <p><u>Report writing and the first draft of the Final Evaluation Report (estimated duration: 10 days)</u></p> <p>The final report, including the first draft, should be based on the approach and methodology outlined in the inception report. Each evaluation question, including the cross-cutting questions on gender and human rights, should be answered in the draft report and analysis and findings should be backed up with credible quantitative and qualitative evidence.</p> <p>The evaluation report is expected to include case studies and concrete examples and citations across the report.</p> <p>The draft report will contain the same sections as the final report. The evaluation report must follow the structure provided in the annexes of this ToR. The evaluator is requested to review IEO's Quality Standards for evaluations to ensure that the report meets these criteria. The standards are provided in the annexes.</p> <p>The draft will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager. A debriefing with the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Reference group will be organised at the time of the submission of the first draft.</p> <p>The draft will be reviewed by the evaluation Manager and Evaluation Reference Group who will provide feedback on it</p> | 30 Days | 3 February 2022 |
| 3 | Second Draft of the Final Report. Final Evaluation Report, Evaluation Brief, Audit Trail Form and Final Presentation | <p><u>Second Draft Report and Debriefing (estimated duration: 5 days)</u></p> <p>The second draft will be prepared based on the feedback provided on the first draft report and submitted to the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Reference Group for final clearance.</p> <p>The evaluator is requested to organise a debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders before the submission of the final evaluation report.</p> <p><u>Final evaluation report, evaluation brief, audit trail form and final presentation (estimated duration: 5 days)</u></p> <p>Final Evaluation Report: The final evaluation report will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager alongside the audit trail form and evaluation brief.</p> <p>Evaluation Brief: A brief summary of the key findings and recommendations of the evaluation (max 2 pages).</p> | 10 Days | 3 March 2022 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Audit Trail Form: 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. Audit trail form will be attached to the evaluation report (please see a template in the Annexes)</p> <p>Final presentation to Stakeholders: A presentation of the final report to the evaluation reference group and key stakeholders.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

6) TIMEFRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Timeframe for the evaluation process

Following here is the anticipated number of working days required in each final evaluation process with total number of working days not exceeding 50 working days during 01 December 2021 to 30 April 2022.

| No | Deliverables | Estimated # of days | Tentative Date of Completion | % of the total contract amount | Review and Approvals Required |
|----|--|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Draft and Final Inception Reports and Evaluation Matrix | 10 days | 21 December 2021 | 30 % | Evaluation Manager |
| 2 | Data Collection and Analysis and the First Draft of the Final Report | 30 days | 3 February 2022 | 40 % | Evaluation Manager |
| 3 | Second Draft of the Final Report, Final Evaluation Report, Evaluation Brief, Audit Trail Form and Final Presentation | 10 days | 3 March 2022 | 30 % | Evaluation Manager |
| | Total | 50 days | | 100 % | |

The final report is expected to follow IEO's UNDP guidelines for template and meet the Quality Criteria. These are provided in Annexes.

Implementation arrangements

| Who (Responsible) | What (Responsibilities) |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Evaluation Manager | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assure smooth, quality and independent implementation of the evaluation with needful guidance from UNDP’s Senior Management. • Approve ToR and selection criteria. • Hire the consultant by reviewing proposals and complete the recruitment process. • Ensure the independent implementation of the evaluation process. • Approve each step of the evaluation including inception and final reports • Supervise, guide and provide feedback and comments to the evaluation consultants. • Ensure quality of the evaluation. • Ensure the Management Response and action plans are fully implemented |
| Project manager | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft ToR to be reviewed and finalized by the Evaluation Manager • Support in hiring the consultant • Provide necessary information and coordination with different stakeholders including donor communities • Provide feedback and comments on draft report • Prepare management response and action plan and follow up the implementation |
| Youth Co:Lab Project Team | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide required information, furnishing documents for review to the consultant team. • Logistical arrangements, such as for support in setting up stakeholder meetings, and coordinating with the partners and stakeholders. |
| Final Evaluation Consultant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the relevant documents. • Develop and submit draft and final inception reports • Conduct evaluation. • Maintain ethical considerations. • Develop and submit draft evaluation reports • Organise meeting/consultation to discuss the draft reports • Incorporate inputs and feedback in draft reports • Submit final report, summary of findings and audit trail form with due consideration of quality and effectiveness • Organise presentation of the final report |
| Evaluation Reference Group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Final Evaluation Reference Group comprised of Programme Team Lead, Regional M&E Specialist, Citi Foundation representative(s) and other stakeholders as relevant • Review inception report and draft report and provide feedback • Participate in debriefing session and provide suggestions, support quality assurance and correct any factual errors |

Regular communication between the evaluation consultant and the evaluation manager and evaluation reference group is expected throughout the evaluation to ensure a smooth coordination of the process, including engagement with the stakeholders.

