



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

From firms/institutes/organizations

Dear Sir / Madam:

We kindly request you to submit your Proposal for **Evaluation of the One Plan 2012-2016**.

Please be guided by the form attached hereto as Annex 2, in preparing your Proposal.

Proposals may be submitted on or before **Monday, June 15, 2015** (Hanoi time) by the following methods:

<b>By email: <u>For green environment, this is preferred submission method</u></b>	<b>By hard copy: (within working hours only)</b>
E-mail address for proposal submission: <a href="mailto:huynh.huong.thanh@undp.org">huynh.huong.thanh@undp.org</a> Cc: <a href="mailto:nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org">nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org</a>	Please submit proposals to:
Separate emails for technical and financial proposal.	Ms. Huynh Huong Thanh Procurement Assistant UNDP Vietnam 72 Ly Thuong Kiet Street, Hanoi, Vietnam Tel: +84-4-39421495 Ext. 224
With subject: (Name of bidder) RFP for... (Email ... of ... emails)	Technical and Financial Proposals are to be submitted in separate envelop.
Maximum size per email: <b>7 MB</b> . Bidders can split proposal into several emails if the file size is large)	With envelop/email subject: (Name of company) RFP for ...

### **Note:**

- *For both submission methods, please send separate email (without attachment) to [procurement.vn@undp.org](mailto:procurement.vn@undp.org) notifying that you already submitted proposal and the number of email submitted (in case submitted by email). Notification emails should be sent to above address by submission deadline or right after you submit proposals).*
- *UNDP will acknowledge receipt of the proposals within 3 working days from the submission deadline. In case you do not receive acknowledgement, please contact us within 5 working days after submission deadline.*

Your Proposal must be expressed in the English language, and valid for a minimum period of 120 days from the date of bid submission.

In the course of preparing your Proposal, it shall remain your responsibility to ensure that it reaches the address above on or before the deadline. Proposals that are received by UNDP after the deadline indicated above, for whatever reason, shall not be considered for evaluation. If you are submitting your Proposal by email, kindly ensure that they are signed and in the .pdf format, and free from any virus or corrupted files.

Services proposed shall be reviewed and evaluated based on completeness and compliance of the Proposal and responsiveness with the requirements of the RFP and all other annexes providing details of UNDP requirements.

The Proposal that complies with all of the requirements, meets all the evaluation criteria and offers the best value for money shall be selected and awarded the contract. Any offer that does not meet the requirements shall be rejected.

Any discrepancy between the unit price and the total price shall be re-computed by UNDP, and the unit price shall prevail and the total price shall be corrected. If the Service Provider does not accept the final price based on UNDP's re-computation and correction of errors, its Proposal will be rejected.

No price variation due to escalation, inflation, fluctuation in exchange rates, or any other market factors shall be accepted by UNDP after it has received the Proposal. At the time of Award of Contract or Purchase Order, UNDP reserves the right to vary (increase or decrease) the quantity of services and/or goods, by up to a maximum twenty five per cent (25%) of the total offer, without any change in the unit price or other terms and conditions.

Any Contract or Purchase Order that will be issued as a result of this RFP shall be subject to the General Terms and Conditions attached hereto. The mere act of submission of a Proposal implies that the Service Provider accepts without question the General Terms and Conditions of UNDP, herein attached as Annex 3.

Please be advised that UNDP is not bound to accept any Proposal, nor award a contract or Purchase Order, nor be responsible for any costs associated with a Service Providers preparation and submission of a Proposal, regardless of the outcome or the manner of conducting the selection process.

UNDP's vendor protest procedure is intended to afford an opportunity to appeal for persons or firms not awarded a Purchase Order or Contract in a competitive procurement process. In the event that you believe you have not been fairly treated, you can find detailed information about vendor protest procedures in the following link: <http://www.undp.org/procurement/protest.shtml>.

UNDP encourages every prospective Service Provider to prevent and avoid conflicts of interest, by disclosing to UNDP if you, or any of your affiliates or personnel, were involved in the preparation of the requirements, design, cost estimates, and other information used in this RFP.

UNDP implements a zero tolerance on fraud and other proscribed practices, and is committed to preventing, identifying and addressing all such acts and practices against UNDP, as well as third parties involved in UNDP activities. UNDP expects its Service Providers to adhere to the UN Supplier Code of Conduct found in this link : [http://www.un.org/depts/ptd/pdf/conduct\\_english.pdf](http://www.un.org/depts/ptd/pdf/conduct_english.pdf)

Thank you and we look forward to receiving your Proposal.

