



TERMS OF REFERENCE

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Reference No. | PN/FJI/59/21 |
| Location | Home-based |
| Application deadline | 30 July 2021 (NY Time) |
| Type of Contract | Individual Contractor |
| Title of Consultancy | Team Leader – Senior Evaluator |
| Post Level | International Consultant |
| Languages required: | English |
| Duration of Initial Contract: | 3 months |

BACKGROUND

The UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022¹ directs the programmes and operations of 29 UN Agencies that form the UNCT, to support internationally agreed Priority Areas, including the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in the Pacific region (2015 GA res. 69/318). The United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022 outlines the collective response of the UN system to development priorities in 14 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs), namely Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu. The UNPS supports these 14 Governments and Peoples in the Pacific to advance a localized response to the global 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The 14 PICTs covered by the UNPS have a total population of 2.5 million people² in an area that encompasses 15 per cent of the earth's surface. There are key differences in geography, size, history, culture, economies, and political systems across the region. Fiji is the most populous country with approximately 900,000 residents and Tokelau is the smallest with approximately 1,000. Wide ranging economic, social, environmental, and political challenges present threats to the region's development, including the achievement of the SDGs. Four countries in the Pacific are among the top 15 at highest risk of disaster, with Vanuatu and Tonga as the first and second at greatest risk among 181 countries ranked³. Human Development ranges widely in the Pacific with Solomon Islands ranking 151st and Palau ranking 50th among 189 countries⁴. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the Pacific is amongst the lowest in the world, ranging from US\$5,496 million in Fiji to US\$47 million in Tuvalu⁵.

The UNPS Results Framework captures the strategic focus of the UNPS 2018-2022 with six outcomes that address priority issues and development challenges across the Pacific sub-region including special measures to address gender inequality, the empowerment of women, human rights, climate change,

¹ UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022 available at <https://unsdg.un.org/download/1740/16580>

² 2020 UN Population estimates are available on <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/DataQuery/>

³ 2020 World Risk Report available at <https://weltrisikobericht.de/english/>

⁴ 2020 UNDP Human Development Report available at <http://hdr.undp.org/>

⁵ 2019 World Bank available at <http://data.worldbank.org>

and the importance of building resilience and capacity for disaster risk management. These outcomes collectively contribute both to the achievement of results within national development frameworks and towards the SDGs.

The primary purpose of the UNPS evaluation is to **promote greater learning and operational improvement**. Overall, the evaluation has both learning and accountability purposes. The evaluation will provide important information for strengthening programming and results at the sub-regional level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next Cooperation Framework (CF) programme cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the sub-regional level. The UNCT, host governments and other CF stakeholders can learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned, which can then be shared with DCO and used for the benefit of other countries

The objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To assess the contribution of the UNPS to Pacific sub-region development results through evidence-based judgements using evaluative approaches
2. To identify the factors that have affected the UNPS's contribution, investigating why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks.
3. To provide actionable recommendations for improving the UNPS's contribution, especially for incorporation into the new CF programming cycle. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and findings of the evaluation and should draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation.

UNRCO is therefore seeking for a qualified Team Leader-Senior Evaluator, to lead a team of 2 other evaluation members/consultants. The team leader will be the primary focal point for delivery of key evaluation products and will be accountable for managing the work of the other two evaluators and deliver the milestone deliverables (inception report and draft/final report).

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Scope of Work

This evaluation will cover all programme based contributions of UNCT to the six UNPS outcomes. The UNPS evaluation covers all initiatives during the 2018 – 2022 cycle until the evaluation starts in 2021, and in all 14 PICTs of the UNPS. The timeframe of the UN Pacific roadmap towards a new UNSDCF requires the evidence from this evaluation to inform the Strategic Prioritization step starting in October 2021.

The primary users of the evaluation results will be the UNCT. Secondary users include host governments, donors, development partners, DCO, and UNCTs of other countries and sub-regions.

