Terms of Reference (TOR)
For an Assignment Requiring the Services of an Individual Contractor (IC) to Conduct an Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

A. Background and Context

Background

The Sudan United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) was signed by the UN Country Team (UNCT) and the Government of Sudan (GoS) in 2012 as the framework for development partnership between the United Nations (UN) and Sudan for the period 2013-2016. It outlines the UN contribution in support of the GoS in achieving its national priorities as articulated in the Five-Year National Development Plan 2012-2016.

The UNCT has a range of coordinating mechanisms to facilitate the implementation of the UNDAF under the eight outcomes in the four UNDAF pillars: Poverty Reduction, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Livelihoods; Basic Services; Governance and Rule of Law; Social Cohesion, Peace Consolidation and Peace Dividends. The Programme Management Team (PMT) is the key coordinating body for the UN’s development programming activities. It facilitates coordination around the UNDAF and is supported by mechanisms that include the Outcome Groups (one for each of the UNDAF outcomes), UN cross-cutting thematic groups (e.g. on HIV/AIDS and on gender) and the UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Group, which provides technical support on M&E issues.

Currently, the UNCT, in close partnership with the government, is in the process of preparing for the mid-term evaluation of the UNDAF. This evaluation is a key step in the UNDAF process aimed at improving accountability and strengthening programming and inter-agency coordination. Emphasis will be placed on looking forward, as the evaluation is being conducted in the penultimate year of the UNDAF cycle so it informs the planning stage of the next UNDAF.

The evaluation seeks to answer the following questions: “Are we doing the right thing? Are we doing it the right way? Are there better ways of achieving results?” For this, the UNDAF evaluation will assess the UNDAF with regards to the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The UNDAF evaluation will be an independent evaluation for which an external evaluation consultant will be recruited. The government and other partners in the country will be major actors in the evaluation, contributing both information and validation of UNDAF evaluation results. The main users of the UNDAF evaluation will be the UNCT, government counterparts and other development partners.

UNDAF Evaluation Context

The UNDAF evaluation is an essential part of the results-based management of the UNDAF, and it is meant to contribute not only to the current UNDAF but also to the next UNDAF. The UNDAF will be evaluated against the strategic intent laid out in the UNDAF document and specifically its contribution to the national development results included in the UNDAF results matrix and the UNDAF outcome work plans.

As decided by the UNCT, the current Sudan UNDAF did not undergo any annual reviews, and the once-in-a-cycle UNDAF progress report is not to be elaborated either, underscoring the importance of this evaluation. In late
2014, the UNDAF Outcome Groups, in collaboration with the UNDAF M&E Group, developed inter-agency work plans for each of the outcomes to help operationalize the UNDAF results matrix. In early 2015 the M&E Group coordinated an exercise to collect baseline, target and monitoring data for each of the indicators in the work plans. These data are to help determine the achievements of the UNCT with regards to the results in the work plans.

**B. Purpose, Objectives, Scope of Work, Methodology, Structure of the Report**

The overall purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

1) To generate evidence and lessons learnt based on an assessment of what works in the context of the UNDAF, what does not work, and why. It is expected that the evaluation will provide important information for strengthening programming and results, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF and for improving UN coordination in Sudan.

2) To support greater accountability of the UNCT to UNDAF stakeholders. By objectively verifying results achieved within the framework of the UNDAF and assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the strategies and interventions used, the evaluation will enable the UNCT to show national counterparts, donors and other stakeholders what it is delivering against its commitments.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

1) To assess the extent to which UNDAF results (outputs and outcomes) have been achieved, and with what level of efficiency and sustainability, and to analyze the extent to which results achieved by the UNCT in the framework of the UNDAF have made a worthwhile contribution to national development priorities and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

2) To identify the factors that have affected the UNCT’s contribution, explaining why performance is as it is.

3) Based on the lessons learnt, to provide actionable recommendations for improving the UNCT’s contribution, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF.

The time period covered by the evaluation is 2013 to mid-2015. The scope covered by the evaluation includes examining the five UN programming principles: human rights-based approach; gender equality; environmental sustainability; results-based management; and capacity development. (See methodology below)

The UNDAF evaluation will follow the UN Development Group (UNDG) guidelines on the UNDAF\(^1\), as well as UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidance on evaluations, in particular UNDAF evaluations\(^2\).

**Evaluation criteria**

The contribution of the UNCT to development results will be assessed according to a standard set of evaluation criteria used across UNDAF evaluations:

1) **Relevance**: The extent to which the objectives of UNDAF are consistent with Sudan’s needs, national priorities and the MDGs.

2) **Effectiveness**: The extent to which the UN programming in the UNDAF contributed to the outcomes defined in the UNDAF. The evaluation should also note how the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed.

---


3) **Efficiency:** The extent to which outcomes are achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

4) **Sustainability:** The extent to which the benefits from the UNDAF interventions have continued, or are likely to continue, after the UNDAF has been completed.

While assessing performance using the above criteria, the evaluator(s) will identify the various (enabling) factors that can explain the performance, including UN coordination and the five UN programming principles (listed above).

The evaluation will use a variety of data collection methods, including desk review of relevant documents, semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, surveys and questionnaires, focus group discussions. Qualitative and quantitative tools will be used to analyze the data. The evaluation will use a variety of validation methods, including triangulation, to ensure that the data and information used and conclusions made carry the necessary depth.