Sincerely yours,  
**Tran Thi Hong**  
Head, Procurement Unit  
5/25/2015

### Description of Requirements

Context of the Requirement	Please see information in the TOR
Implementing Partner of UNDP	Please see information in the TOR
Brief Description of the Required Services	Evaluation of the One Plan 2012-2016
List and Description of Expected Outputs to be Delivered	Please see information in the TOR
Person to Supervise the Work/Performance of the Service Provider	One Plan Steering Committee (OPSC)
Frequency of Reporting	Please refer to the TOR
Progress Reporting Requirements	Please refer to the TOR
Location of work	<input type="checkbox"/> Exact Address: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At Contractor's Location and provinces
Expected duration of work	June – Dec 2015
Target start date	June 2015
Latest completion date	Dec 2015
Travels Expected	Please refer to the TOR
Special Security Requirements	Not applicable
Facilities to be Provided by UNDP (i.e., must be excluded from Price Proposal)	<input type="checkbox"/> Office space and facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Land Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Others <i>[pls. specify]</i>
Implementation Schedule indicating breakdown and timing of activities/sub-activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required
Names and curriculum vitae of individuals who will be involved in completing the services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required
Currency of Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United States Dollars – for international bidders <input type="checkbox"/> Euro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Currency (Vietnam Dong) – for local bidders  For the purposes of comparison of all Proposals: UNDP will convert the currency quoted in the Proposal into the UNDP preferred currency, in accordance with the prevailing UN operational rate of exchange on the proposal submission deadline.
Value Added Tax on Price Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> must be inclusive of VAT and other applicable indirect taxes <input type="checkbox"/> must be exclusive of VAT and other applicable indirect taxes

Validity Period of Proposals (Counting for the last day of submission of quotes)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 120 days In exceptional circumstances, UNDP may request the Proposer to extend the validity of the Proposal beyond what has been initially indicated in this RFP. The Proposal shall then confirm the extension in writing, without any modification whatsoever on the Proposal.
Partial Quotes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not permitted <input type="checkbox"/> Permitted
Payment Terms	As indicated in the TOR.  Condition for Payment Release:  Within thirty (30) days from the date of meeting the following conditions: a) UNDP's written acceptance (i.e., not mere receipt) of the quality of the outputs; and b) Receipt of invoice from the Service Provider.
Person(s) to review/inspect/ approve outputs/completed services and authorize the disbursement of payment	One Plan Steering Committee (OPSC)
Type of Contract to be Signed	<input type="checkbox"/> Purchase Order <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Contract or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract for Professional Services <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Other Type of Contract
Criteria for Contract Award	<input type="checkbox"/> Lowest Price Quote among technically responsive offers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highest Combined Score (based on the 70% technical offer and 30% price weight distribution) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full acceptance of the UNDP Contract General Terms and Conditions (GTC). This is a mandatory criteria and cannot be deleted regardless of the nature of services required. Non acceptance of the GTC may be grounds for the rejection of the Proposal.
Criteria for the Assessment of Proposal	Proposal shall be considered technically qualified if it achieves minimum 70% of total obtainable technical points.  <b>Weight of technical and financial point:</b>  <u><b>Technical Proposal (70%)</b></u>  <u><b>Financial Proposal (30%)</b></u> Financial score will be computed as a ratio of the Proposal's offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.  See detailed evaluation criteria in the below table.
UNDP will award the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One bidder

contract to:	
Annexes to this RFP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Form for Submission of Proposal (Annex 2a: Technical proposal; Annex 2b: Financial proposal; Annex 2-c: Submission check-list) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">General Terms and Conditions</a> (Annex 3) <sup>1</sup> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed TOR (Annex 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Institutional contract for service</a> & <a href="#">Contract for Professional services</a> (Annex 5) <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Long Term Agreement</a> (Annex 6)
Contact Person for Inquiries (Written inquiries only) <sup>2</sup>	<p>Ms. Nguyen Thi Hoang Yen  Procurement Associate, UNDP Vietnam  Email: <a href="mailto:nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org">nguyen.thi.hoang.yen@undp.org</a>  Cc: <a href="mailto:procurement.vn@undp.org">procurement.vn@undp.org</a></p> <p>Any delay in UNDP's response shall be not used as a reason for extending the deadline for submission, unless UNDP determines that such an extension is necessary and communicates a new deadline to the Proposers.</p>
Notification of selection result:	UNDP will contact only successful bidder for contracting
Other information	

<sup>1</sup> Service Providers are alerted that non-acceptance of the terms of the General Terms and Conditions (GTC) may be grounds for disqualification from this procurement process.

