

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

ETHIOPIA

GENERAL INFORMATION

Services/Work Description:	International Firm Level Consultancy Midterm Evaluation of the Regional Programme for Africa
Project/Program Title:	Support Oversight of the Regional Programme for Africa
Duty Station:	Home-based
Type of the Contract:	International Consultancy Firm
Duration:	30 working days
Expected Start Date:	Immediately after concluding the contract

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Regional Programme 2018-2021 for Africa, as approved by the United Nations' Executive Board's first regular session in 2018 (22-26 January 2018) is an instrument for realising the SDGs set out in the UNDP SP 2018 - 2021. By promoting regional programmes to sustain human development in the region, the Regional Programme (RP) for Africa provides a framework for the provision of policy and knowledge-based advisory services to the RECs, UNDP COs, United Nations organizations (furthering the "Common Chapter" where possible) governments and civil society organisations, and helps the region to exploit its opportunities in the global economy. As part of the demand-driven approach at the core of this programme, priorities were informed by consultations with the African Union, CSOs and bilateral partners, and elaborated on the basis of coherence with the United Nations. Decisions were shaped by the need to consolidate gains made from the previous regional programme on building the capacity of regional institutions and improving funding opportunities.

The four-year Regional Programme for Africa 2018-2021 focuses on three strategic priority areas with a proposed budget of USD236,100,000.

Priority 1: African Union and RECs deliver on their mandate, especially cross-cutting issues related to resilience-building (contributes to SP Outcome 2)

Priority 2: Regional growth is inclusive, transformational and sustainable with reduced economic inequalities, and characterised by structural transformation (contributes to SP Outcome 2)

Priority 3: Regional institutions sustain peace and build resilience to crises and shocks (contributes to SP Outcome 3)
See Annex 1 for programme outcomes, outputs and projects

Each of these outcomes have been translated to projects for effective implementation and accountability of results. The project has been developed in a way to build complementarities with other projects

In line with the SSC and 'New Way of Working' principles, the regional programme is also promoting and strengthening collective self-reliance among all development partners in Africa through the exchange of experiences at continental and inter-regional levels, the sharing and use of technical knowledge, and by building up complementary capacities through SSC partnerships.

This evaluation fit into the current ongoing Midterm evaluation of the UNDP strategic plan, and the ongoing midterm review of the regional programmes

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

UNDP commissions evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to development results at the regional level as articulated in both the Strategic Plan 2018 – 2021 and the Regional programme document (RPD). These evaluations are carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the Evaluation Plan of the Regional Bureau for Africa, this midterm evaluation is being conducted to assess the impact of RSCA development assistance across the major thematic and cross cutting areas of the three priority areas mentioned above.

The Midterm RP evaluation will build on the Midterm review conducted in May 2020 and capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of current programming, which can be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for new initiatives going forward into the next programming cycle. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results of the regional level support.

The outcome evaluation will be conducted during the months of June and July 2020, with a view to enhancing programmes while providing strategic direction and inputs to the preparation of the next Regional programme. Specifically, the RP midterm evaluation will assess:

- i. The relevance and strategic positioning of RSC support to the region for the 3 priority areas mentioned above.
- ii. The frameworks and strategies that RSC has devised for its support on these 3 priority areas, including partnership strategies, and whether they are well conceived for achieving planned objectives.
- iii. The progress made towards achieving the 3 outcomes through specific projects and advisory services, and including contributing factors and constraints
- iv. The progress to date under these outcomes and what can be derived in terms of lessons learned for future RSC support to the region.

The evaluation will consider all programme outcomes and outputs as stated in the Regional programme document of RBA from 2018 to date. These activities are largely implemented by the Regional Centre but in some cases by the country offices. Furthermore, they could include activities that use resources provided by global, regional or country programmes.

