



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

UNDP Access to Justice and Rule of Law Project
Midterm Evaluation
2015

Location :	South Sudan
Application Deadline :	9-June-2015
Type of Contract :	Individual Contract
Post Level :	International Consultant
Languages Required :	English
Starting Date :	01-July-2015
(date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	
Expected Duration of Assignment :	45 days

1. Background and Context

The Access to Justice and Rule of Law (A2J/RoL) project contributes to the South Sudan Development Plan's (SSDP), Conflict Prevention and Security Pillar. The SSDP Rule of Law Sector Objective is *"to strengthen the Rule of Law in South Sudan by enforcing and maintaining law and order, providing equitable access to justice and a functioning criminal justice system, increasing security in communities and promoting and protecting human rights for all."* The project also contributes to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Outcome Five: *"Access to Justice and the Rule of Law improves."*

The current iteration of the project was developed in 2012 and awarded multi-year funding from the Netherlands in 2013. Presently, the project is supported by the Netherlands, Japan, Norway, UKAID and UNDP BPPS/BCPR. UNDP's A2J/RoL project supports rule of law institutions (*Judiciary of South Sudan (JoSS), Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Ministry of Interior (MoI) (South Sudan National Police Service (SSNPS) and National Prisons Service of South Sudan (NPSSS)*), traditional justice and community level interventions through a sector-wide holistic approach designed to increase the *availability, affordability, adaptability and acceptability* of justice services in South Sudan. With the December 2013 crisis and the subsequent escalation of conflict in the country, the operating environment changed drastically. UNDP staff had to be evacuated on account of the volatile security situation following the events of 15 December 2013. Staff could only return in the second quarter of 2014 when the security situation improved slightly. This resulted in the reduction of UNDP's field presence from nine to five states. To effectively respond to the crisis, UNDP's programmatic support to rule of law institutions has been guided by the United Nations

Country Team (UNCT) Programme Criticality Analysis¹, Conflict Sensitivity Analysis and conformity to the United Nations Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (UNHRDDP).

Notwithstanding the difficult operating environment, the project continues to provide technical and advisory support to the JoSS, MoJ, SSNPS, NPSSS, and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). Through co-located Chief Technical Advisors (CTAs), Rule of Law Officers (RoLOs) and Law Enforcement Advisors (LEAs), UNDP's technical support aims to improve access to justice.

1.1 Project Strategic Objectives

The key strategic objectives of the project are:

1. Increase access to justice through coordinated institutional presence at state and county levels;
2. Support clearance of case backlog and address prolonged and arbitrary detention;
3. Support harmonization of traditional justice with the formal justice sector; and
4. Improve capacity development and institutional strengthening.

1.2 Project Outputs

The project has the following four outputs aligned to the above strategic objectives:

1. Increased access to justice to citizens of South Sudan with special focus on vulnerable groups and women
2. Reduced case Backlog and prolonged and arbitrary detention at state level
3. Ascertainment of customary Law through continuous research
4. Capacity of Police, Prisons, Ministry of Justice and Judiciary strengthened

2. Purpose of the Mid Term Evaluation

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation (MTE) is to assess and determine the performance of the A2J/RoL Project over the past 1.5 years of implementation with regard to the above stated key strategic objectives, in order to specifically a) ascertain the progress towards achieving agreed project outputs and targets, b) determine appropriate measures for refocusing project strategies where necessary and c) highlight areas of strength and opportunities for achieving the desired project results and d) capture effectively lessons learnt.

3. Scope and focus of the Mid Term Evaluation

3.1 Scope

The scope of the mid-term evaluation for this project reflects the diverse range of activities as defined in the Results and Resource Framework (RRF) and the Annual Work Plan (AWP). The mid-term 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

¹ The UNCT together with the UN Mission conducted a programme criticality exercise on 24 – 25 January 2014. The exercise resulted in the identification of six strategic objectives for UN programming in the context of programme criticality levels 2 to 4; and eight areas of support under Level 1 (very high residual risk) and Level 2 (high residual risk). Among the eight areas of PC1 and PC2 activities, promote access to justice and rule of law through capacity development and Institutional strengthening (PC2); establish mechanisms for the protection against SGBV (PC2) and support harmonization of traditional justice with the formal justice sector (PC2) are related to the Access to Justice and Rule of Law project.

modalities, coordination, partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation, replication, sustainability of the programme. The mid-term 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. Further, the evaluation will investigate the specific activities relating to each of the project objectives listed above including training and technical support through co-located team members. The training design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation initiatives will also be reviewed. The mid-term evaluation specifically:

- Determine whether the project outputs are on track, are in line with the project strategy and will be able to contribute to the stated objectives;
- Collect preliminary information, which will then be used as a baseline from which year two and three activities will be compared and assessed;
- Determine the immediate effect of UNDP's specialized training and co-location on justice sector professionals;
- Determine whether there are any preliminary project results; and
- Make recommendations to guide the implementation of the remainder of the project.