<sup>2</sup> This contact person and address is officially designated by UNDP. If inquiries are sent to other person/s or address/es, even if they are UNDP staff, UNDP shall have no obligation to respond nor can UNDP confirm that the query was received.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
				A	B	C	D	E
1.	Expertise of Firm / Organization submitting Proposal	30%	300					
2.	Proposed Work Plan and Approach	40%	400					
3.	Evaluation Team	30%	300					
<b>Total</b>			<b>1000</b>					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 1		Points obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
<b>Expertise of firm/organization submitting proposal</b>							
1.1	Organization's relevance to the task, taking into consideration: - Mandate - Specialized knowledge and expertise - Geographical focus	130					
1.2	Organization's track record, taking into consideration: - Reputation - Experience on similar tasks - Experience in the region/country - Experience with UN and/or other major multilaterals	170					
<b>Total Part 1</b>		<b>300</b>					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 2		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
<b>Proposed Work Plan and Approach</b>							
2.1	Do the Work Plan and Approach address the critical aspects of the task in sufficient detail?	80					
2.2	Is the amount of time allocated to activities adequate considering the overall timeframe?	80					
2.3	Is the overall evaluation approach, scope and methodology appropriate, feasible and efficient with quality assurance?	80					
2.4	Are data analysis/collection methods and tools appropriate, feasible to implement and efficient, taking due consideration for the complexity of the task?	80					

2.5	Is the overall proposal appropriate for the country and institutional context in which the task is being carried out?	80					
<b>Total Part 2</b>		<b>400</b>					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
<b>Evaluation Team<sup>3</sup></b>							
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Leader</b>	<b>200</b>					
		Sub-Score					
	International expertise and experience in evaluation	50					
	Data collection and analysis skills, including using mixed methods in evaluation	50					
	Knowledge of UN role, UN reform and UN country programming	40					
	Experience and knowledge of programming principles/cross-cutting issues (human rights-based approach, gender quality, environmental sustainability, culturally appropriate programming, results-based management and capacity development)	30					
	Excellent English language skills	30					
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Evaluation team member(s)<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>100</b>					
		Sub-Score					
	Knowledge of Viet Nam and ability to bring local perspective to the evaluation	40					
	Data collection and analysis skills, including using mixed methods in evaluations	30					
	Good English and excellent Vietnamese language skills	30					
<b>Total Part 3</b>		<b>300</b>					

<sup>3</sup> NOTE: The team should be composed of one Evaluation Team Leader, and one or more Evaluation Team Member(s), though this number may vary depending on the Firm's/Organization's proposal.

<sup>4</sup> NOTE: The evaluation team member(s), however many, will as a unit be scored against these criteria.

## FORM FOR SUBMITTING SERVICE PROVIDER'S TECHNICAL PROPOSAL<sup>5</sup>

*(This Form must be submitted only using the Service Provider's Official Letterhead/Stationery<sup>6</sup>)*

[insert: Location].

[insert: Date]

To: Procurement Unit - UNDP Vietnam

Dear Sir/Madam:

We, the undersigned, hereby offer to render the following services to UNDP in conformity with the requirements defined in the RFP dated *[specify date]*, and all of its attachments, as well as the provisions of the UNDP General Contract Terms and Conditions:

### A. Qualifications of the Service Provider

*The Service Provider must describe and explain how and why they are the best entity that can deliver the requirements of UNDP by indicating among others the following with appropriate supporting documents:*

- a) Profile – describing the nature of business, field of expertise, licenses, certifications, accreditations;*
- b) Business Licenses – Registration Papers, Tax Payment Certification, etc.*
- c) Track Record – list of clients for similar services as those required by UNDP, indicating description of contract scope, contract duration, contract value, contact references;*

Name of project	Client	Contract Value	Period of activity	Types of activities undertaken	Status or Date Completed	References Contact Details (Name, Phone, Email)

- d) Certificates and Accreditation – including Quality Certificates, Patent Registrations, Environmental Sustainability Certificates, etc. (if any)*
- e) Written Self-Declaration that the company is not in the UN Security Council 1267/1989 List, UN Procurement Division List or Other UN Ineligibility List.*

**(Note:** Please refer to Form 1 – Evaluation criteria for providing appropriate information and supporting documents to demonstrate the bidders' capacity)

<sup>5</sup> This serves as a guide to the Service Provider in preparing the Proposal.

<sup>6</sup> Official Letterhead/Stationery must indicate contact details – addresses, email, phone and fax numbers – for verification purposes



**B. Proposed Methodology for the Completion of Services**

*The Service Provider must describe how it will address/deliver the demands of the RFP; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics, reporting conditions and quality assurance mechanisms that will be put in place, while demonstrating that the proposed methodology will be appropriate to the local conditions and context of the work.*

**(Note:** Please refer to Form 2 – Evaluation criteria for UNDP requirements when preparing this section)

**C. Qualifications of Key Personnel**

*The Service Provider must provide:*

- a) Names and qualifications of the key personnel that will perform the services indicating who is Team Leader, who are supporting, etc.;*
- b) CVs demonstrating qualifications must be submitted if required by the RFP*

**(Note:**

- Please refer to Form 3 – Evaluation criteria for UNDP requirements when preparing this section
- All the members of the evaluation team should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the One Plan subject of the evaluation)

We agree to abide by this Proposal for 120 days from the date of proposal submission deadline.

