**Terms of Reference**

**Individual Consultant**

**UNDP-UNSMIL Policing and Security Joint final Programme Evaluation**

**Office: UNDP Libya**

**Description of the assignment: International Consultant to conduct Policing and Security Joint Programme Final Evaluation**

**Project name: Policing and Security Joint Programme**

**Reports to: Deputy Resident Representative (P)**

**Type of Appointment: Individual Consultant (International)**

**Duty Station: Homebased with 10 days in country (Libya)**

**Duration of the contract: 40 working days**

**Expected start date 1 March 2022**

1. **Background and Context**

Libya continues to face varied challenges in its transition to democratic rule in the aftermath of the 2011. However, the country has been unable to establish functional governance and sustainable peace. Various levels of violence have slowed development. Despite ongoing security challenges, prospects for a comprehensive political agreement to end the conflict in Libya have improved with the establishment of the Government of National Unity (GNU) and with national elections on the horizon. Despite the severe challenges, political uncertainty and limited enabling environment, it remains essential to provide support to rule law institutions, many of which have been severely weakened. Recent protests in Libya against impunity after the discovery of mass grave sites has reaffirmed the peoples’ demand for justice as a precursor to any political settlement.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)/ United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) “*Policing and Security Joint Programme*” (PSJP) supports to the Rule of Law sector and was aligned with the Country Programme Document (CPD) Outcome 3 *“Libya successfully manages a transition to a state founded on the rule of law.”*

The current phase of the project was developed in 2017 and awarded multi-year funding from the Governments of Germany, Italy, Netherlands, United States Department of State’s Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL/US), and UNDP Bureau of Policy and Programme Support (BPPS). Policing and Security Joint Programme supports rule of law institutions Ministry of Interior (MoI) and Ministry of Justice (MoJ). Police Service personnel working under MoI and Judicial Police personnel working under MoJ are the direct beneficiary, indirect beneficiaries are communities to whom rule of law institutions are providing services including vulnerable population in greater Tripoli area.

The entry points for assistance targeted by the PJSP are derived from extensive analysis and experience of the Libyan security and justice sectors, both substantively and operationally. In recognition of the political and security developments in Libya and related opportunities to enhance stability in Tripoli and avert the further erosion of institutional capacities the PSJP was designed to support criminal justice institutions to advance security and the rule of law in Libya’s capital. Initially, the joint programme intended to provide a coherent framework of assistance to the then Government of National Accord’s (GNA) efforts to strengthen security and rule of law in Tripoli, that can be emulated elsewhere in Libya later. However, after 18 months of active conflict in 2019, notwithstanding the positive momentum created by the ceasefire agreement and the peaceful transfer of power to the Government of National Unity (GNU), Libya continues to face daunting challenges, most pressingly in the security arena. Disagreements over the composition and control over the security forces and lack of integration of influential armed groups under a unified command and control structure, mean that some of the major drivers of conflict remain unresolved.

Although the MOI seem to continue working under a unified institutional structure even during the political division of the government between east and west, policing institutions at the local level have been loyal to the political power according to the geographic location and the local political and economic context. The divergence is such that local branches of the same institutions can have opposing cultures and strategic priorities and respond to different political incentives. One of the biggest challenges for the reform of the security sector in Libya is to find a coherent and harmonized framework that encompasses security actors who have very different and sometimes conflicting political, ideological, and economic interests. A preliminary analysis of the local context, including the main formal and informal actors and the social and economic specificities should take place before identifying the approach and the intervention strategy.

Though change of leadership in Ministries of Interior and Justice resulted in slowing down implementation, the joint programme continued to support MoI and MoJ working under the GNU. The joint programme during implementation,

To effectively respond to the conflict-situation, programmatic support to rule of law institutions has been guided by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) Programme Criticality Analysis and conformity to the United Nations Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (UNHRDDP). In addition, the joint programme is aligned with UN Strategic Framework, Area 3: Public Administration and Governance); Area 4 (Human Rights, Transitional Justice and Rule of Law; UNDP CPD Outcome 3: Libya successfully manages a transition to a state founded on the rule of law; and Sustainable Development Goal 16: Peace, justice, and strong institutions.