The Final Evaluation Consultant will be briefed by UNDP Evaluation Manager upon arrival on the objectives, purpose and outputs of the evaluation. An oral debriefing by the Final Evaluation Consultant on the proposed work plan and methodology will be done and approved prior to the commencement of the process.

The final evaluation will remain fully independent. The evaluation Consultant maintains all the communication through the Evaluation Manager during the implementation of the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager should clear each step of the evaluation. Evaluation report must meet the requirements from the Independent Evaluation Office’s guidelines which are provided in the annexes of this TOR.

Contractors will arrange online final presentation with UNDP BRH and relevant stakeholders and noted comments from participants which will be incorporated in the final report.

The final report will be signed off by the Manager of UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub.

7) EVALUATION ETHICS

To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in a final evaluation and evaluation consultants working for the United Nations system are required to commit themselves in conducting the evaluation in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'³ and writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

Consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.

8) EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCES

The Final Evaluation requires one international consultant to complete the exercise. The consultant will have the following experience:

- Minimum Master's Degree or higher in Public Administration, Law, Political Science, Finance, Economics, International Relations, Development Studies, or related fields
- At least 5 years of professional experience of the development project/programme design, assessment, monitoring and evaluation, including UN projects/programmes and private sector led/funded projects and experience in the Asia-Pacific region
- Proven technical knowledge and experience in at least three of the following thematic areas in the development context: youth, the private sector, entrepreneurship, communications and advocacy, economic empowerment, civic engagement
- Technical knowledge and experience in at least two of the following cross-cutting issues; gender equality, disability, rights-based approach and youth-responsive approach
- At least 3 years of experience in producing research studies, conducting qualitative and quantitative data analysis and writing reports, preferably in the above-mentioned fields
- Excellent knowledge of verbal and written English
- Experience in evaluating or assessing regional or multi-country projects/programmes is highly desirable
- Experience in managing, evaluating or assessing projects/programmes implemented in partnership with private sector and a UN agency is highly desirable

9) SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The contract will be on a lump-sum basis.

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, living allowance and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

| Milestone/ Deliverable (list of documents or actions expected to be performed by the consultant) | Payment Terms in % of Total Contract Amount |
|---|--|
| <u>1st instalment:</u> Upon satisfactory completion of Inception Report, including the evaluation matrix | 30% |
| <u>2nd instalment:</u> Upon satisfactory completion of the data collection and analysis and delivery of the first draft of the Final Evaluation Report | 40 % |
| <u>3rd instalment:</u> Upon satisfactory delivery of findings presentation and completion of Final Evaluation Report, Evaluation Brief and Audit Trail Form | 30 % |

It is important to note that multiple iterations of the report may be required for the satisfactory completion of the report.

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent.

10) APPLICATION PROCEDURE

Interested individuals must submit the following documents mentioned below to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into one (1) single PDF document as the application only allows to upload maximum one document.

Any individual employed by a company, organization or institution who would like to submit a proposal in response to this Individual Contract notice must do so in their individual capacity.

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided.
- A Curriculum Vitae (CV) or P.11 Personal History Form stipulating applicant's official name as shown in identification document, the qualifications and professional experiences (with similar projects) relevant to the assignment/TOR, the contact details (email address, telephone numbers) of 3 professional references and a writing sample (e.g. a previous evaluation report or a research study authored by an applicant).
- A signed financial proposal, quoted in US dollars, outlining the all-inclusive fee, supported by a breakdown of reimbursable – direct and indirect – costs such as travel, lodging, per diem etc. Note: if an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP (Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability).
- Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment (max 1 page).