*[Name and Signature of the Service Provider's  
Authorized Person][Designation]*

*[Date]*

## FORM FOR SUBMITTING SERVICE PROVIDER'S FINANCIAL PROPOSAL<sup>7</sup>

*(This Form must be submitted only using the Service Provider's Official Letterhead/Stationery<sup>8</sup>)*

The Proposer is required to prepare the Financial Proposal in an envelope separate from the rest of the RFP as indicated in the Instruction to Proposers.

The Financial Proposal must provide a detailed cost breakdown. Provide separate figures for each functional grouping or category.

Any estimates for cost-reimbursable items should be listed separately.

In case of an equipment component to the service provider, the Price Schedule should include figures for both purchase and lease/rent options. UNDP reserves the option to either lease/rent or purchase outright the equipment through the Contractor.

The format shown on the following pages is suggested for use as a guide in preparing the Financial Proposal. The format includes specific expenditures, which may or may not be required or applicable but are indicated to serve as examples.

### A. Cost Breakdown per Deliverable\*

	<b>Deliverables</b> <i>[list them as referred to in the RFP]</i>	<b>Percentage of Total Price</b> <i>(Weight for payment)</i>	<b>Price</b> <i>(Lump Sum, All Inclusive)</i>
1	Deliverable 1		
2	Deliverable 2		
3	....		
	Applicable taxes		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	

### B. Cost Breakdown by Cost Component *[This is only an Example]:*

<b>Description of Activity</b>	<b>Remuneration per Unit of Time</b>	<b>Total Period of Engagement</b>	<b>No. of Personnel</b>	<b>Total Rate</b>
<b>I. Personnel Services</b>				
1. Services from Home Office				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
2. Services from Field Offices				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
3. Services from Overseas				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
<b>II. Out of Pocket Expenses</b>				

<sup>7</sup> This serves as a guide to the Service Provider in preparing the Proposal.

<sup>8</sup> Official Letterhead/Stationery must indicate contact details – addresses, email, phone and fax numbers – for verification purposes

1. Travel Costs				
2. Daily Allowance				
3. Communications				
4. Reproduction				
5. Equipment Lease				
6. Others				
<b>III. Other Related Costs</b>				
<b>Applicable taxes</b>				

We agree to abide by this Proposal for 120 days from the date of proposal submission deadline.

[Name and Signature of the Service Provider's  
Authorized Person]

[Designation]

[Date]

## CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY BIDDERS

**Note:**

- Bidders are required to review carefully this checklist before submitting proposal to ensure complete submission.
- Maximum email size: 07 MB. Bidders can split proposal into several emails if the file size is large
- Technical and Financial Proposals are to be submitted in separate envelop/email by 15 June 2015 (Hanoi time).
- Email and proposal should indicate clearly the name of tender.

Item	Documents	To be completed by bidders		
		Doc submitted Y/N	Number of pages	Remarks
1	<b>Fully filled Technical proposal</b> (pls. refer to template in Annex 2-a) with copies/scan of supporting documents			
2	<b>Dully signed Price Schedule</b> (pls. Refer to template in Annex 2-b)			
3	<b>CVs of team members</b>			
4	This duly filled, checked, certified submission checklist to be attached to the submission			
5	Proposal sent to address specified on page 1 of the Request for Proposal by 15 June 2015 (Hanoi time).			
6	Send email (without attachment) to <a href="mailto:procurement.vn@undp.org">procurement.vn@undp.org</a> notifying that you already submitted proposal and the number of email submitted (in case submitted by email). Notification emails should be sent to above email address by submission deadline or right after you submit proposals (either by email or hard copy).			

*[Name and Signature of the Service Provider's  
Authorized Person]*

*[Designation]*

*[Date]*

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Evaluation of the One Plan 2012-2016

#### 1. BACKGROUND

The One Plan 2012-2016 is the common programmatic framework for participating UN system agencies in Viet Nam. It is aligned with national planning cycles, in particular the 2011-2015 Socio-Economic Development Plan (SEDP). The One Plan 2012-2016 sets out a focused and coherent joint programme of work in support of national priorities and is based on the comparative advantages of participating UN entities. Importantly, the One Plan 2012-2016 represents a continuing shift towards high quality policy work to support the people and Government of Viet Nam. The One Plan 2012-2016 also gives greater emphasis to provision of high quality technical assistance, capacity development at the national and sub-national level and the UN's role in convening different stakeholders and expanding partnerships.