The joint programme is supporting the rule of law institutions for institutional capacity building in terms or developing policies documents. Implementation of this policy documents would empower rule of law personnel with human rights-based approach, gender and conflict responsive, while providing services.

Based on detailed context assessments, capabilities, and in consultation with Libyan stakeholders, the following priority areas have been identified for programmatic engagement as follows:

**Joint Programme Outcome:** National capacities to advance safety and security in Tripoli are improved, including through more effective and public-oriented policing and rule of law services.

1. **Output 1:** Structure, roles and resourcing of local police and criminal justice institutions clarified and prioritized according to identified needs in Tripoli.
2. **Output 2:** Effectiveness of law enforcement and prison service delivery in Tripoli improved through provision of training and technical and material assistance.
3. **Output 3:** Ministry of Interior enabled to better assess and provide feasible reintegration and demobilisation options for members of armed formations.
4. **Output 4:** Ministry of Interior provided with capacity development and organizational assistance

A theory of change underpinning the programme is elaborated around the preconditions and change pathways outlined in the text box below

* If the MOI can assess, clarify, and update the structure, roles and resourcing of police directorates and services, take on board better community-led policing practices and if similar work can be done to improve coordination with the MOJ, prison management services, and related institutions, and;
* If the MOI and MOJ can be provided sufficient capacity development and organisational assistance to do so – in the form of better strategic planning, project management and delivery, human resources and vetting, and better administrative processes;
* Then UN joint programme partners can better support the MOI and MOJ in improving the effectiveness of police and prison service delivery in Tripoli, and militate better against risks involved in training and technical and material assistance, and;
* Then improved state security services, executive and administrative capacity, and the ability to provide stronger law enforcement and justice services reduce the incentives for ongoing mobilization of armed groups within the communities. This increases opportunities for credible, long-term options for reintegrating and demobilizing its armed formations into society.

STRATEGIC OUTCOME: Libyan government efforts, supported by the UN, to stabilize Tripoli are more likely to succeed; police operations and services can achieve a baseline level of activity, visibility, respect, and effectiveness; forces are reintegrated into host communities; public confidence improved in the ability of the State to provide security and justice services and in the effectiveness of the police and criminal justice institutions.

PSJP in collaboration with the strategic partner UNSMIL commenced its implementation in October 2017 and the period was extended up to June 2022.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION** | | |
| **Project/Outcome Title** | UNDP/UNSMIL Policing and Security Joint Programme | |
| **Atlas ID** | 00101889 Output ID: 00104136 | |
| **Corporate Outcome and Output** |  | |
| **Country** | Libya | |
| **Region** | RBAS | |
| **Date project document signed** | September 21, 2017 | |
| **Project Dates** | **Start** | **Planned end** |
| September 21, 2017 | June 30, 2022 |
| **Project Budget** | US$ 9,379,414 | |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** | US$ 6,955,807 | |
| **Funding Source** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Donors** | **Contribution** | | The Government of Germany | $1,562,456 | | The Government of Italy | $3,144,413 | | The Government of Netherlands | $1,722,569 | | The Government of USA (INL) | $1,949,976 | | UNDP-BPPS | $1,000,000 | | **TOTAL** | **$9,379,414** | | |
| **Implementing Party**[[1]](#footnote-1) | UNDP, Libya | |

1. **Scope of work**

The overall objective of the joint final programme evaluation is to assess the extent to which PSJP has contributed to its intended outcome to strengthened criminal justice institutions to respond to the security needs of the people (Libyans, migrants, and refugees). The evaluation will highlight the intended and unintended consequences (both positive and negative) of implementation to date and prepare recommendations to be implemented during a next phase.