The users of the evaluation results include UNDP management, programme and project staff, and South Sudanese stakeholders. The mid-term evaluation will cover the period October 1, 2013 to June 2015.

3.2 The Mid-term Evaluation Questions

The following key questions will guide the mid-term evaluation:

A. Relevance

1. **The extent to which the program is aligned with national, UNCT, UNDP development frameworks:**

- To what extent is the project design based on an adequate analysis of needs?
- How well does the project match the priorities of the South Sudan Government?
- Is the UNDP A2J/RoL project offering a unique approach in comparison with other international organizations operating in the justice sector of South Sudan?
- To what extent are the project objectives still valid taking into account the changes in the context?
- To what extent is the project contributing to the extension of state authority?

B. Effectiveness

2. **The extent to which the project design and strategy are likely to attain its objectives:**

- 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?
- Were the co-location activities and outputs planned and organized to achieve the desired results?
- Are the case management and data collection activities able to bring about the desired results?
- Are the project training initiatives designed, organized and implemented to bring about the stated objectives?
- Are the project activities of community level engagement of rule of law institutions designed, organised and implemented to bring stated impact?

C. Efficiency

3. The extent to which activities and outputs have been delivered with the available resources.

- 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 its outputs and services in a timely manner?
- Is the scope of project activities outreaching different locations or concentrating on particular locations?

D. UNDP Project Management and Coordination

4. What kind of management support was in place to ensure effective project delivery?

- How effective is this management support mechanism/model?
- How effective is the UNDP HQ and UNDP South Sudan collaboration?
- How effective is UNDP's technical support to the Ministries at national and state level?
- How useful and adequate are the project monitoring, reporting and evaluation tools to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant support and information for decision-making purposes?
- To what extent is the project coordinating with the key justice sector actors and agencies in South Sudan?
- Is UNDP A2J/RoL maximizing its comparative advantage in the framework of other interventions conducted by peer international organizations?
- How effective is the coordination system in terms of lessons learned at national and state level?

E. Results

5. **What are the short to medium-term results produced by the project whether directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, and positive or negative? If not achieved, what are the reasons for this?**

- What, if any, are the noticeable or tangible benefits of the project to date?
- What, if any, are the specific challenges?
- To what extent are the project outputs likely to lead to the planned outcomes?
- To what extent are the Ministries, institutions and traditional leaders satisfied with the services offered?
- To what extent are the beneficiaries of the training activities experiencing improvements in their work or have instituted some kind of institutional changes as a result of the trainings?
- To what extent do the community members feel any change in service delivery by rule of law institutions due to support provided by the project?

F. Sustainability

6. **Whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue for a reasonable period of time after the project closes.**

- 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 UNDP A2J/RoL supported the capacity strengthening initiatives of national staff to enable them to take the lead in respective project areas?

G. Lessons Learned

7. **What were the lessons learned during implementation?**

- 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?

4. **Mid-term Evaluation Methodology**

This is a mid-term evaluation involving qualitative and quantitative methods to assess the A2JRoL project implementation and performance and to make recommendations for improvement. In order to respond to the mid-term evaluation question identified above, and considering the dispersion of the beneficiaries reached by the project, the methodology will consider the most cost-effective approaches to collect information which will sufficiently respond to the evaluation issues. The evaluation team is expected to collect data from a representative sample of the project beneficiaries, which will include meetings and/or focus

group discussions with beneficiaries (*government, CSOs, communities*) in five state (CES, EES, WES, WBS and NBS). The state visits will be finalized based on security conditions. All travel arrangements will be arranged by UNDP, and, if possible, UNDP will provide support to arrange accommodation.