The One Plan 2012-2016 was developed jointly from the outset by UN entities working in partnership with Government and development partners. Key stakeholders from Government, donors and political, social, professional and mass organizations (PSPMOs) were engaged at each step of developing the focus areas, outcomes, outputs and indicators. The One Plan 2012-2016 is based on robust analysis which identified the key development challenges Viet Nam has been expected to face over the period of the One Plan 2012-2016. The One Plan 2012-2016 identifies the key interventions of the UN system in Viet Nam over its five-year cycle. Programming documents of individual participating UN system agencies have been developed based on the One Plan 2012-2016. The One Plan 2012-2016 is signed between the Government of Viet Nam and the UN, including 14 resident and two non-resident UN entities.

The One Plan 2012-2016 is accompanied by a Results Monitoring and Evaluation Framework with three focus areas, 12 outcomes, 43 outputs and 122 indicators. Eight inter-agency Joint Programming Groups (JPGs) are the vehicles through which One Plan results are delivered, and these groups are responsible for overall planning, monitoring and reporting on annual contribution to One Plan results. The Results-Based Management Working Group provides advisory and technical support on PMRE of the One Plan to UNCT and JPGs. The Results-Based Management Strategy (2013-2016) provides the Resident Coordinator, the UN Country Team (RC/UNCT), UN staff, and national and international partners with the overall approach to manage for One Plan and other Delivering as One pillar outcomes.

#### 2. EVALUATION CONTEXT

In late 2014, an Equity-focused Systematic Review (including evaluability assessment) of the One Plan was conducted. The Systematic Review identified a number of advantages and challenges of the One Plan in terms of demonstrating its contribution to reduction of inequalities and disparities with a focus on the most vulnerable groups.

Advantages:

- An outcomes and outputs chain based on a reasonable theory of change;
- a selection of 47 outcome and output indicators to measure the contribution of UN to build a level playing field;

- 13 evaluations have provided or 12 have the potential to provide independent evidence of UN contributions in the three focus areas regarding the UN work in benefit of most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups;
- Contribution stories from the UN annual reports that build the bridge between some equity-focused outputs and outcomes.

#### Challenges:

- The vulnerable and disadvantaged groups are only defined for some One Plan outcomes and outputs;
- For some outcomes, there is a gap between the concrete results at the output level and the higher level indicators at the outcome level, and therefore UN may struggle to justify a significant contribution to outcome changes;
- Information on indicators related to VHLSS may come from 2012 as VHLSS 2014 is likely not to be available at that time;
- the evaluative evidence on the contributions of UN to the One Plan outcomes and outputs is still scarce; there are only few additional evaluations planned to be conducted before mid-2015 and the independent cases studies at outcome level recommended by in the RBM strategy have not been carried out;
- the explanation of the effect of UN actions for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups is not always explicit in the available evaluations and contribution stories;
- Several evaluations are mostly based on secondary data without triangulation of information with different stakeholders, which reduces the robustness of the evidence collected.

Based on the above, for the One Plan Evaluation the Systematic Review thus recommended:

- using an approach that allows to show a comprehensive picture of UN work in Viet Nam and which does not necessarily require the level of data disaggregation that would be most suitable in using the equity approach;
- not conducting an outcome focused evaluation due to due to the risk of not having updated data from a key source such as VHLSS and the lack of clear indicators that bridge the gap between outputs and outcomes and that support the measurement of UN contribution to the different outcomes; and
- including impartial case studies, collecting opinions of several (external and internal) stakeholders to allow to bridge the gap between outcome and output level, while partially filling gaps in available evaluative evidence.

The One Plan Evaluation has been designed building on the Systematic Review's findings, conclusions and recommendations.

### 3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES, OBJECTIVES, PURPOSES AND SCOPE

The **guiding principles** of the evaluation are that it:

- is credible, independent, impartial and transparent;
- builds on the One Plan Systematic Review conclusions and recommendations;
- is meaningful and utilization-focused;
- is feasible in terms of scope and timeframe;
- is efficient in use of human and financial resources available; and
- meets UNEG Standards, Norms and Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System;

The **objectives** of the evaluation are:

- to assess the contribution made by the UNCT in the framework of the One Plan to national

development results through making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability).

- to identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning).
- to reach conclusions concerning the UN's contribution across the scope being examined.
- to provide actionable recommendations for improving the UNCT's contribution, especially for incorporation into the new One Plan. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation.