The TOR is designed to guide the conduct of an independent evaluation (IE). This TOR seeks to strengthen and improve the joint programme’s intervention by examining, amongst other things, the delivery of the joint programme, the quality of its implementation and the organizational context, personnel, structures, and procedure; and examines the joint programme theory of change by testing the relationship between goals, activities, outcomes, and wider context.

The purpose of the joint programme evaluation is to assess and determine the performance of the PSJP over the past four years of implementation regarding the above stated key strategic interventions, to specifically:

* ascertain the progress towards achieving agreed outputs and targets,
* determine appropriate measures for refocusing joint programme strategies,
* highlight areas of strength and opportunities for achieving the desired joint programme results and
* capture effectively lessons learnt
* To establish and document the positive impact & any unintended consequences of activities and the relevance to the overall strategy, to validate results in terms of achievements toward the outputs; to examine to what extent interventions supported co-existence efforts, strengthened and empowered and enhanced participation of vulnerable groups particularly in decision making and resources sharing
* To document lessons learned, best practices, success stories and challenges to inform future initiatives.
* To formulate informed recommendations on future programmatic vision, including the processes and governance mechanisms

The scope of the joint programme evaluation reflects the diverse range of activities as defined in the Results and Resource Framework (RRF) and the Annual Work Plan (AWP). The target group to be considered for evaluation are rule of law personnel, particularly Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, Police and judicial police and communities in greater Tripoli area The evaluation is forward looking and will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy to ascertain whether the specific and overall interventions and approaches were appropriate and effective. This will include the implementation modalities, coordination, partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation, replication, sustainability of the joint programme. The joint programme evaluation will include review of the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project and the development process. It will assess the extent to which the programme results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built, and cross cutting issues such as gender, and human rights have been addressed. It will also assess whether the programme implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning. The evaluation specifically:

* Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per the Project Document and their contributions to outcome level goals. By providing an objective assessment of the intervention achievements, constraints, performance, results, relevance, and sustainability.
* Generate lessons for the period October 2017 to December 2020 to inform current and future programming in the context of Covid-19 and continued political instability in the country by identify factors, which facilitated or hindered the results achievement, both in terms of the external environment and those related to internal factors. Document and record the lessons learned at various implementation stages. This should include but not be limited to assessing the strengths and weaknesses in different stages of the project, design, management, coordination, human resource, and financial resources.
* Assess the appropriateness of the Project strategy to reach the intended outputs and outcomes.
* Define the extent to which the Project addressed cross cutting issues including gender, human rights, and conflict sensitivity.
* Identify and assess the project’s response mechanisms and adaptability to unforeseen external and internal factors.
* Identify whether past results represent enough foundation for future progress.
* Provide clear, focused, and forward-looking recommendations to suggest effective and realistic new and adaptative strategies by UNDP and partners during the 1) the current phase and 2) during a new phase, if agreed upon by all relevant counterparts.

The users of the evaluation results include UNDP management, programme and project staff, and Libyan stakeholders. The evaluation will cover the period 01 October 2017 to 31 December 2021. The independent evaluation will focus on the second phase of the Policing and Security Joint Programme. The evaluation will be conducted over a forty (40) days period beginning on March 01, 2022.

Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. This section proposes the questions that, when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take actions or increase knowledge. Questions should be grouped according to the four or five OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) coherence; (c) effectiveness; (d) efficiency; and (e) sustainability (and any other criteria used).

**Evaluation Criteria and Key Guiding Questions**

The joint programme evaluation among other is required to address two issues: the extent to which the PSJP was able to adapt to changes in operating context brought on by the fighting in Tripoli, Libya in early April 2019 which persisted for more than one year and on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In assessing the joint programme, the evaluation will take into consideration the following evaluative dimensions and questions:

1. **Relevance:**

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

* To what extent is the intervention strategically relevant to fulfil its objective as stated in the Project Document?
* To what extent are the objectives still relevant given the continued political instability, Libya’s financial crisis, and the impact of COVID-19 pandemic?
* Has the joint programme put in place a mechanism to understand and design specific interventions to address the issues of women, girls, and boys?
* Is the PSJP’s Theory of Change valid? What changes, further assumptions or additional risk management might be required to give it greater effect in upcoming phases?