Criteria and Questions

The criteria against which the UNPS will be assessed are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and coherence. The evaluation will answer the following questions to achieve its objectives and taking the respective criteria into account:

| Criteria | Evaluation questions |
|----------|----------------------|
|----------|----------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| Relevance IS THE UNPS DOING THE RIGHT THINGS? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are the UNPS objectives aligned and been consistent with the needs, priorities, and policies of the PICT governments (including alignment to national development goals and targets, national plans, strategies and frameworks). How dynamic and responsive has the UNPS been to emerging and unforeseen needs, especially those of the most vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalized groups? To what extent has the UNPS implementation taken on the findings and addressed recommendations of the 2019 Multi-Country Office Review? |
| Effectiveness HAS THE UNPS ACHIEVED ITS OBJECTIVES? IS THE UNPS DOING IT RIGHT? | Cooperation Framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the UNPS contributed effectively to provide greater clarity and transparency of results achieved and resources used? UN System Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What have been the benefits for the people and institutions targeted by the interventions, including the most vulnerable, disadvantaged, and marginalized population? |
| Efficiency HOW WELL HAVE RESOURCES BEING USED? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does UNPS internal coordination reduce transaction costs and create efficiencies for UNCT members implementing the UNPS? |
| Sustainability WILL THE BENEFITS LAST? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What mechanisms, if any, has the UNPS planned for - and UNCT established - to ensure socio-political, institutional, financial and environmental sustainability? |
| Coherence HOW WELL DOES THE UNPS FIT? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the UNPS implementation fostered coherence, through the promotion of synergies, interlinkages between its interventions, partnerships, external relations, and through its governance structures? |

The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, upon agreement between the evaluation manager and the evaluator as reflected in the inception report.

Approach and Methodology

The UNPS evaluation is not expected to conduct a complete analysis of individual programmes, project or activities of UNCT members but rather build on each agency's programme and project reviews, assessments, and other evaluative evidence. Where a paucity of data necessitates a quick assessment of a contribution, this should be carried out using appropriate methodologies that identify contributions at the outcome level. A causal analysis between activities and outcomes is not in scope of this evaluation.

Data generated in this evaluation should be to the extent possible disaggregated by sex, age, and geographic region. Disaggregation by ethnicity, disability, migratory status and other contextually relevant markers of equity would be valuable.

The evaluation should use methodological triangulation that involves multiple data sources, methods, and quantitative and qualitative analytical approaches. The evaluation questions (outlined above) must be used to develop the approach and methodology, which will in turn determine the data collection strategies, instruments, sampling strategy, and the analysis plan. The UNPS 2018-2022 strategy and the

PICTs' development plans will be the frameworks used to draw conclusions from findings of the evaluation.

Expected Outputs and Deliverables

| ACTIVITIES | DELIVERABLES | TIME ESTIMATE (from start of contract) | PAYMENT SCHEDULE |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. INCEPTION | | | |
| a. Desk review of relevant program documents, reports, and secondary data; Stakeholder analysis; | Summary of desk review findings; List of sources; | Week 1-2 | 25% (1 st tranche) |
| b. Prepare inception report (incl. desk review, methodology, work-plan, data collection tools), in accordance with UNEG quality guidelines; | Draft inception report | Week 3 | |
| c. Review and comments on draft inception report by EM, SC, and UNEDAP | Inception Report Comments Matrix | Week 4 | |
| d. Finalize inception report; | Final inception report ⁶ | Week 5 | |
| 2. DATA COLLECTION AND VALIDATION | | | |
| a. Data collection, field work, analysis of data; | | Week 6-7 | 25% (2 nd tranche) |
| b. Workshop to validate data collection results and preliminary findings; | PowerPoint presentation, meeting minutes | Week 8 | |
| 3. REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS | | | |
| a. Processing and analysis of the collected data, and drafting of the interim report; | 1 st draft report; | Week 9 | 25% (3 rd tranche) |
| b. Review and comments on draft report by EM, SC, and UNEDAP; | Evaluation Comments matrix | Week 10 | |
| c. Prepare and submit second draft of evaluation report addressing issues in comments matrix; | 2 nd draft report; | Weeks 11 | |
| d. Review and comments by UNCT; | 2 nd Evaluation Comments matrix | Week 12 | |
| e. Submit and present final report; | Final report ⁷ | Week 13 | 25% (4 th tranche) |