The overall **purposes** of the OP Evaluation are:

- To support greater learning about what works, what doesn't and why in the context of the One Plan. The evaluation will provide important information for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next One Plan cycle (2017-2021) and for improving United Nations coordination at the country level. The Government of Viet Nam, UNCT, donors, civil society and other key One Plan stakeholders can learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned. These will also be shared with UN Regional Offices and HQ for potential benefit of other countries.
- To support greater accountability of the UNCT to One Plan stakeholders. By objectively verifying results achieved within the framework of the One Plan and assessing the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions used, the evaluation will enable the various stakeholders in the One Plan process, including national counterparts and donors, to hold the UNCT and other parties accountable for fulfilling their roles and commitments.

The **scope** covered by the evaluation includes examining the cross-cutting issues of the One Plan 2012-2016 and the global UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, culturally appropriate programming, HIV, results-based management, capacity development). The evaluation will examine overall strategies and outcome/output specific strategies included in the One Plan itself. The One Plan will be evaluated against the strategic intent laid out in the One Plan document and specifically its contribution to the national development results included in the One Plan results framework.

#### **4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY**

**Overall approach:** The One Plan Evaluation is a programmatic evaluation of the One Plan programmatic framework and its specified strategic intent and objectives. It assesses UNCT's contribution to national development outcomes contained in the One Plan's results framework. The overall approach is participatory and orientated towards learning and identifying lessons on how to jointly enhance development results at the national level.

In line with UNEG standards, the contribution of UNCT to development outcomes will be assessed according to the following evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the objectives of the One Plan are consistent with country needs, national priorities, the country's international and regional commitments, including on human rights (core human rights treaties, including ICCPR, ICESCR, ICERD, CEDAW, CPRD, CRC, etc.) and the recommendations of Human Rights mechanisms (including the treaty bodies, special procedures and UPR), sustainable development, environment, and the needs of women and men, girls and boys in the country.
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which the UNCT contributed to, or is likely to contribute to,

addressing target groups' vulnerabilities through the outcomes defined in the One Plan. 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.

- **Efficiency.** The extent to which outcomes are achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (e.g. funds, expertise, time and administrative costs).
- **Sustainability.** The extent to which the benefits from a development intervention have continued, or are likely to continue, after it has been completed.

To assess the above, the One Plan evaluation will look at two factors, general enabling/explanatory factors that can help to explain One Plan performance overall, and target group case studies that can help demonstrate contribution to addressing vulnerabilities in contribution to One Plan outcomes.

**General enabling/explanatory factors:** These can be assumed to affect performance, and assessing them in line with the above evaluation criteria can allow broader lessons to be learned about why the UNCT performed as it did. Examples that may be examined include:

- Did **UN coordination** reduce transaction costs and increase the efficiency of One Plan implementation? To what extent did the One Plan create synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimise results and avoid duplication?
- To what extent did other **Delivering as One pillars** (One House, One Leader, One Voice, One Plan Fund and Operating as One) serve as enablers to effectively and efficiently achieving One Plan results?
- How were the five **cross-cutting issues/programming principles** employed (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, culturally appropriate programming, HIV, results-based management, capacity building)? To what degree did they contribute to performance?
- How well did the UN use its **partnerships** (e.g. with civil society, private sector, local government, National Assembly, development partners) to improve its performance? To what extent was the "active, free, and meaningful" **participation** of all stakeholders (including non-resident agencies) ensured? What mechanisms were created throughout implementation to ensure participation?

**Target group case studies:** Building on the Systematic Review findings on challenges related to the current One Plan 2012-2016, in particular limited available evaluative data that can demonstrate contributions of UN's outputs towards One Plan outcomes, and directly responding to the Review recommendation to develop "impartial case studies that collect the opinion of several (external and internal stakeholders) on selected interventions" to allow to bridge this gap, the evaluation will assess, against the above evaluation criteria, UN's performance in addressing vulnerabilities of a limited number of target groups (approximately 4-6). Criteria for selection of target groups include:

- 1) a group that the UN jointly supports (more than one, but ideally not too many agencies);
- 2) a group that is supported through a number of UN interventions across a number of One Plan Outcomes (more than one, but ideally not too many);
- 3) a group for which the UN is a main actor in supporting and has provided a clear added value compared to other development actors; and

Examples of evaluation questions case studies will aim to answer include:



- How were these groups identified?
- How were their vulnerabilities defined?
- How was it expected that UN interventions/policy support would contribute to addressing these vulnerabilities?
- To what degree have UN interventions/policy support contributed – or are likely to contribute – to achievement of One Plan outcomes for these groups?

Within the scope of the case studies, the enabling/explanatory factors will also be examined in greater detail as they pertain to the case study in question. Evidence emanating from both the generic enabling/explanatory factors pertaining to the whole One Plan, as well as the more detailed target group case studies, will constitute the findings of the One Plan Evaluation, used to formulate related conclusions and recommendations.

