a. Background Information and Rationale, Project Description

The Project, Support to Peacebuilding and Normalization (SPAN) was envisioned to contribute towards sustaining the gains of the Government’s comprehensive peace process, and in ensuring peace and security in conflict-affected areas by a) accelerating the implementation of security and socioeconomic aspects of the Normalization Annex of the GPH-MILF Comprehensive Agreement on Bangsamoro (CAB), and b) strengthening the enabling environment for peace, recovery and development. By accelerating the achievement of results relative to the Normalization process, SPAN will help sustain confidence-building and stability on the ground, and help strengthen joint platforms for the transition process of the MILF towards self-governance through political rather than military means. By increasing capacities for conflict prevention and peacebuilding and responding to the critical needs of vulnerable sectors, SPAN will help establish conflict-sensitive and peace-promoting governance, and contribute to the achievement of a durable peace and sustainable recovery and development. In partnership with OPAPP, UNDP will implement SPAN through the National Acceleration Modality (NAM) initially over a period of one year. The Programme is implemented in areas covered by the Comprehensive Agreement on Bangsamoro (CAB) and the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM).

The SPAN Programme has the following components:

Component 1: Support to the Implementation of the Security Aspect of Normalization
Component 2: Support to the Implementation of the Socioeconomic Aspect of Normalization
Component 3: Strengthening the Enabling Environment for Peace, Recovery and Development
Component 4: Social Healing and Peacebuilding Programme for Marawi

Evaluations are critical for UNDP to progress towards advancing human development. Through the generation of evidence and objective information, evaluations enable UNDP to make informed decisions and plan strategically. This project terminal evaluation is intended to demonstrate the level of change in the project outputs indicators and the project’s contribution to outcome level changes, which are normally demonstrated as changes in the performance of institutions or behavior changes. It must also consider whether resources have been properly and judiciously harnessed towards implementation and delivery of stated outputs and the extent to which these outputs contributed to observed results achieved. The evaluation must also identify any operational issues that may be improved to facilitate better program implementation and delivery for similar programs in the future.

The evaluation will be used by all main parties (UNDP and partner government agency) to assess their approaches to development assistance and to design future interventions. It is expected to ensure accountability and to generate knowledge for wider use.

b. Specific Objectives

The evaluation will identify the level of achievement in project outputs and the contribution to results at the outcome level, including unintended positive and negative results. The evaluation also aims to identify the key lessons learned and best practices.

The evaluation will assess:
- The relevance of the project
- The effectiveness of the achievement of results at the output levels and the level of efficiency in the use of project resources
The usefulness and sustainability of the results for the project beneficiaries
UNDP’s performance as a development partner
UNDP’s added value to the expected results

**c. Scope**

Under the overall guidance of the Evaluation Reference Group, and reporting to the UNDP evaluation manager, the evaluator, shall assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the Support to Peacebuilding and Normalization (SPAN) Project by reviewing progress towards project results based on the project document and annual work plans. The evaluation will review the project’s theory of change vis-à-vis the project’s achievements and risks, and assess the project’s potential effects on the target groups. It will likewise highlight strengths, weaknesses/gaps, good practices, and provide forward looking recommendations for the design and implementation of future government financing projects.

The evaluation will also provide an analysis of the data generated from the client satisfaction surveys that were collected by partner CSOs. To the extent possible, the evaluation will assess the contributions of the project to the beneficiaries of the different programs such as WAVE Social Enterprise, WAVE Anti-Dispute Resolution and College Education Assistance Program (CEAP).

The conduct of the evaluation should be based on the following criteria and key guide questions and may employ the methodological approaches indicated in see Section D.

- **Relevance**
  a. Did the project design and choice of activities and deliverables properly reflect and respond to specifically identified needs of the government and of the beneficiaries? How were the needs determined and assessed?
  b. How valid is the Theory of Change? Were the planned and actual activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended outcomes?

- **Efficiency**
  a. To what extent was the project managed and delivered in a cost-effective way?
  b. How was the project managed in terms of timeliness?
  c. How did project risks influence the efficiency of project implementation? Were all major risks adequately identified before and during project implementation?
  d. How does COVID-19 pandemic affect the implementation of the project (timeline, deliverables, beneficiaries etc.)

- **Effectiveness**
  a. To what extent is the project successful in achieving results, both expected and unexpected?
  b. How effective was the project in building the capacities of partners and beneficiaries?
  c. To what extent has the use of UNDP systems accelerated the implementation of the project in the following areas: budgeting, procurement, HR augmentation, partnerships and CSO engagement, finance, and monitoring?
  d. To what extent has UNDP met standard integrity/accountability measures in the delivery of civil works, projects, goods and services?
  e. What are the innovative approaches or strategies that the project introduced?
  f. What value has UNDP added? Both expected and unexpected?
  g. Is the project reaching the intended beneficiaries, rights holders and duty bearers?
  h. To what extent has the project been effective in policy/systems influencing at the national and local level?
  i. Did the project build effective synergies with other existing initiatives?
  j. What are the results of the client satisfaction surveys carried out by partner CSOs?
k. To what extent does the project integrate gender equality, women’s empowerment, and human rights?