Key objectives of this evaluation are to

- provide evidence of UNDP's contribution to Africa's development effectiveness through the achievement of the 3 priority areas, including the contributory factors and impediments;
- Provide stakeholders in regional programme, countries, RECs and development partners with an objective assessment of the development contributions that have been achieved through UNDP RSC support and partnerships with other key players through the regional programme during the given period.
- determine the strategic positioning and relevance of UNDP in the – the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps - especially with regard to the appropriateness of their partnership strategy (including choice of beneficiaries), their ToC, and any need for mid-course adjustments to achieve the outcomes
- distil lessons for future programming, including to inform higher level evaluations and future decision-making and planning for the remainder of the programme cycle
- Contribute substantively to the Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board;
- Facilitate learning to inform current and future programming at the regional and corporate levels and also address how the intervention sought to strengthen the application of the rights-based approach and mainstream gender in development efforts

The evaluation will analyze the contributions made by the regional programme during the current programme period 2018-2020 and UNDP's strategic position within the region. A set of appropriate and forward-looking recommendations will be drawn at the end of the evaluation. It is expected that evaluation results will be used in the formulation of the next regional programme document. Results should also feed into other relevant evaluations planned by the Independent Evaluation Office in, such as the Global / SP Programme Evaluation.

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS

The Midterm evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, Coherence and sustainability:

Relevance

- To what extent is the RP aligned with the Regional development needs and priorities
- How well does the design of the RP address the needs of the most vulnerable groups in the Region
- To what extent is the RP responsive to the changing social, economic and political environment in Region, sub-regional and at national levels and how should it adapt to these changes?

- To what extent was the method of delivery selected by UNDP appropriate to the development context in the region?
- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome models a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?

Effectiveness

- To what extent is the current RP on track to achieve planned results (intended and unintended, positive or negative) building on the Midterm review for the 3 priority areas?
- To what extent the vulnerable groups especially, women, PWDs and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups?
- How were the United Nations programming principles including Gender and human rights mainstreamed in the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the RP and how have they benefited from the work of UNDP in the Region? Were there any unintended effects?
- To what extent have triangular and South-South cooperation and knowledge management contributed to the results attained?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider or not going forward?
- To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of Regional implementing partners to advocate and deliver on the 3 priority areas
- To what extent has the RSCA been able to form and maintain partnerships with other development actors including the RECs, bilateral and multilateral organizations, civil society organizations and the private sector to leverage results?

Efficiency

- To what extent and how has the United Nations system following the reforms mobilized and used its resources (human, technical and financial) and improved inter-agency synergies to achieve its planned outcome level results in the current RP cycle?
- To what extent have UNDP RSCA practices, M&E, policies, processes and decision-making capabilities affected the achievement of the Regional programme's outcomes?
- To what extent were quality regional programme outputs delivered and on time?

Coherence

- To what extent the policies of different actors in the region were complementary or contradictory in adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

Sustainability

- What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from the previous and current RP will continue at Regional and sub regional levels through adequate ownership, commitment and willingness displayed by the member states/Governments and RECs?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits
- Looking at the past, the present and the future, how well designed is the RP in order to remain valid in light of the changing environment?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other regional institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?
- Was the choice and adaptation of technology appropriate to sustain result?
- To what extent does Political stability, crises and shocks, and natural disasters affect the sustainability of results.

Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on UNDP RSCA results in the 3 priority area of support, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP RBA could adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the RP fully achieves current planned outcomes and is positioned for sustainable results in the future. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer lessons for UNDP support in Region and elsewhere based on this analysis.

IV. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** One and half week after contract signing, the lead evaluator of the team/consortium/firm will produce an inception report containing the proposed theory of change for UNDPs work on 3 priority areas in the region. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution etc.)
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, UNDP Management at the RSCA may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length)¹** will be shared with the stakeholders and the RBM Team and presented in a validation workshop (if applicable), that the RSC coordination team will organize. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluators will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report. The Coordination and RBM teams and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report including lessons learned.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group.**
- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.

V. METHODOLOGY

The outcome evaluation will be carried out by a firm/consortium/team of evaluators, and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments where programmes or advisory support were provided, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives etc.