⁶ Max 15-20 page/8,000 words, excluding annex;

⁷ Maximum 45 pages/30,000 words, excluding annexes and executive summary (maximum 5 pages)

Institutional Arrangement

- The evaluation team will operate under the supervision of an Evaluation Manager (EM), who will oversee the entire process of the evaluation, from its preparation to the dissemination and use of the final report. The EM coordinates comments on, quality assures and approves the deliverables of the evaluators, aligns the assessment process with the UNEG norms and standards, code of conduct and ethical guidelines for evaluations as well as guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality in evidence generation. The EM will monitor and report any attempts to compromise the independence of the team of evaluators during the evaluation process. The EM clears the payment to the evaluators once any outstanding issues have been addressed satisfactorily.
- The EM is supported by the Steering Committee (SC), who in close coordination with UNCT, is to approve the selection of the evaluators and all key deliverables. The SC facilitates stakeholder identification and consultations, access to national information and data sets. In collaboration with the EM, the SC organizes the findings workshop following the data collection, and ensures the final report and its results are disseminated and shared with DCO and other key stakeholders, promoting the use of evidence and lessons.
- The UN Evaluation Development Group for Asia Pacific (UNEDAP), including DCO Evaluation Adviser, will serve as technical reference group for additional level of quality control of the evaluation products.
- The evaluation will inform the planning and decision-making for the next CF programme cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the sub-regional level. The evaluation report will be shared with UNCT, host governments and other CF stakeholders to learn from the good practices and lessons learned. The evaluation results will be disseminated to relevant stakeholders in line with the accountability purpose of the work. The report will also be shared with DCO and used for the benefit of other countries.

Risks and limitations

There are several risks for the UNPS which are envisaged. Foremost is the evolving COVID-19 pandemic and response, and the restrictions that go along with it. With the current limitations in movement, travel, meetings, face-to-face interviews or site visits are not possible in many countries in the Pacific. The urgency and severity of the pandemic within this constrained context also means many of the stakeholders and potential users of the evaluation will have as their principle responsibility the response to the pandemic and its effects. This in turn means conducting primary data collection, even using remote methods, runs the risk of low response rates, if at all possible.

The UNPS 2018-2022 does not have a documented Theory of Change. This in itself limits the options for evaluation of change effected by the UNPS. The UNPS does have a Logical Framework, however, it is only “an outcome level document whereby results of outputs and activities attributable to individual agencies or joint work plans contribute to the attainment of the Outcomes”, and there are no results chain or consolidated logic model to show the link between causes and effects. Without theoretical counterfactuals, the questions that are reliably answerable, particularly in the domain of effectiveness and impact, are limited.

The UNPS Results Framework includes 40 indicators for monitoring its outcomes, including baselines and targets. In the 2018 UN Pacific Annual Report, most of the results against these indicators are missing. In the 2020 UN Pacific Annual Report, the results are not reported specifically against the target indicators, rather a case study approach is taken on the topic of the outcomes.

A typical UNDAF evaluation is estimated to require 9 to 10 months according to UNEG. The UNPS evaluation encompasses two sub-regions and 14 countries, and the timeframe for the evaluations allows 3 months from start to finish. Therefore, significant trade-offs need to be made to the scope of the evaluation in order to maintain a level of quality of evidence resulting from it. The inception report to be produced should outline these tradeoffs for the consideration of the UNCT.