1. **Efficiency**

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

* To what extent has PSJP adapted to the COVID emergency to ensure efficiency in implementation?
* Is PSJP’s risk matrix fit for purpose? Is the risk management approach appropriate?
* Is the project delivering its outputs in a cost-efficient manner?
* Are there necessary and relevant resources allocated to the project to carry out the stated activities and outputs?
* Are the human and financial resources appropriately allocated?
* Is the project equipped with the necessary tools and equipment?
* Is the project delivering it outputs and services in a timely manner?

1. **Effectiveness**

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

* What factors have influenced the ability of PSJP to deliver its results? Has the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic affected implementation of project activities? To what extent has PSJP adapted and responded to any factors affecting its implementation?
* Is the project on track to deliver the planned outputs? If not, why? What unplanned outputs have been delivered?
* Is the project achieving progress according to the stated targets and agreed timeframe?
* Are the outputs consistent with the intended project objectives?
* Overall, were the activities and outputs planned and organized to achieve the desired results?

1. **Disability**

* Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
* What proportion of the beneficiaries of a programme were persons with disabilities?
* What barriers did persons with disabilities face? Was a twin-track approach adopted?[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. **Human rights**

* To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women, men and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

1. **Risk**

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and outcomes?

1. **Sustainability of the Project.**

In assessing the sustainability of the Project, the evaluation will look at the positive and negative changes produced by the Project’s development interventions, directly or indirectly, intended, or unintended. It will also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of peacebuilding and reconciliation conditions.

On sustainability, the evaluation will measure the likeliness of project’s results continuity after donor funding has been withdrawn. Some of the key questions will include:

* To what extent was sustainability considered in the planning and execution of the Project’s activities? To what extent is there evidence of sustainability of results?
* Are the necessary steps being taken to build ownership of the project and promote sustainable outcomes?
* Are steps being taken to ensure there will be the necessary human and financial resources, key stakeholder support to ensure the continuation of activities after the project ends?
* Has PSJP supported the capacity strengthening initiatives of national staff to enable them to take the lead in respective project areas?
* What are the key lessons learned throughout the period of implementation of the project and which can be utilized to guide future strategies and projects?
* How could the project be improved to ensure increased sustainability? Particularly in relation to future project design and management.
* What set of recommendations can be given for a similar initiative, especially the development of a second phase of the project?

Evaluation of Cross-Cutting Issues:

Leave no one behind and gender aspects will be considered well in evaluation questions as well the evaluation process. Gender analysis, including gender disaggregated data need to be incorporated in the evaluation.

Leave no one behind:

* To what extent have the research and monitoring of PSJP for Libya been inclusive in terms of capturing the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized part of the Libya population, vulnerable for incitement of criminal justice institutions to advance security
* To what extent has PSJP for Libya civil society and youth engagement been able to include and reach the most vulnerable and marginalized part of the Libya population, vulnerable for incitement of justice.

Gender Equality:

* To what extent has PSJP for Libya and other national stakeholders’ capacity been strengthened in better promoting and protecting women’s rights.
* To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
* Is there gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the  
  empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
* To what extent was the management structure outlined in the project document efficient to generate the expected results? To what extent were the resources used to address inequalities in general, and gender issues in particular?
* To what extent will targeted men, women and vulnerable people benefit from the project interventions in the long term? To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?

**Methodology**

Based on UNDP guidelines for evaluations (*UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators* and UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (updated June 2021))[[3]](#footnote-3), and in consultation with UNDP Libya CO, the evaluation will be inclusive and participatory, involving all principal stakeholders into the analysis. The evaluation will consider the social, political, security and economic context which affects the overall performance of the outcome achievements. During this evaluative exercise, the evaluation team is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis.