Possible data collection methods include:

1. Desk/document review: project documents and reports (please be referred to annex 1); feedback collected throughout project implementation from beneficiaries; including end of course evaluation forms; administrative records related to the various activities; project progress reports and other relevant documents.
2. Interviews with beneficiaries: Most of the training beneficiaries are from the rule of law institutions. The evaluation will seek to capture information from them to ascertain the impact of the training and co-location on their professional capacity. The evaluation team will also benefit from the pre and post training results captured during the period under review.
3. Key informant interviews: Semi-structured interviews with the key project stakeholders, namely; 1) UNDP CO management and programme/project staff; 2) project donors; 3) the management and selected staff of the Ministries; 4) selected providers of traditional justice; 5) selected CBO providers of legal aid and advice (through project grants); and 6) representatives of relevant international organizations operating in South Sudan.
4. Focus-group discussions: Focus group discussions will be held with selected groups of beneficiaries of the CBOs, Special Protection Units, the Emergency Call Center, traditional courts and formal justice service providers.
5. (Focus-group) discussions/interviews: will be held with community members to ascertain the impact of project support to rule of law service providers.
6. Other: other cost-effective data collection methodologies are welcomed that will capture information from a significant number of program stakeholders.

Table 1: Activity, deliverable and days allocated

Sn.	Activity	Deliverable	Duty station	Days allocated
1	Document review, evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan	Inception Report	In-country	5 days
2	Inception meeting initial briefing with reference group			
3	Document review and stakeholder consultations	Draft Report	In-country	20 days
4	Field visits			
5	Preliminary data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft mid-term evaluation Report			
6	Validation workshop with reference group	Final Mid-term Evaluation Report	Home-based	20 days
7	Final data analysis, finalization of mid-term evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders and submission to UNDP.			
Total number of working days				45 days

5. Expected Deliverables

The following deliverables are expected:

1. **Inception Report:** The evaluator will prepare an inception report which details the evaluators' understanding of the mid-term evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that evaluator and the stakeholders (*Judiciary of South Sudan (JoSS), Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Ministry of Interior (MoI)-South Sudan National Police Service (SSNPS) and National Prison Services of South Sudan (NPSSS), UNDP, CSOs, and the programme/project team*) have a shared understanding of the mid-term evaluation. The Inception Report will include key deliverables and a comprehensive evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, data sources and collection analysis tool for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated (see sample in annex 3). The report will include the scope of work, work plan and timeframe. **(5 days after starting the mid-term evaluation process including activities indicated in table 1 above).**
2. **Draft Access to Justice and Rule of Law Mid-term Evaluation Report:** The evaluation team will prepare a draft A2J/RoL Mid-term Evaluation Report in-country which will contain a summary of key findings, lessons learned and recommendations. The evaluation team will hold a **debriefing meeting** with UNDP senior management, key project staff and stakeholders in Juba (Reference Group) at the end of their mission to discuss the first draft of the report and with it the preliminary findings and tentative conclusions of the evaluation. The objective is to correct any factual inadequacies and misinterpretation. **(20 days including activities indicated in table 1 above).**
3. **Final Access to Justice and Rule of Law Mid-term Evaluation Report:** After incorporating feedback received on the draft report, the evaluator will submit a final report as per the agreed timelines. The evaluator will attach the following annexes to the final report (or present them in a separate volume); data collection tools and guidelines, datasets, analysis plans, collation and aggregation tables, risk matrix, etc., if available. The final report will be submitted no later than 20 days following the presentation of the draft report to be reviewed internally and externally for quality assurance. Internal review will ensure factual verification and the identification of any errors or omission. **(20 days including activities indicated in table 1 above).**

6. Duty Station

The duty station of the work is Juba, Central Equatoria State, Republic of South Sudan (RSS) However, the consultant is be required to travel to project sites outside Juba.

7. Scope of price proposal and schedule 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.

8. Required Expertise and Qualification

The Mid-term Evaluation exercise will be conducted by a team of independent consultants. The team will be comprised of one international² evaluation expert (Team Leader) and one national evaluation expert (Associate). Both the international and national consultants 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:

The International Consultant (Team Leader) must demonstrate the following:

- 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;
- 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 designing and leading gender-sensitive evaluations of Access to Justice and Rule of Law programmes/projects (at national and sub-national levels) 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 local community members, using participatory and consultative approaches;
- In-depth understanding of Access to Justice and Rule 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 at national and sub-national level
- Experience in engaging with government institutions and handling sensitive information;
- Experience with conducting evaluations in various cultural settings and knowledge of South Sudan 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

² The international Consultant (Team Leader) will be recruited first and s/he will assist in the recruitment of the national consultant.