Incomplete proposals may not be considered. The shortlisted candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified.

11) EVALUATION METHOD AND SELECITON CRITERIA

Evaluation Methods and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%), and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (70%) - max 100 points

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Max Score (points) |
|----------|--|--------------------|
| 1 | Minimum Master's Degree or higher in Public Administration, Law, Political Science, Finance, Economics, International Relations, Development Studies, or related fields | 10 |
| 2 | At least 5 years of professional experience of the development project/programme design, assessment, monitoring and evaluation, including UN projects/programmes and private sector led/funded projects, including experience in the Asia-Pacific region | 30 |
| 3 | Technical knowledge and experience in cross-cutting issues: gender equality, disability, rights-based approach and youth-responsive approach (at least two of the mentioned cross-cutting issues) | 10 |
| 4 | Proven technical knowledge and experience in at least three of the following thematic areas in the development context: youth, the private sector, entrepreneurship, communications and advocacy, economic empowerment, policy design and analysis, civic engagement | 20 |
| 5 | At least three years of experience in producing research studies, conducting qualitative and quantitative data analysis and writing reports | 20 |
| 6 | Excellent knowledge of verbal and written English (the applicants are requested to attached to the application an evaluation report or a research study they have authored) | 10 |
| TOTAL | | 100 |

Language:

- Excellent knowledge of verbal and written English

Competencies:

- Demonstrates commitment to the UN's mission, vision and values;
- Demonstrates sound judgment, diplomacy and sensitivity to confidential matters;
- Demonstrated ability to meet deadlines and work under pressure;
- Innovative forward thinking, good coordination and organizational skills, teamwork; and
- Participate effectively in team-based, information sharing environment, collaborating and cooperating with others.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points (70% of the total 100 points in technical evaluation) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation respectively.

For those passing technical evaluation above, offers will be evaluated per the Combined Scoring method:

- Technical Evaluation (70%)

b) Financial Evaluation (30%)

Financial Evaluation (30%)

Financial proposals from all technically qualified candidates will be scored out of 30 marks based on the formula provided below. The maximum marks (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals will receive points according to the following formula:

- $p = y (\mu/z)$.

Where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated;
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal;
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal;
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated.

Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

****Failure to submit the above-mentioned documents or Incomplete proposals shall result in disqualification**

****Please group all your document into one (1) single PDF document as the application system only allows to upload maximum one document.**

The short-listed candidates may be contacted, and the successful candidate will be notified. Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

12) ANNEXES⁴

1. Indicative list of documents for the desk review
2. UNDP and UNEG Evaluation Guidelines
3. Inception Report Contents Outline
4. Final Report Contents Outline
5. Evaluation Audit Trail Form
6. UNEG Code of Conduct Form

This ToR is prepared by: Beniam Gebrezghi, Programme Specialist, Civil Society and Youth Governance and Peacebuilding Team, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub

Signature Beniam Gebrezghi

This ToR is approved by: Karin Takeuchi, Programme Coordinator, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub

Signature Karin Takeuchi

Date of Signing 27-October-2021

⁴ These documents will be provided after signing of the contract.

Annexes

1) Documents to be reviewed as part of desk review include but are not limited to:

- Project Document
- Project Theory of Change and Results and Resources Framework
- Annual Project Progress Reports and other activity reports
- Project Monitoring and Evaluation Data
- Financial and management information
- Survey Data
- Third party feedback on the project
- RBAP Regional Programme Document 2018-2021 Mid-Term review
- RBAP Regional Programme Document
- UNDP Strategic Plans
- Youth 2030 – the UN Strategy on Youth
- Knowledge products and case studies developed by the project
- Communication and advocacy materials and content
- Project consultation and outreach materials
- Relevant global, regional, and national research studies
- Citi Foundation guidelines
- Other documents

The list of key agencies, stakeholders and partners for interview will be provided after signing the contract.

2) UNDP and UNEG Evaluation Guidelines

1. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (please review especially sections 4, 5 and 6). Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>
2. United Nations Evaluation Group (2020). Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. Access at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>
3. United Nations Evaluation Group (2017). UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. Access at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>
4. UNEG (2014). Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations. Access at: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980>

3) Inception report Content

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.
4. Evaluability analysis. Illustrates the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) approaches, and the implications for 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 the inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
6. Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models to be adopted, and describing the 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 discussing their reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan.