**Data Collection, Data Review and Analysis:**

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) [Norms &](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914) [Standards.](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914) The evaluation will be carried out by an independent consultant. The consultant should adopt an integrated approach involving a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments for the data collection and analysis to generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus group discussions (FGD), surveys and site visits where/when possible.

The evaluation methodology should employ a participatory results-oriented approach that involves project implementers, targeted beneficiaries and other community members, donors and other relevant stakeholders and will provide evidence of achievement of expected outputs using quantitative and qualitative methods. The consultative element of the evaluation is crucial for building up a consensus about the programme’s overall rationale and desired outcomes. The process steps of the evaluation will include:

* Desk Review of documents: Project Document, AWPs, Joint Programme Reports etc.
* Develop and detailed the evaluation framework, design and methodology and the evaluation instruments and tools.
* Develop the evaluation work plan and the instrument that will be used during the exercise.
* Draft Inception Report and present it to UNDP for agreement
* Collection of quantitative & qualitative data from beneficiaries and community members, current and former implementing partners, national partners, etc. through case study, key informants’ interviews, in-depth interview, focus group discussion, cross-sectional survey, meeting, etc.
* Data review and analysis
* Draft a report with the evaluation findings.
* Present the evaluation findings to relevant stakeholders and facilitate discussion to draw out the way forward.
* Interviews with project staff, present and past.
* Interviews with key stakeholders including government line ministries, development partners, civil society, and other relevant partners through a participatory and transparent process.
* Consultations with beneficiaries through interviews and/ or focus group discussions.
* Survey and/ or questionnaires where appropriate.
* Visits to offices/sites/locations where the joint programme provided support as appropriate
* Triangulation of information collected from different sources/methods to enhance the validity of the findings.

The proposed approach and methodology should be considered as flexible guidelines rather than final requirements. The evaluators will have an opportunity to make their inputs and propose changes in the evaluation design. The consultant will be required to confirm the reliability and the quality of collected data through triangulation and diversification of sources and methods/approaches of collection.

The evaluation is expected to use a variety of data sources, primary, secondary, qualitative, quantitative, etc. to be extracted through surveys, storytelling, focus group discussions, face to face interviews, participatory methods, desk reviews, etc. conducted with a variety of partners. A transparent and participatory multi-stakeholder approach should be followed for data collection from government partners, community members, private sector, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, etc.

Evidence will be provided for every claim generated by the evaluation and data will be triangulated to ensure validity. An evaluation matrix or other methods can be used to map the data and triangulate the available evidence.

In line with the UNDP’s gender mainstreaming strategy, gender disaggregation of data is a key element of all UNDP’s interventions and data collected for the evaluation will be disaggregated by gender, to the extent possible, and assessed against the programme outputs/outcomes. All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues.

Due to travel restrictions imposed globally and internally by Covid-19 pandemic, majority of work will be done remotely using different mediums (Zoom, WhatsApp, Microsoft teams, etc.) to conduct the evaluation. FGDs in Libya will be limited in number to conform with country restrictions on public meetings and gatherings.

1. **Deliverables and Timeline**

The consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs:

1. **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report, containing the proposed the theory of change, and evaluation methodology should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed (this element can be shared with UNDP well in advance). The inception report should be endorsed by UNDP in consultation with the relevant government partners before the evaluation starts (before any online formal evaluation interviews and survey distribution) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluator.
2. **Evaluation** debriefings. Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP will ask for a preliminary debriefing of findings
3. **Draft Evaluation Report**:
4. **Final evaluation reports** (max 60 pages including executive summary). The international consultant will submit the final evaluation report. UNDP and other designated government representative and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the evaluation report providing comments in the audit trail for the evaluator to address them within an agreed period. The consultant will address the required content and quality criteria as per the evaluation guidelines.Comments and changes by the evaluators in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluators to show how they have addressed the comments.
5. **Evaluation brief**.