- **Sustainability**
  a. To what extent can project results be continued without the project’s further involvement?
  b. To what extent has OPAPP been capacitated to improve financial management and service delivery through the project?
  c. To what extent has the project built in resilience to future risks? (e.g. wastage, over-budgeted specs)
  d. What are the learnings and best practices?

d. **Approach and Methodology**

Methodological approaches should include some of the following approaches indicated below. To note that the project expects a modest evaluation:

- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia:
  - Project document (contribution agreement)
  - Theory of change and results framework
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports
  - Annual work plans
  - Activity designs
  - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports
  - Results-oriented monitoring report
  - Highlights of project board meetings
  - Technical/financial monitoring reports

- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners:
  - Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions 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.

- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
  - The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
  - Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
  - 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 evaluation must cover all 10 sites listed below. Activities for the study must be carried out using a combination of onsite and online modalities (6 locations for onsite and 4 locations for online).

**On-site (6 sites)**
Five (5) sites in Cotabato and BMFI in Cagayan de Oro are for on-site evaluations.

**On-line/Remote (4 sites)**
ECOWEB, MARADECA, 1 barangay beneficiary in Iligan/Marawi/CDO and IRDT.

**Locations for Evaluation:**

**a) Cotabato City – at least 3 days**
- OPAPP Cotabato (JPSC/Security Unit and TFDCC/Socioeconomic Unit) *(DOS, Maguindanao – approx. 30 mins away from Cotabato City; 5 mins away from Awang Airport)*
- JPST Operations Center *(based in the OPAPP Compound; DOS, Maguindanao – approx. 30 mins away from Cotabato City; 5 mins away from Awang Airport)*
- The Moropreneur (CSO) *(Cotabato City)*
- Independent Decommissioning Body (IDB) *(Cotabato City)*
- Camp Darapanan *(Simuay, Sultan Kudarat, Maguidanao approx. 30 mins away from Cotabato City)*

**b) CDO/Iligan City – at least 4 days**
- BMFI *(CDO)*
- ECOWEB *(Iligan)*
- MARADECA *(Marawi)*
- 1 Barangay Beneficiaries in Iligan/Marawi/CDO

**c) Zamboanga City – 1 day**
- IRDT

For the 6 locations where online evaluations will be done, the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. Remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). The contractor can work remotely with local evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, contractor or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

This should be detailed in the Proposal and Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

Consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

e. **Deliverables and Schedules/Expected Outputs**

The contractor is expected to deliver the outputs, according to a set schedule. The following is an indicative schedule and prospective Evaluators may propose an alternative delivery schedule. The total length of the contract shall ideally be three (3) months, with a tolerance of one (1) month depending on the value-added work to be proposed compared to the requirement. The total duration of the evaluation will be a minimum of 45 days spread over 3 months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables/Outputs</th>
<th>Estimated Duration to Complete</th>
<th>Target Due Dates</th>
<th>Review and Approvals Required</th>
<th>Designated person who will review and accept the output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report with attachments/annexes</td>
<td>Draft within one (1) week from the start of the contract</td>
<td>3 September 2021</td>
<td>To be presented to and commented on by ERG</td>
<td>OIC of Project SPAN and/or Team Leader, Peace Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised, with matrix of key inputs from Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) with feedback</td>
<td>Revised within one (1) week from presentation to ERG</td>
<td>10 September 2021</td>
<td>Approval: Evaluation Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings</td>
<td>Within seven (7) weeks from the start of the contract</td>
<td>15 Oct 2021</td>
<td>To be presented to and commented on by ERG</td>
<td>OIC of Project SPAN and/or Team Leader, Peace Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Within eight (8) weeks from the start of the contract</td>
<td>22 Oct 2021</td>
<td>To be presented to and commented on by ERG</td>
<td>OIC of Project SPAN and/or Team Leader, Peace Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A matrix of key inputs from the ERG with feedback</td>
<td>Within one (1) week from presentation to ERG</td>
<td>05 November 2021</td>
<td>Approval: Evaluation Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report and evaluation audit trail</td>
<td>Refinement of the final draft with matrix of key inputs from the ERG with feedback</td>
<td>Within eleven (11) weeks from start of the contract</td>
<td>12 November 2021</td>
<td>Approval: Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** 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 or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Presentation of preliminary findings.** Immediately following an evaluation, the evaluator will present preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report.** The programme unit 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.

- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be submitted by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.

- **Final evaluation report.**

- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** or participation in knowledge-sharing events

f. **Key Performance Indicators and Service Level**

The evaluation will review the project’s theory of change vis-à-vis the project’s achievements and risks, and assess the project’s potential effects on the target groups. It will likewise highlight strengths, weaknesses/gaps, good practices, and provide forward looking recommendations for the design and implementation of future government financing projects.

The evaluation will also provide an analysis of the data generated from the client satisfaction surveys that were collected by partner CSOs. To the extent possible, the evaluation will assess the contributions of the project to the beneficiaries of the different programs such as WAVE Social Enterprise, WAVE Anti-Dispute Resolution and College Education Assistance Program (CEAP).

The Firm is expected to:

a) Proactively communicate all updates to the UNDP Peace Programme Analyst on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. Meetings and weekly reports will be discussed at the inception meeting;

b) Update any issues, challenges to the UNDP Peace Programme Analyst real time, especially those that may affect timelines;

c) Inform the UNDP Peace Programme Analyst and/or Programme Assistant a month prior to contract expiry for any extension requests via a formal letter.

g. **Governance and Accountability**

The contractor will be supervised by the Peace Programme Analyst and the UNDP Results Based Management Analyst. Both will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Team pertaining to required technical and financial documents, coordinating with stakeholders, setting up interviews, arranging field visits, and looking after the evaluation budget and schedule. They shall likewise assist in distribution of draft reports to stakeholders for their review, consolidation of comments, and in organizing key stakeholders’ meetings for presentation of the salient points of the draft/final reports.

The UNDP RBM Analyst will brief the Evaluation Team on UNDP evaluation norms and standards, reviewing and quality assuring the inception/draft/final reports, and in publishing findings and management responses at the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center.

The Evaluation contractor will be responsible for implementing all evaluation-related activities and in producing the evaluation products listed in the deliverables section of this TOR. While the Project SPAN Team will provide the information required and support in coordinating with stakeholders, the Evaluator will have to manage its own schedule and logistical arrangements in the conduct of interviews and site visits.
h. **Facilities to be provided by UNDP**

The UNDP Project SPAN Team focals will provide project related documents and assist in providing the names and contact numbers of key informants or organizations. They will also provide support in coordinating with the project stakeholders.

i. **Expected duration of the contract/assignment**

The evaluators will be hired for an indicative period of three (3) months, beginning August 2021, in accordance with the timetable set forth in Section E above.

j. **Duty Station**

Majority of the work shall be done remotely. Given the current situation in the country, UNDP supports implementation of remote or virtual meetings. Please refer to D. Approach and Methodology for online vs onsite work requirement).

If allowed by IATF and local government community quarantine protocol, the Firm’s key personnel may be asked to report physically to UNDP as agreed during the inception report, and when physical participation, such as consultations with stakeholders and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) meetings, will be necessary. A list of stakeholder with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the project team.

k. **Selection of the Contractor, Professional Qualifications, and Key Personnel**

The Firm shall make available at the very minimum, a Project Lead, who shall serve as main representative and liaison of the Firm with UNDP, and at least 1 or 2 key personnel.

   a) **Expertise of the Firm**

   - At least 5 years’ experience in producing high quality research outputs for government and international organizations, including on peacebuilding and development programs in the Bangsamoro region
   - At least (3) years’ recent experience in conducting quantitative and qualitative research and/or monitoring and evaluation assessments across multiple geographic locations in Mindanao, including the Bangsamoro region
   - At least 3 years’ experience in research work relative to joint, multi-dimensional programmes between the Philippine government and international development organizations

   b) **Key Personnel**

   - A team of at least two (2) members, with an assigned Team Leader or Project Lead who shall serve as main representative and liaison of the Firm or team of experts. Both key personnel should have experience in monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects. Knowledge about the Bangsamoro peace and development context is an advantage
Team Leader/M&E Specialist:
• At least a Master’s Degree in economics, political science, social science, public administration, business management, or other relevant fields. A higher degree as well as specialized training in M&E, project management, etc. are advantageous;
• At least five (5) years of work or consultancy experience in the monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects, with preference to those with demonstrated specialization / experience in evaluations, and those with work experience in the government or international organizations;
• A portfolio of at least three (3) published and/or unpublished research work in relevant policy/program areas and/or research output from consultancy projects in the last three (3) years. Research works may include applied research studies, e.g. evaluation, action research, policy papers, etc. At least one (1) of these should be an evaluation;
• At least 3 years’ experience in the application of various quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, with demonstrated specialization in either quantitative or qualitative research, or both;
• At least five (5) years’ experience in project/team leadership and management.