7. Evaluation matrix, identifying the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered through the selected methods.
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
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 standards provided in UNDP's evaluation guidelines.

4) Outline of the evaluation report format (please see further details in UNDP evaluation guidelines)

1. Title and opening pages with details of the project/ programme/ outcome being evaluated and the evaluation team.
2. Project and evaluation details, including the project title, Atlas number, budgets and project dates and other key information.
3. Table of contents.
4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.
5. Executive summary, a stand-alone section of maximum four pages including the quality standards and assurance ratings.
6. Introduction and overview, explaining what is being evaluated and why.
7. Description of the intervention being evaluated, providing the basis for readers to understand the design, general logic, results framework (theory of change) and other relevant information of the initiative being evaluated.
8. Evaluation scope and objectives, to provide a clear explanation of the evaluation scope, primary objectives and main questions.
9. Evaluation approach and methods, describing in detail the selected methodological approaches and methods.
10. Data analysis, describing the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions.
11. Findings and conclusions, setting out the evaluation findings, based on analysis of the data collected, and the conclusions drawn from these findings.
12. Recommendations. The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make.
13. Lessons learned. As appropriate and when requested in the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation of the intervention.
14. All findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned need to consider gender equality and women's empowerment, disability, and other cross-cutting issues.
15. Annexes. At a minimum these should include: a. TOR for the evaluation. b. Evaluation matrix and data collection instruments c. List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. d. List of supporting documents reviewed e. others as deemed necessary by the evaluator to support the findings and recommendations in the final

5) Audit Trail Template

| Chapter and section number | Paragraph number/ line number | Comments | Evaluation team responses and/ or actions taken |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |

6) The UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation Pledge to be signed by the evaluator



By signing this pledge, I hereby commit to discussing and applying the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and to adopting the associated ethical behavior.

**INTEGRITY**

I will actively adhere to the moral values and professional standards of evaluation practice as outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and following the values of the United Nations. Specifically, I will be:

- **Honest and truthful** in my communication and actions.
- **Professional**, engaging in credible and trustworthy behaviour, alongside competence, commitment and ongoing reflective practice.
- **Independent, impartial and incorruptible**.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

I will be answerable for all decisions made and actions taken and responsible for honouring commitments, without qualification or exception; I will report potential or actual harms observed. Specifically, I will be:

- **Transparent regarding evaluation** purpose and actions taken, establishing trust and increasing accountability for performance to the public, particularly those populations affected by the evaluation.
- **Responsive** as questions or events arise, adapting plans as required and referring to appropriate channels where corruption, fraud, sexual exploitation or abuse or other misconduct or waste of resources is identified.
- **Responsible** for meeting the evaluation purpose and for actions taken and for ensuring redress and recognition as needed.

**RESPECT**

I will engage with all stakeholders of an evaluation in a way that honours their dignity, well-being, personal agency and characteristics. Specifically, I will ensure:

- **Access** to the evaluation process and products by all relevant stakeholders – whether powerless or powerful – with due attention to factors that could impede access such as sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBTQ status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability.
- **Meaningful participation and equitable treatment** of all relevant stakeholders in the evaluation processes, from design to dissemination. This includes engaging various stakeholders, particularly affected people, so they can actively inform the evaluation approach and products rather than being solely a subject of data collection.
- **Fair representation** of different voices and perspectives in evaluation products (reports, webinars, etc.).

**BENEFICENCE**

I will strive to do good for people and planet while minimizing harm arising from evaluation as an evaluation. Specifically, I will ensure:

- **Explicit and ongoing consideration** of risks and benefits from evaluation processes.
- **Maximum benefits** at system (including environmental), organizational and programmatic level.
- **No harm**. I will not proceed if harm cannot be mitigated.
- **Evaluation makes an overall positive contribution** to human and natural systems and the mission of the United Nations.

I commit to playing my part in ensuring that evaluations are conducted according to the Charter of the United Nations and the ethical requirements laid out above and contained within the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. When this is not possible, I will report the situation to my supervisor, designated focal points or channels and will actively seek an appropriate response.

(Signature and Date)