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

The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between the UNDP and the selected International Consultant. The Project evaluation will require forty (40) working days to take place over a month period from March 01, 2022. Due to travel restrictions due to the Covid-19 Pandemic, the consultancy will be home-based.

The International Consultant is expected to commence the assignment on March 01, 2022, subject to restrictions and conditions imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic). The assignment and final deliverable are expected to be completed, with the detail as described in the below table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Deliverables** | **Time frame** | **Payment** |
| Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed  Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and proposed structure of the report. | Inception Report | 8 days | 20% |
| Briefing to UNDP on inception report for agreeing methodology | 1 day |
| Desk review of existing documents, interviews, and preparation of guidance for national consultant  Data collection and interviews in the country | Draft Report | 10 days | 30% |
| Draft evaluation report | 8 days |
| Debriefing with UNDP | 1 day |
| Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report |  | 1 day |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on the drafts) and the set of recommendations | Final Report | 10 days | 50% |
| Presentation to PSJP | 1 day |
| **Total number of working days** |  | **40 days** |  |

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid. Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

**Disbursement of Payment**

The consultancy shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones:

• 20% after adoption of the inception report

• 30% after presentation of the draft evaluation report

• 50% after the approval of the final evaluation report

The consultancy fee will be paid as Lump Sum Amount (all inclusive of expenses related to the consultancy). The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

**Institutional Arrangements**

The joint programme evaluation is commissioned by the UNDP Libya Deputy Resident Representative. The International Consultant will work with the project team for conducting the evaluation, who will be responsible for the provision of documents and data as requested and support the overall evaluation.

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established, made up of representatives of the donors to the PSJP and national counterparts. The ERG will perform advisory role throughout the evaluation process and will provide advice on the ToRs, including the appropriateness of evaluation questions and methodology, will support the evaluation in its analysis of existing evidence by facilitating access and providing inputs, and will discuss the preliminary findings of the evaluation.

The ERG will provide feedback to the evaluation report which should be addressed by the evaluator. The ERG will also provide input to the development of the management responses and key actions recommended by the evaluation

**Evaluation Ethics**

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct and the ethical Pledge upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

“This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.”

**Travel Plan**

Below is an indicative travel plan for the duration of the assignment. The Consultant will be required to travel to the below indicated destinations and include the relevant costs into the proposal. There may be also unforeseen travel that will come up during the execution of the contract which will be agreed on ad-hoc basis.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Destination | Frequency | Duration/days |
| 1 | Libya | In the beginning of the process | 10 days |

1. **Duty Station:**

**Homebased with 10 days in country (Libya)**

1. **Contract duration:**

**The duration of the contract will be 40 working days as per the deliverables.**

1. **Qualification and Experience**

**Qualification:**

* Master’s degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant social science degree
* At least **ten years** of accumulated experience in programme/project monitoring and evaluation, of which at least five years should be in international settings preferably in- post-conflict or fragile state contexts.

**Experience:**

* Proven experience of designing and leading the use of a mix of evaluations tools in the areas of Access to Justice and Rule of Law programmes/projects; applying a variety of mixed-methods evaluation approaches (including the Theory of Change-based, Utilization-focused, Participatory, and Gender and Equity-based evaluations)
* Demonstrated experience in in designing and leading gender-sensitive evaluations of Access to Justice and Rule of Law programmes/projects including experience using a range of quantitative and qualitative data gathering techniques to assess programme/project results at individual, institutional, sector and policy level
* Proven experience in evaluating a variety of different modalities in international development evaluation (including programmes/projects or interventions contributing to broader programmatic interventions conducted by single or multiple partners, including for the UN system)
* Evidence of formal evaluation and research training, including familiarity with UN Norms and standards for development evaluation
* Experience in engaging with different stakeholders using participatory and consultative approaches.
* In-depth understanding of rule of law issues in “in-conflict” and post-conflict context and/or countries in transition
* Preferably in-depth knowledge of legal/judicial reform, legal aid, gender-based violence (GBV), community policing
* Experience in engaging with government institutions and handling sensitive information
* Experience with conducting evaluations in various cultural settings and knowledge of Libya socio-cultural context is an asset
* Strong interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality evaluation and research products in a timely manner
* Thorough understanding of key elements of Result-based management/programming
* Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and excellent analytical and writing skills
* Initiative, ability to work independently, sound judgment and good interpersonal skills