Duration of the Work

The work is expected for a duration of 3 months from 10th August -10th November 2021. The team leader will be expected to work for 50 days during this period.

Duty Station

- The consultancy will be homebased assignment. No travel is foreseen due to Covid19 travel restrictions and challenges.

COMPETENCIES

- Strong interpersonal and communication skills;
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities skills;
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
- Ability to plan, organize, implement and report on work;
- Ability to work under pressure and tight deadlines;
- Proficiency in the use of office IT applications and internet in conducting research;
- Outstanding communication, project management and organizational skills;
- Excellent presentation and facilitation skills.
- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards;
- Positive, constructive attitude to work;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**Educational Qualifications:**

- Minimum post graduate university degree in social science, economics or related field.

Experience

- A minimum of 15 years of professional experience, including in international development
- Extensive knowledge of and minimum of 10 years of experience in research and/or evaluation of complex programmes and themes
- Proven track record in writing reports
- Strong understanding and knowledge of development issues, particularly the SDGs, in the Pacific, and an in-depth understanding of at least one area of work of UNCT members; collectively, Evaluation Team members should broadly cover all areas of UNCT initiatives
- Facilitation skills is highly desirable with experience in leading multi-stakeholder discussions
- Shown ability to lead a team of evaluators
- Excellent oral and written communication skills in English
- Knowledge of the UN system and the SDG and their role in development cooperation in the context of the Pacific

- Understanding of the UN Reform and its implementation implication at the country level

Others

- An absence of conflicts of interest (never employed by UNCT members or implementing partners, nor expected to be employed in the near future, no personal relationships with any UNCT members).

Language requirements

- Fluency of English language is required;

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

- Deliverable 1 - Final inception report: 25% of total contract amount
- Deliverable 2 – Data Collection and Validation (PowerPoint presentation, meeting minutes) : 25% of total contract amount
- Deliverable 3 - Reporting and Dissemination of Results (First draft report): 25% of total contract amount
- Deliverable 4 – Reporting and Dissemination of Results (Submit and present final report); 25% of total contract amount

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Evaluation Method and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%). and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 70 points)

- Relevance of Education – Minimum post graduate university degree in social science, economics or related field (10 points)
- A minimum of 15 years of professional experience, including in international development (10 points)
- Extensive knowledge of and minimum of 10 years of experience in research and/or evaluation of complex programmes and themes, including leading a team of evaluators (15 points)

- Strong understanding and knowledge of development issues, particularly the SDGs, in the Pacific, and an in-depth understanding of at least one area of work of UNCT members; collectively, Evaluation Team members should broadly cover all areas of UNCT initiatives (5 points)
- Facilitation skills is highly desirable with experience in leading multi-stakeholder discussions initiatives (5 points)
- Knowledge of the UN system and the SDG and their role in development cooperation in the context of the Pacific (5 points)
- Understanding of the UN Reform and its implementation implication at the country level (5 points)
- Proposed methodology and approach to the present evaluation of the UNPS, including methods to manage/mitigate any risks/constraints (15)

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Shortlisted candidates may be called for an interview which will be used to confirm and/or adjust the technical scores awarded based on documentation submitted.

Documentation required

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document and submit via UNDP Jobsite.

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II.
- **Personal CV**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- **Technical proposal**, including a) a brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment; and b) a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- **Financial proposal**, as per template provided in Annex II.

Note: Successful individual will be required to provide proof of medical insurance coverage before commencement of contract for the duration of the assignment.

Incomplete and joint proposals may not be considered. Consultants with whom there is further interest will be contacted. The successful consultant shall opt to sign an Individual Contract or a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) through its company/employer with UNDP.

Annexes

- Annex I - [Individual IC General Terms and Conditions](#)
- Annex II – [Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual IC, including Financial Proposal Template](#)

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to Mr. Ronald Kumar on procurement.fj@undp.org.