**Data analysis and collection methods:** Both for the overall assessment of enabling/explanatory factors, as well as for conduct of the target group case studies, the One Plan evaluation will draw on a variety of data collection methods. This firstly will include desk review and analysis of existing evidence (e.g. from agency evaluations, reviews and assessments). Some primary data will be collected to fill existing evaluative evidence gaps as identified by the Systematic Review. Examples of data analysis and collection methods include:

- Document review focusing on One Plan planning documents, progress reviews, annual reports and past evaluation reports (including those on projects and small-scale initiatives, and those issued by national counterparts), strategy papers, national plans and policies and related programme and project documents. These should include reports on the progress against national and international commitments.
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organisations, UNCT members, and implementing partners.
- Surveys and questionnaires including participants in development programmes, UNCT members, and / or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders.
- Focus Group discussions involving groups and sub-groups of stakeholders, decision-makers.
- Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, photo stories, etc.

Data collection methods must be linked to the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions that are included within the scope of the evaluation. The use of an evaluation matrix is recommended in linking these elements together. In addition, the precise data collection methods should be identified following:

- Analysis of availability of existing evaluative evidence and administrative data
- Logistical constraints (travel, costs, time, etc)
- Ethical considerations (especially when evaluating sensitive topics such as GBV or in sensitive settings such as post-conflict settings)

Data collection methods and process should consider gender sensitivity and data should be systematically disaggregated by sex and age and, to the extent possible, disaggregated by geographical region, ethnicity, disability, migratory status and other contextually-relevant markers of equity.

**Validation:** The One Plan evaluation will use a variety of validation methods to ensure that the data and information used and conclusions made carry the necessary depth, including by sharing findings, conclusions and recommendations with evaluation participants and the evaluation

reference group. Information sources and findings will be triangulated to improve validity, quality and use of evaluation outputs.

## 5. MANAGEMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION

The One Plan Evaluation Team will work under the supervision of a dual-tiered evaluation management structure.

- The commissioner and decision-making organ for the One Plan Evaluation is the **One Plan Steering Committee** (OPSC) which is composed of representatives of UN and national counterparts. The key evaluation deliverables, namely the Final Evaluation Report and its Management Response, will be approved by the ESC.
  
- Direct supervision is provided by the One Plan **Evaluation Management Group (EMG)** which will function as the guardian of the independence of the evaluation. The EMG is composed by the Results-Based Management Specialist in the Resident Coordinator's Office, up to three members of the Results-Based Management Working Group and one representative from the Ministry of Planning and Investment. This group will be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation and management of the evaluation budget. The key roles of the EMG are:
  - To lead the hiring of the team of external consultants, reviewing proposals and approving the selection of the evaluation team;
  - To supervise and guide the evaluation team in each step of the evaluation process;
  - To review, provide substantive comments and approve the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework and methodology;
  - To review and provide substantive feedback to the draft and final evaluation reports for quality assurance purposes;
  - To ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation and to guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms, Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
  - To identify and ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders throughout the evaluation process, if needed in consultation with OPSC;
  - To ensure relevant feedback to excerpts of findings and conclusions is solicited from the Evaluation Reference Group;
  - To ensure the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable; and
  - To contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.
  
- The **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)**, composed of key technical-level stakeholders and evaluation experts, will provide advice to key consultant products and deliverables, including advance excerpts of findings and the full draft evaluation report. The ERG is constituted by the representatives of UN agencies in Viet Nam, the Results-Based Management Working Group, evaluation experts of national line counterparts, target group representatives and interviewees, regional UNDG and regional UNEG.

### Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team will work in full independence from the evaluation commissioners. Given the importance of the One Plan Evaluation and the complexities involved in its design and conduct, it is critical that the evaluation team meet the standards to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation team will consist of a team leader and one or more team members with the following

responsibilities:

- The **evaluation team leader** will lead the entire evaluation process, working closely with all team member(s). He/she will conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner and communicate with the Evaluation Management Group on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered. The team leader will be responsible for producing the inception report and the draft and final evaluation reports.
- The **evaluation team member(s)** will contribute to the evaluation process substantively through data collection and analysis. He/she/they will share responsibilities for conducting desk review and interviews and conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data. He/she/they will provide substantive inputs to the inception report as well as to the draft and final reports.

## Evaluation process

There are four main stages in the One Plan Evaluation process:

- **Preparation** (April-May): Includes reflection on the evaluation with stakeholders establishing the elements of the evaluation management structure and setting up an Evaluation Management Group. The ToR will be adopted and the evaluation team will be recruited
- **Conduct / implementation** (May-August): The evaluation team will prepare an inception report that will operationalize the design elements made in this ToR and will undertake data collection.
- **Reporting** (August): Preliminary findings and lessons learned will be presented to all the above referred stakeholders and, based on their feedback, a final report will be produced.
- **Follow-up and use** (September onward): Once the evaluation report is completed and validated by the Evaluation Steering Committee it will be made publicly available by posting in the UN Viet Nam and the UNDG websites. UNCT represented in the Evaluation Steering Committee will endorse a management response to the evaluation recommendations within two months of the final report becoming available. This includes committing follow up actions to the recommendations as well as establishing responsibilities for the follow up.