**Languages:**

* Fluency in spoken and written English and Arabic

1. **Competencies**

A consultant must be independent to the Programme’s formulation, implementation, or monitoring phases. It is proposed that an evaluation be carried out by an international consultant.

An international consultant will perform the following tasks:

* Lead the entire evaluation process, including communicating all required information
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis) for the report.
* Finalize the research design and questions based on the feedback and complete inception report
* Develop data collection tools and conduct of data gathering activities: desk review, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions etc.
* Data analysis, draft and final report preparation, consolidation and submission, and presenting the findings
* Provide UNDP with data collection tools in advance for UNDP feedback to ensure realistic application in the field.
* Submit draft evaluation report
* Ensure UNDP feedback on inception and draft evaluation reports is considered in final versions, always under the basis of an independent evaluation.
* Finalize the whole evaluation report and engage in debriefing with UNDP.
* Submit final evaluation report revised
* Have/bring their laptops, and other relevant software/equipment

The evaluation exercise will be conducted by an independent consultant. The Consultant must have extensive experience in strategic programming of development assistance within the broader areas of democratic governance, in-depth knowledge of legal/judicial reform and rule of law sector capacity building at national and sub-national levels. Preferably, the consultants also have substantial knowledge of and experience with the monitoring and evaluation of projects in the rule of law sector in volatile environments. The required expertise, qualifications and competencies are listed below:

**Competencies:**

**Core Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards.
* Demonstrates professional competence and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines, and achieving results.
* Display cultural, gender, nationality, religion and age sensitivity and adaptability.
* High sense of relational skills, including cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability, with a demonstrated ability to work in a multidisciplinary team.

**Functional Competencies:**

* Ability to manage and supervise evaluation teams and ensure timely submission of quality evaluation reports.
* Good knowledge and understanding of the UN system, familiarity with UNDP mandate an asset.
* Knowledge of issues concerning governance, and rule of law.
* Thorough knowledge of results-based management and strategic planning processes.
* Excellent facilitation and communication skills.
* Wide experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and –analysis including surveys, focus group discussions, key informant interviews etc.
* Ability to deal with multi-stakeholder groups.
* Ability to write focused evaluation reports.

1. **Documents to be included When Submitting the Proposals**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. **Letter of interest** and availability using the standard template.
2. **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a brief methodology on how you will approach and conduct the work (if applicable).
3. **Technical Proposal:**
4. Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work
5. Confirmation of availability to provide services within the stipulated timeframe
6. **Financial proposal**

* Specifying the daily fee, number of days of work required. Payments are made to the Individual Consultant based on the actual number of days worked.

1. **Personal CV** including experience in similar activities and at least 3 references.
2. **Financial proposal**

**Lump sum contract**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount.

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative expenses associated with undertaking this assignment.