The RP midterm evaluation is expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP RSCA has supported and observed progress in the three priority areas. The evaluators will develop a logic model of how UNDP RSCA interventions are expected to lead to improved regional, sub regional and national management and service delivery.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP RSCA support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, etc.

Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.

The steps in data collection may include **some or all** of the following:

- i. **Document review of all relevant documentation. See annex 2 for list of documents (not exhaustive)**
- ii. **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key Regional, sub-regional, government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, United Nations Agency members and implementing partners:
- iii. **Review/Development of evaluation questions/sub questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
 - Key informant interviews with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
 - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

¹ A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested

- iv. **Surveys and questionnaires** including implementing partners in development programmes, UN and RECs members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
 - The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- v. **Other methods** such as outcome mapping etc.
- vi. **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
 - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP RSCA Management, stakeholders and the evaluators.

VI. TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation is expected to take 30 working days, over a period of six weeks starting 1 June 2020. A tentative date for the stakeholder workshop is 25 June, and the final draft evaluation report is due the 30 June 2020. The following table provides an indicative breakdown of activities and delivery:

Activity	Deliverable	Workday allocation
Review materials and develop work plan	Inception report and evaluation matrix (1-8 June)	8
Participate in an Inception Meeting with project staff and M&E of the RSCA and relevant partners		
Draft inception report		
Review Documents and stakeholder consultations	Draft evaluation report Stakeholder workshop presentation (8 -25 June)	18
Interview stakeholders/questionnaires		
Conduct field visits where feasible		
Analyze data		
Develop draft evaluation & lesson Learned report to project	Final evaluation report (6 June)	10
Present draft Evaluation and lesson learned Report at Validation Workshop		
Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders		
	Totals 30	6. weeks

VII. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT / REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS

The UNDP RSC will select the partnership of consultants/consortium or firm and will be responsible for the management of the consortium of consultants or firm. RSCA the regional coordinator will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the Evaluation Specialist and RSC Project Managers to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Regional Office Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The Programme Specialist for the Regional Programme will arrange introductory meetings within RSC and will establish initial contacts with partners and project implementation staff. The consultants assisted by the regional specialist will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The Management of RSC/RBA will develop a management response to the evaluation within four weeks of report finalization.

An Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation will be convened by the Regional Coordinator. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team/firm is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detailed rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

It will be the responsibility of the consultants/firm to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites (if the current situation allows) and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed with the RSC if required.

VIII. PAYMENT MILESTONES AND AUTHORITY

partnership of consultants/consortium or firm should provide their requested fee rates when they submit their expressions of interest, in USD. The Regional Office will then negotiate and finalise contracts. Travel costs and daily allowances will be paid against invoice, and subject to the UN payment schedules for RSCA. Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by the RSC of planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

Installment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained from:	Percentage of Payment
1 st Installment	Inception report	UNDP	10%
2 nd Installment	Draft Evaluation Report and lessons learned report	"	70%
3 rd Installment	Final Evaluation Report with annexed lesson learned report	"	20%

IX. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

9.1 Minimum Organization Requirements

A partnership/ consortium of consultants or firm will be contracted to carry out the Midterm regional programme evaluation. The team leader will be responsible for submitting the proposal and should assign/select a team (desirable with gender balance) to work on this assignment. The proposal should include the CV's of each team member. It is expected that the partnership of consultants/consortium or firm makes use of relevant international and local expertise if possible. It is desirable to have team members with experience working in the region

The required expertise and skills of the team members that will be required to adequately carry out this task are detailed below:

Functional competencies of the Team:

- Excellent knowledge of the UN system and UN joint country/regional programming processes (RP/CCA/UNDAF).
- Good knowledge and experience with the Regional development frameworks, especially African Agenda 2063, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), key regional legislations, etc.
- Specialised technical knowledge, including in conducting external programme evaluations, data collection and analytical skills, mainstreaming the HRBA to programming and gender equality and women's empowerment considerations, and transition contexts.
- Excellent communication, interpersonal skills, teamwork and adept at working with people of diverse cultural and social backgrounds.
- An understanding of and ability to abide by the core values of the United Nations.