- 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
- Assist in the recruitment of the National Consultant
- Fluency in spoken and written English

Competencies :

Core Competencies and values:

- 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, women's rights and gender equality;
- Specific knowledge in the subject area (e.g. democratic governance, rule of law, access to justice, and GBV);
- 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;
- Willingness and ability to travel to the different project's sites in the country.

Responsibilities (in addition to other generic responsibilities and expected deliverables outlined in this ToR)

- Document review
- Developing and pre-testing the necessary data collection tools (to be presented in the Inception Report)
- Leading/managing the evaluation team through the mid-term evaluation phases
- Hiring and training enumerators/assistants and, if necessary, translators
- Deciding the division of labour, role and responsibilities within the consulting team
- Ensuring the use of best practice evaluation methodologies
- Leading the presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the mid-term evaluation report, integrating comments received from stakeholders and partners
- Drafting, finalizing and submitting the final mid-term evaluation report
- Quality control of the evaluation report

- Adherence to the requirements of the ToR

9. Management arrangement of for the mid-term evaluation

The mid-term evaluation management structure will be comprised of the **coordinating entity (Management Group)**³ and the **consultative body (Reference Group)**⁴. Under the overall leadership of the Democratic Governance and Stabilization Unit Team Leader, the A2J/RoL Programme Specialist (evaluation manager) will manage the day-to-day aspects of the evaluation ensuring that all information is provided and requests for feedback are responded to in a timely manner. The Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist from UNDP's Programme and Partnership Support Unit (PPSU) will also provide technical oversight in terms of clearing the final evaluation tools (including methodology and final key issues), reviewing data collections tools as appropriate, and commenting on the draft evaluation report. The Chief-technical Advisors (CTAs) co-located at national level and Rule of Law Officers and Law Enforcement Advisors co-located at Field level will assist with arrangements for the evaluation in consultation with the Programme Specialist. The mid-term evaluation team will be hosted by the Democratic Governance and Stabilization Unit of UNDP's South Sudan Country Office. The Unit will provide office space, internet connection, and printing of documentation. The evaluation team is responsible for developing and administrating all methodological tools.

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNDP Evaluation guidelines⁵ and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)⁶ norms and standards. Upon completion of the evaluation, UNDP, through the A2J/RoL project, has the responsibility to prepare a management response that addresses the findings and recommendations to ensure future learning and inform implementation of relevant programmes.

The **Reference Group** will be established to safeguard independence and give technical input over the course of the evaluation. It will provide guidance on key deliverables (Inception Report, Draft Report and Final Evaluation Report) submitted by the evaluation team. It will also support dissemination of the findings and recommendations. The Reference Group will include representatives from JoSS, MoJ, SSNPs, NPSSS, CSOs and A2J/RoL Project, donors (Netherland, Japan, Norway and DFID)

10. Time frame for the mid-term evaluation

The evaluation will be conducted between **July 01, 2015 – 14 August 2015 for 45 calendar days or 45 working days from July 01, 2015 to September 2, 2015. (July 22 days (excluding July 9); August 21 days; September 2 days)**. The consultants will be provided with information to prepare a table with tasks, timelines and deliverables, for which the consultants will be responsible and accountable.

11. Proposed Budget for the mid-term evaluation

The budget for the exercise is **US\$ 70,000**. The budget items are as follows:

³ The Management Group is composed of the Team Leader, Programme Specialist and CTAs

⁴ The Reference Group is composed of representatives of JoSS, MoJ, SSNPs, NPSSS, CSOs and A2J/RoL Project, donors (Netherland, Japan, Norway and DFID) and

⁵ Please refer UNDP's Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (2009)

⁶ Please refer: <http://uneval.org/>

- Consultant's fees
- All travel-related costs for consultants to project sites
- Focus group meetings & interviews
- Convening Reference Group and/or stakeholder meeting/consultations

12. Application and documents to be submitted

12.1 Technical proposal

- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- Personal CV or P11, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidates and at least three (3) professional references indicating the last experience in the domain
- Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment;
- Qualification documents of the consultant. These include certified degrees and certificates;
- A detailed clear methodology will be applied to make the evaluation more successful and the planning of activities which will be followed during this evaluation exercise. The consultant wishing to submit his/her offer must note that this is the crucial part of his/her offer
- At least 3 certificates of good completion of similar tasks. Note: any certificate without the client's name, address, stamp and signature will not be accepted;
- Any other document deemed relevant to this consultancy service.