## 6. EVALUATION TEAM QUALIFICATIONS

As the One Plan Evaluation is an independent exercise, an external evaluation team will be engaged from a firm containing expertise and a good track record in conducting evaluations, preferably complex evaluations for UN and/or other multilateral organizations. Between all members of the evaluation team, the following should be demonstrated:

*Essential:*

- a. International expertise and experience in evaluation
- b. Knowledge of Viet Nam and ability to bring local perspective to the evaluation
- c. Knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and in a wide range of evaluation approaches
- d. A strong record in designing and leading evaluations
- e. Data collection and analysis skills
- f. Process management skills such as facilitation skills and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders
- g. Technical competence in undertaking complex evaluations which involve use of mixed

methods

- h. Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies
- i. Strong experience and knowledge in the cross-cutting issues/programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, culturally appropriate programming, results-based management and capacity development)
- j. Excellent English and Vietnamese language skills (written and spoken)

*Desirable:*

- k. Balance in terms of gender
- l. Knowledge of UN role, UN reform process and UN programming at country level
- m. Experience in evaluation of UNDAFs
- n. Knowledge and experience applying participatory approaches to evaluation

While the above are not expected to apply to each evaluation team member individually, all of the above must be demonstrated between the evaluation team as a whole. In addition, all the members of the evaluation team should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the One Plan subject of the evaluation.

## **7. LOCATION AND TENTATIVE TIMEFRAME**

The Evaluation Team is expected to conduct at a minimum two missions to Viet Nam; one for data collection during the data collection phase for a maximum period of two weeks and a second mission for debriefing and presentation of preliminary findings to the various stakeholders once the draft report has been submitted for a maximum period of 3 days. For the case studies travel within Viet Nam might be necessary, to a maximum of three locations determined based on the definition of target groups.

The **evaluation timeline**, which will be adjusted once the Evaluation team has been recruited, can be viewed on the following page.

### Timeline for Evaluation of One Plan 2012-2016

April-December 2015

Activities	April				May				June					July				Aug				Sept onward
<i>Week starting on:</i>	6	13	20	27	4	11	18	25	1	8	15	22	29	6	13	20	27	3	10	17	24	
<b>Planning</b>																						
Finalize and begin implementation of Systematic Review Management Response																						
Establish management structure for the evaluation																						
Draft Evaluation TOR and Workplan																						
Organize relevant documentation																						
Recruit Evaluation Team																						
<b>Implementation</b>																						
Brief the Evaluation Team																						
Review inception report																						
Conduct desk review and analysis of existing data																						
Conduct initial informational interviews																						
Draft report																						
<b>Reporting</b>																						
Submission and presentation of 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of Evaluation Report by the evaluation team																						
Reference group comments on 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of Evaluation Report																						
Evaluation Team submits Final Report																						
<b>Use</b>																						
Prepare management response and implement evaluation recommendations as appropriate																						
Prepare/disseminate evaluation products, organize knowledge sharing events																						
Use results and lessons learned to inform development of One Plan 2017-2021																						

## **8. DELIVERABLES**

1. Inception Report, including proposed methodology and work plan
2. Draft Evaluation Report
3. Power point presentation with key findings
4. Final Evaluation Report (including relevant annexes)

## **9. STRUCTURE OF EVALUATION REPORT**

The final report will be kept reasonably short (~50-75 pages maximum excluding annexes). More detailed information on the context, the One Plan or the comprehensive aspects of the methodology and analysis will be placed in the annexes. The report will be accompanied by an executive summary (max three to four pages of text). The report will be prepared in accordance with UNEG guidance (Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports).

The proposed structure will be considered during the inception phase and a more detailed outline of the Evaluation Report will be included in the inception report. The proposed structure is as follows:

- Chapter 1: Introduction (objectives, scope, methodology, limitations)
- Chapter 2: National development and institutional context
- Chapter 3: Evaluation findings
  - 3.1: General findings on enabling/explanatory factors
  - 3.2: Findings of target group case studies (one sub-section per target group)
- Chapter 4: Conclusions and recommendations
- Annexes

## **10. PAYMENT TERMS**

First payment of 30% of total contract amount shall be paid upon receipt and acceptance of the inception report.

Last payment of 70% of total contract amount shall be paid upon receipt and acceptance of the Final Evaluation Report.