Required Skills and Experience of the Team:

- Master's degree or equivalent in Economics, Development Studies, Social Studies, International Relations or other related field.
- Expertise in the following thematic areas: Governance, Environment, climate change and Resilience, inclusive economic growth/poverty
- 5-10 years' experience and proven expertise with programming processes, and evaluations including strong understanding of UN's relevant Programming Guidelines on Gender Equality, HRBA, Capacity Development, Environmental Sustainability and RBM.
- Proven excellent command in written and spoken English, including excellent report writing skills, analytical skills as well as good computer skills. Knowledge of French is an added advantage.
- Previous experience in multi country or regional programme evaluation or related evaluation process and practical experience in African region
- Experience in working with teams and team processes.
- Proven track record in evaluation and review writing.

9.2 Team Leader

Academic Qualification:

- A minimum of master's degree or equivalent in Economics, Development Studies, Social Studies, International Relations or another related field.

Experience:

- At least 10 years of relevant experience and proven expertise with multi country or Regional evaluation processes and in one of the thematic areas

Competencies:

- Good understanding of the UN Development Reform Agenda
- Excellent knowledge of the UN Programming Principles: Gender Equality, HRBA, Capacity Development, Environmental Sustainability and RBM
- Experience leading evaluation teams

9.3 Team Members

Academic Qualification:

- A minimum of master's degree or equivalent in Economics, Development Studies, Social Studies, International Relations or another related field.

Experience:

- 5-10 years proven experience working in social sector.

Competencies:

- Technical expertise in the following thematic areas: Gender, Governance, Environment/climate change and Resilience, inclusive economic growth/poverty reduction
- Experience working in Africa and knowledge of the context

X. APPLICATION SUBMISSION AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFER

The partnership of consultants/consortium or firm shall be required to submit a financial and technical proposals. The financial proposal should be proposal based on an all-inclusive lump sum amount. If the Proposer is a group of individuals that will form or have formed a Joint Venture (JV), Consortium or Association for the Proposal, they shall confirm in their Proposal that: (i) they have designated one party to act as a lead entity, duly vested with authority to legally bind the members of the JV, Consortium or Association jointly and severally, which shall be evidenced by a duly notarized Agreement among the legal entities, and submitted with the Proposal; and (ii) if they are awarded the contract, the contract shall be entered into, by and between UNDP and the designated lead entity, who shall be acting for and on behalf of all the member entities comprising the joint venture. After the Deadline for Submission of Proposal, the lead entity identified to represent the JV, Consortium or Association shall not be altered without the prior written consent of UNDP. The description of the organization of the JV, Consortium or Association must clearly define the expected role of each of the entity in the joint venture in delivering the requirements of the RFP, both in the Proposal and the JV, Consortium or Association Agreement. All entities that comprise the JV, Consortium or Association shall be subject to the eligibility and qualification assessment by UNDP.

The Financial Proposal shall be prepared using the Standard Form provided by UNDP. It shall list all major cost components associated with the services, and the detailed breakdown of such costs. Any output and activities described in the Technical Proposal but not priced in the Financial Proposal, shall be assumed to be included in the prices of other activities or items, as well as in the final total price. Prices and other financial information must not be disclosed in any other place except in the financial proposal. All prices shall be quoted in United States Dollars. The Technical Proposal shall not include any price or financial information. A Technical Proposal containing material financial information may be declared non-responsive.

Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a. Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided;
- b. Signed Personal CV, indicating all past experience from similar evaluation, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.
- d. Description of Approach to Work/Methodology

Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The offers that will be received shall be evaluated based on the Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max of 70% and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%. Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points out of 100 points at the technical evaluation will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

XI. LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

UNDP RSCA will ensure that the Consultancy Firm receives access to the RSCA Compound in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. When required, the Firm will be provided with workspace and internet access within UNDP.