12.2 Financial proposal

A Financial Proposal must be submitted that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs as per template provided. 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 a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate this at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

13. Criteria for selection of the consultants

The offer will be evaluated by using the Best value for money approach (combined scoring method). Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70%. Whereas budget proposed will be evaluated on 30% based on sufficiency for applying the data gathering techniques and for obtaining reliable data for the evaluation in the timeframe indicated. Below is the breakdown of technical proposal on 100% which will be brought to 70%:

13.1 International Consultant (Team Leader)

No	Evaluation criteria	Weight	Max. Point
	Description of qualification		

1	Master's degree in Law, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, or any other relevant social science degree	10%	10
2	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;	20%	20
3	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	20%	20
4	Adequate Methodology and work plan (Evaluation matrix, techniques for gathering and analyzing gender sensitive qualitative and quantitative data)	30%	30
5	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%	10
6	Excellent English writing and communication skills	10%	10
	TOTAL	100%	100

14. Application Process

Qualified candidates are requested to apply by the 09 June 2015 by sending their application packages to bids.juba@undp.org with the subject line "**Access to Justice and Rule of Law Project Mid-term Evaluation**".

The application should contain:

- **Letter of interest** and availability using the standard template. <http://www.undp.org/xxx>
- **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).
- **Filled P11 form including past experience** in similar projects and contact details of referees, please upload the P11 instead of your CV (a template can be downloaded from <http://www. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>)
- **Financial Proposal** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office and on mission, travel – international and local, per diems and any other possible costs).

Contact person: Rakan Alassaf
Procurement Unit

DISCLOSURE

Although the consultant is free to discuss with the authorities on anything relevant to the assignment, under the terms of reference, the consultant is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of UNDP, the Governments of the countries participating in the UNDP/A2J/RoL project).

Annex 1: Recommended list of Documents

A. Development Frameworks

1. South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP)
2. United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
3. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
4. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

B. Project Documents and Annual Wok Plans (AWPs)

1. Access to Justice and Rule Law-Netherlands Proposal
2. Support to Judiciary of South Sudan (Japan)
3. Support to Access to Justice and Rule of Law for Conflict Affected People and Returnees (Japan)
4. Emergency Support to Women and Vulnerable Groups in Conflict Prone Areas in South Sudan- Phase I (Japan)
5. Emergency Support to Women and Vulnerable Groups in Conflict Prone Areas in South Sudan- Phase II (Japan)
6. Joint Integrated Crisis Prevention and Recovery Programme (ICPRP) document (BCPR/BPPS)
7. Police ID Card Project Document funded by DFID and the UNHRDD Taskforce cleared document
8. Access to Justice and Rule of Law Annual Wok Plans (AWPs) -2013, 2014, 2015)
9. Access to Justice and Rule of Law Conflict related Development Analysis

C. Project Reports

1. Access to Justice and Rule Law-2013 Annual Report
2. Access to Justice and Rule Law-2014 Annual Report
3. Access to Justice and Rule Law Monthly Reports (June 2014- May 2015)
4. Access to Justice and Rule Law Bi-Weekly Report to Japan (April -May 30, 2015)
5. Rule of Law Forum, Community Policing and Outreach training reports
6. Strategic paper and concept notes

D. Knowledge Products

1. Ascertainment Study of 14 Communities (Volumes 1-3)
2. Traditional Leaders Training Manual
3. National Access to Justice and Rule of Law Perception Survey

4. Quarterly Crime Statistics (2012- March 2015)
5. Prison Rapid Assessment (Photo booklet and Narrative Report)
6. Transitional Justice Perception Survey

Annex 2: Recommended structure of the A2J/RoL Mid-term Evaluation Report

The main final output of the evaluation will be an independent and comprehensive Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) report with annexes as needed. The minimum requirements for the content of the final report are:

- a) Title Page
- b) List of acronyms and abbreviations
- c) Table of contents, including list of annexes
- d) Executive Summary
- e) Introduction: background and context of the programme
- f) Description of the programme – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
- g) Purpose of the evaluation
- h) Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and delimitations
- i) Approach and methodology
- j) Findings
- k) Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
- l) Conclusions
- m) Recommendations
- n) Lessons learned
- o) 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