**Evaluation of applicants**

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated.
* Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria will be weighted at 70% and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%.
* Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.
* The financial proposal shall specify an all-inclusive lumpsum payment linked to deliverables.
* The top applicant with the Highest Combined Scores and accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the IC contract.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | | |
| **Technical Evaluation** | | 70 POINTS |
| Academic Requirement | Master’s degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant social science degree | 10 |
| Experience | Minimum of ten years of accumulated experience in programme /project evaluation, of which at least five years should be in international settings – preferably in post-conflict or fragile state contexts; | 10 |
| Good knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, experience applying UNDP Results Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, good knowledge of the UNDP DIM/NIM Guidelines and Procedures, knowledge of Result-Based Management Evaluation methodologies, knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches; experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, demonstrable analytical skills | 10 |
| Adequate Methodology and work plan (Evaluation matrix, techniques for gathering and analyzing gender sensitive qualitative and quantitative data) | 20 |
| Good knowledge of (monitoring and evaluation of) access to justice and rule of law programmes/projects as well as experience using the United Nations Rule of Law Indicators | 10 |
| Excellent English writing and communication skills | 10 |
| **Financial Evaluation** | | **30 POINTS** |
| Candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points over 70 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation - 30 points  Lowest Price will be qualified with the maximum of 30 points. Higher prices will be qualified according to the following calculation:  **FE = LFP x 30**  **FPi**  FE = Financial Evaluation  LFP = Lowest Financial Proposal  FPi = Financial Proposal of bidder i | |  |
| **Technical + Financial Evaluation** | | **MAX 100 POINTS** |

1. **TOR Annexes:**

**Annex 1: Recommended list of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. Annual Wok Plans (AWPs)
3. Project Reports
4. Knowledge Products
5. Country Programme Document
6. Inception Report Template
7. Key stakeholders and partners

**Annex 2: Recommended structure of Evaluation Report**

The main final output of the evaluation will be an independent and comprehensive Evaluation report with annexes as needed. The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports. Follow the link: [Evaluation report template and quality standards](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20UNDP%20evaluation%20report%20template%20and%20quality%20standards.docx)

The minimum requirements for the content of the final report are:

1. Title Page
2. List of acronyms and abbreviations
3. Table of contents, including list of annexes
4. Executive Summary
5. Introduction: background and context of the programme
6. Description of the programme – its logic theory, results framework, and external factors likely to affect success
7. Purpose of the evaluation
8. Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
9. Approach and methodology
10. Findings
11. Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
12. Conclusions
13. Recommendations
14. Lessons learned
15. Annexes (TORs; itinerary; map; photos; data/documents reviewed; list of people interviewed, and sites visited; list of documents used)

**Annex 3: Sample evaluation matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation**  **criteria** | **Key Questions** | **Specific Sub-**  **Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data collection**  **Methods /**  **Tools** | **Indicators/**  **Success**  **Standard** | **Methods for**  **Data Analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Annex Evaluation Quality Assessment

Evaluations commissioned by UNDP country offices are subject to a quality assessment, including this evaluation. Final evaluation reports will be uploaded to the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC site) after the evaluations complete. IEO will later undertake the quality assessment and assign a rating. IEO will notify the assessment results to country offices and makes the results publicized in the ERC site. UNDP Libya aims to ensure evaluation quality. To do so, the consultant should put in place the quality control of deliverables. Also, consultant should familiarize themselves with rating criteria and assessment questions outlined in the Section six of [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](about:blank)

1. Annex: Code of conduct.

UNDP requests each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system’*,* which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report. Follow this link: [http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100](about:blank)

It is also required to sign a pledge of ethical conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. The Pledge can be downloaded from the following [link](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866)

Annex

[Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452)

Inception Report Template

1. Background and introduction
2. Purpose and scope
3. Approach and methodology
4. Evaluation tools
5. Detailed work schedule
6. Evaluation matrix
7. Inception period interviews conducted
8. Reporting
9. Implementation arrangements and responsibilities
10. Risks and limitations

1. This is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The twin-track approach combines mainstream programmes and projects that are inclusive of persons with disabilities as well as programmes and projects that are *targeted* towards persons with disabilities. It is an essential element of any strategy that seeks to mainstream disability inclusion successfully. Also, see chapter 9 of the Technical Notes. Entity Accountability Framework. United Nations Disability and Inclusion Strategy: <https://www.un.org/en/disabilitystrategy/resources> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, 2020. Access at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)