XII. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, a Service Provider advised to use a proposed Table of Contents. Hence, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the respective RFP Proposal Submission Form.

XIII. CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROPRIETARY INTERESTS

The consultants shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy or the Government without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP. This assignment will be administrated by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and all relevant UNDP rules, policies and procedures will apply.

XIV. ANNEXES TO THE TOR

Annex 1 RP Outcomes, outputs and Projects

RPD Outcome	RPD Output		Project Outputs linked to the RPD Output	
	CPS Code	RPD Output Description	Atlas ID	Atlas Project Output description
OUTCOME 1: African Union and RECs deliver on their mandate, especially cross-cutting issues related to resilience-building.	H01_OUTPUT_1.1	Output 1.1: The AUC Legal Office has strengthened technical capacity to oversee the ratification and domestication of the African Union treaties	00109735	African Union Treaties
	H01_OUTPUT_1.3	Output 1.3: The AUC PSC ECOWAS IGAD and LCBA have strengthened technical capacities to coordinate the continental and sub-regional PVE agenda	00116103	Africa Borderlands Programme
	H01_OUTPUT_1.4	Output 1.4: The AUC Trade and Industry Commission has adequate technical capacity to implement the African Union Mining Vision (AMV)	00110410	Extractives
	H01_OUTPUT_1.5	Output 1.5: RECs and member states have the adequate technical capacities to implement the SDGs and Agenda 2063 and share knowledge on lessons learned that are gender responsive from the implementation of the continental and global development	00093934	RP_1_Sustainable Development
	H01_OUTPUT_1.5	Output 1.5: RECs and member states have the adequate technical capacities to implement the SDGs and Agenda 2063 and share knowledge on lessons learned that are gender responsive from the implementation of the continental and global development	00109852	Knowledge Products
	H01_OUTPUT_1.5	Output 1.5: RECs and member states have the adequate technical capacities to implement the SDGs and Agenda 2063 and share knowledge on lessons learned that are gender responsive from the implementation of the continental and global development	00109853	Partnership and Dev. Exchange

	H01_OUTPUT_1.5	Output 1.5: RECs and member states have the adequate technical capacities to implement the SDGs and Agenda 2063 and share knowledge on lessons learned that are gender responsive from the implementation of the continental and global development	00109854	SDGs Monitoring & Reporting
	H01_OUTPUT_1.5	Output 1.5: RECs and member states have the adequate technical capacities to implement the SDGs and Agenda 2063 and share knowledge on lessons learned that are gender responsive from the implementation of the continental and global development	00110184	RBA Senior Economist Programme
	H01_OUTPUT_1.5	Output 1.5: RECs and member states have the adequate technical capacities to implement the SDGs and Agenda 2063 and share knowledge on lessons learned that are gender responsive from the implementation of the continental and global development	00094139	RBA Senior Economist Programme
	H01_OUTPUT_1.7	Output 1.7: IGAD has strengthened technical capacities to develop gender sensitive and inclusive early-warning systems on droughts floods and rangelands and pasture and develop strategic actions to address these issues	00093941	Energy and Climate Change
OUTCOME 2: Regional growth is inclusive, sustainable, with reduced economic inequalities, and characterized by structural transformation	H01_OUTPUT_2.1	Output 2.1: AUC RECs and member states are enabled to design implement monitor and coordinate delivery of social protection to those excluded or marginalized	00109198	Social Protection
	H01_OUTPUT_2.3	Output 2.3: RECs and the Africa Group of Negotiators (AGN) have strengthened technical capacities to promote the implementation of the Paris Agreement	00120245	Climate Finance Governance
	H01_OUTPUT_2.4	Output 2.4: The AUC the African Volunteer Corps and YouthConnekt Africa initiative have enhanced operational and technical capacities to increase youth participation in political and economic development initiatives	00111366	Youth Connekt
	H01_OUTPUT_2.5	Output 2.5: The African Union RECs and Member States have enhanced technical capacities to promote gender equality	0094361	Gender Project
OUTCOME 3: Regional institutions sustain peace and build resilience to crises and shocks	H01_OUTPUT_3.2	Output 3.2: Security actors and communities are able to reduce recruitment into violent extremism and support reintegration efforts of diverse returnees.	00113440	LCB Stabilization Phase 2
	H01_OUTPUT_3.2	Output 3.2: Security actors and communities are able to reduce recruitment into violent extremism and support reintegration efforts of diverse returnees.	00115736	LCB Stabilization Facility
	H01_OUTPUT_3.2	Output 3.2: Security actors and communities are able to reduce recruitment into violent extremism and support reintegration efforts of diverse returnees.	00099758	RESPONDING 2 VIOLENT EXTREMISM
	H01_OUTPUT_3.3	Output 3.3: The African Union Peace and Security Unit (PSU) and national and sub-national actors are enabled to establish vertical and horizontal partnerships with other critical actors to set-up and support peace infrastructures	00109194	Regional Cross-border KEN/ETH
NA	N/A	N/A	00120956	Regional RBA COVID-19 Response