**Structure of the UNDAF Evaluation Report**

The report will be written in English, shall not exceed 50 pages (excluding annexes), and is to include the following sections:

- Table of content
- List of acronyms
- Executive summary (max 2 pages)
- 1. Introduction (background, objectives, scope and methodology, limitations)
- 2. National development context (max. 2 pages)
- 3. Evaluation findings (corresponding to the UNDAF outcomes with each analyzed by the evaluation criteria and identifying enabling factors)
- 4. Lessons learned and recommendations for the current UNDAF and for the next UNDAF
- Annexes might include the following:
  - Stories worth telling
  - List of documents used and persons met
  - Details on the methodology

**C. Expected Deliverables and Schedule of Payments**

The expected deliverables of the consultancy are:

1) Desk review, data collection and consultations
2) Draft evaluation report, within 15 days of contract signature, for PMT comments within five days
3) Final evaluation report incorporating comments received on draft report, within five days of receiving comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities/Deliverables</th>
<th>Estimated duration to complete</th>
<th>Due dates</th>
<th>% of payment</th>
<th>Review/ Approval required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review, data collection, consultations</td>
<td>10 working days</td>
<td>Within 10 working days from contract commencement</td>
<td>Nill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Institutional Arrangements

The consultant will report to the RCO, while the PMT will oversee the overall process. The UNCT and the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) will provide overall guidance and approve the final product.

E. Duration of the Work

The total duration of this consultancy will be 30 working days in a 37 day period.

F. Duty Station

This is a home-based consultancy with consultations carried out in Khartoum.

G. Qualifications and Experience

Minimum Level of Education Required

A master’s degree or equivalent in international development, policy studies, social science or related field is a requirement.

Work Experience and Expertise

- A minimum of 7 years of international professional work experience in development, social sciences, M&E or project management
- Experience conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects and programmes an asset; experience conducting UNDAF evaluations highly desirable
- Excellent writing skills and ability to produce high quality reports and documents
- Experience of working in Sudan an asset
- Fluency in English required and Arabic proficiency highly desirable

H. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The consultancy fee will be determined on a lump sum basis. The lump sum amount must be all-inclusive and the contract price must be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components. Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) and travel fees to the duty station, if relevant, will be included in the lump sum. Payment will be made upon completion of key deliverables as outlined in section C above.

I. Recommended Presentation of Offer

Applicants are kindly requested to complete and sign and submit all the following documents:

a) Duly completed Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP.
b) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

c) **Brief description** of why the individual/company considers him/herself/itself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment.

d) **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

**J. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

The offers received from the candidates will be evaluated using combined scoring method. The combined scoring method assesses the offers with technical merits of the proposals – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70%, and later combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%.

### a. Technical Scoring Grid (70 Points ; Pass Marks 49 points):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Maximum obtainable points</th>
<th>Weightage (%)</th>
<th>Evaluated points obtained by the offerors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A master's degree or equivalent in international development, policy studies, social science or related field is a requirement.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 7 years of international professional work experience in development, social sciences, M&amp;E or project management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects and programmes an asset; experience conducting UNDAF evaluations highly desirable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent writing skills and ability to produce high quality reports and documents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of working in Sudan an asset</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency in English required and Arabic proficiency highly desirable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The price proposals of candidates obtaining 49 points and above (or 70% and above) will only be technically qualified; then their price proposals will be reviewed and compared for the assessment of overall ranking of the proposals. Those obtaining lower than 49 points (or lesser than 70%) will be technically non-responsive proposals; price proposals of such candidate will not be compared.

### b. Assessment of the Price Proposals (30 Points or 30%)

The lowest priced bid from among the technically qualified offerors will obtain the full marks of 30 points in the price proposal. Price proposals of remaining qualified bidders will be prorated against the lowest priced bid using the following formula to derive the marks in their price proposal:

$$\text{Marks obtained by a Bidder} = \left( \frac{\text{Lowest Priced Bid (amount)}}{\text{Bid of the Offeror (amount)}} \right) \times 30 \text{ (Full Marks)}$$
c. **Award of the Contract/Award Criteria:**
The contract will be awarded to the candidate (bidder) whose proposal obtains the highest cumulative marks (points) when the marks obtained in technical and price proposals are aggregated together.

K. **Annexes to the TOR**
The Please find attached to this TOR, a detailed description of the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the evaluation.
### Annex A. Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Roles and responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **UNCT**     | • Provide strategic guidance to the process  
  • Review, comment on and approve final report  
  • Ensure any necessary UNCT decisions are made on time  
  • Facilitate provision of necessary information and documents  
  • Hold substantive discussions to inform draft management response to evaluation, and approve final draft of management response |
| **RC Office**| • Draft ToR  
  • Manage recruitment of consultant(s)  
  • Day-to-day management of consultant’s (s’) contract  
  • Facilitate communication between the consultant(s) and RC/UNCT  
  • Facilitate review of work plan, inception report, draft report and final report  
  • Ensure dissemination of evaluation report  
  • Draft management response based on UNCT inputs |
| **PMT**      | • Finalize evaluation ToR  
  • Review and comment on draft report  
  • Review final report before submission to UNCT |
| **M&E Group**| • Review and comment on evaluation work plan  
  • Review and comment on inception report  
  • Provide complete monitoring data from work plans to the consultants  
  • Review and help finalize data gathering tools (e.g. questionnaires)  
  • Review and comment on draft report to ensure adherence to UNDG and UNEG guidelines  
  • Provide technical support on methodology if necessary |
| **Consultant(s)** | • Conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner  
  • Draft evaluation work plan and incorporate comments from RCO  
  • Produce inception report and incorporate comments from RCO  
  • Conduct desk review and gather additional necessary information through semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, surveys and questionnaires, focus group discussions, etc.  
  • Develop draft report and incorporate comments from M&E Group and PMT  
  • Produce final evaluation report incorporating comments received |
M. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Name and Designation: Astrid Marschatz, RCO Sudan

Signature: ________________________________

Date: 21 June 2015