OUTCOME 1, 2, & 3	N/A	N/A	00110187	Engagement and Initiations
	N/A	N/A	0091014	Support Oversight of the Regional Programme for Africa

Annex 2

List of documents to be reviewed

This would include but not limited to the following

- UNDP Strategic plan 2018-2021
- Strategic plan reports
- Regional Programme/project documents (including contribution agreements).
- Theory of change and results framework.
- Programme and project quality assurance reports.
- Annual workplans.
- Integrated work plans
- Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
- monitoring reports.
- Result oriented analysis reports
- Highlights of project board meetings.
- Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- Regional programme publications
- Report Oriented Analysis Report
- Integrated Work plans

Annex 3

Evaluation Matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub questions	Data sources	Data collection methods/tools	Indicators/success standards	Methods for data analysis

Annex 4

List of Key stakeholders and partners (to be filled by the Coordination Office)

PARTNER	INSTITUTION	CONTACT

Annex 5

Intervention Theory of Change (to be filled by the Coordination Office)

PROPOSED STANDARD TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable
1	Expertise of Firm / Organization	30%	300
2	Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan	40%	400
3	Management Structure and Key Personnel	30%	300
TOTAL		100%	1000
Technical Proposal Evaluation (FORM I)-			
Expertise of the Firm / Organization			Points Obtainable
1.1	Reputation of Organization and Staff / Credibility / Reliability / Industry Standing		50
1.2	General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation - Financial Stability - Loose consortium, Holding company or One firm - Age/size of the firm - Strength of the Project Management Support - Project Financing Capacity - Project Management Control		90
1.3	Extent to which any work would be subcontracted (subcontracting carries additional risks which may affect project implementation, but properly done it offers a chance to access specialized skills.)		15
1.4	Quality assurance procedure, warranty		25
1.5	Relevance of: - Specialized Knowledge - Experience on Similar Programme / Projects - Experience on Projects in the Region - Work for UNDP/ major multilateral/ or bilateral programmes		120
SUB TOTAL			300
Technical Proposal Evaluation (FORM II)- Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan			
2.1	To what degree does the Proposer understand the task?		30
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?		25
2.3	Are the different components of the project adequately weighted relative to one another?		20
2.4	Is the proposal based on a survey of the project environment and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposal?		55
2.5	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task?		65
2.6	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?		120
2.7	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?		85
SUB TOTAL			400
Technical Proposal Evaluation (FORM III)- Management Structure and Key Personnel			
3.1	Team Leader - General Qualification Suitability for the project		
	- International experience		25
	- Training experience		20
	- Professional experience in the area of specialization		45
	- Knowledge of region		30
	- Language qualification		20
SUB TOTAL			140
3.2	Team Members - General Qualification Suitability for the project		
	- International experience		20
	- Training experience		20
	- Professional experience in the area of specialization		55
	- Knowledge of the region		35
	- Language qualification		30
SUB TOTAL			160
Aggregate			1000