Peacebuilding Specialist:
• At least a Bachelor’s Degree in economics, political science, social science, international development, conflict studies, law or public administration, or other relevant fields
• At least five (5) years of peacebuilding and development work in Mindanao/Bangsamoro region particularly in the following areas of engagement or practice: conflict prevention and peacebuilding; community-based peacebuilding; emergency response; early recovery and post-conflict/post-disaster community rebuilding/recovery, and women, peace, and security
• At least five (5) years’ experience in conducting programming or research in the Bangsamoro region related to the Bangsamoro peace process (e.g., CAB, BOL, transition, etc.) or other thematic areas as indicated above
• At least (2) published and/or unpublished research work in relevant policy/program areas and/or research outputs from consultancy projects in the last two (2) years. Research works may include applied research studies, e.g. evaluation, action research, policy papers, etc.

I. Scope of Price and Schedule of Payments

While the Project SPAN Team will provide the information required and support in coordinating with stakeholders, the Evaluators will have to manage their own schedule and logistical arrangements in the conduct of interviews and/or site visits (whether these are virtual or face-to-face).

1. Base per-day costs and total cost (i.e., multiplied by the proposed level of effort of personnel based on the technical proposal) shall be indicated in the financial proposal.
2. The following components should be included, as a minimum, in the financial proposal:
   a. Professional fees/salaries/honoraria of the evaluation team
   b. Other professional fees and salaries
   c. Travel, lodging, and allowances for field work (if any under “Other costs”)
   d. Communication, workshops, meetings
   e. Materials, reproduction, subscriptions
   f. Management and operational costs (including health insurance, swab tests, etc)
   g. Others as may be relevant to the scope of work.

Thus, the financial proposal should be an all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs to include professional fees and related logistical expenditures.
The selected Firm shall receive payments based on the schedule below and the milestones indicated in Part E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment Schedule</th>
<th>Percentage of Contract Amount</th>
<th>Payment Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} payment</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Upon submission and acceptance of inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} payment</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Upon presentation of mission evaluation highlights and submission and acceptance of presentation materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} payment</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Upon submission and acceptance of draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} and final payment</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Upon submission and acceptance of final evaluation report and other related documents; and Presentation to stakeholders and/or evaluation reference group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

m. Criteria for Evaluation

1. The selection process will follow a Combined Scoring Method, using the 70\%-30\% distribution for technical and financial proposals, respectively.

2. The minimum passing score of the technical proposal shall be 70\%. Technical proposals will be evaluated based on the following major criteria, as shown in the tables below, with total obtainable points of 1,000. Only firms that obtain a minimum technical score of 70 points will be included in the financial evaluation.

3. All proposers will be evaluated based on the Firm’s complete submission of requirements, eligibility (list of requirements are posted in the solicitation document) and following the technical criteria below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Proposal Evaluation</th>
<th>Points Obtainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bidder’s qualification, capacity and experience / Expertise of the Firm</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management Structure and Key Personnel</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1. Expertise of the firm</th>
<th>Points Obtainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 At least 5 years’ experience producing high quality research outputs for government and international organizations,</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including on peacebuilding and development programs in the Bangsamoro region

5 years = 77 points; additional points for more than 5 years, up to a maximum of 110 points

1.2. At least 3 years’ recent experience in conducting quantitative and qualitative research and/or monitoring and evaluation assessments across multiple geographic locations in Mindanao, including the Bangsamoro region

3 years = 77 points; additional points for more than 3 years, up to a maximum of 110 points

1.3 At least 3 years’ experience in research work relative to joint, multi-dimensional programmes between the Philippine government and international development organizations

3 years = 56 points; additional points for more than 3 years, up to a maximum of 80 points

Total Section 1 300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2. Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan</th>
<th>Points obtainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Description of the Offeror’s approach and methodology for meeting or exceeding the requirements of the Terms of Reference</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Details on how the different service elements shall be organized, controlled and delivered</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Section 2 350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 3. Management Structure and Key Personnel</th>
<th>Points obtainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Composition and structure of the team proposed. Are the proposed roles of the management and the team of key personnel suitable for the provision of the necessary services?</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Qualifications of key personnel proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 a TEAM LEADER/M&amp;E Specialist</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least a Master’s Degree in economics, political science, social science, public administration, business management, or other relevant fields. A higher degree as well as specialized training in M&E, project management, etc. are advantageous;

Master’s Degree = 14 points; additional 6 points for additional degree up to a maximum of 20 points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2 b</th>
<th><strong>Peacebuilding Specialist</strong></th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least a Bachelor’s Degree in economics, political science, social science, international development, conflict studies, law or public administration, or other relevant fields</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>At least five (5) years of peacebuilding and development work in Mindanao/Bangsamoro region particularly in the following areas of engagement or practice: conflict prevention and peacebuilding; community-based peacebuilding; emergency response; early recovery and post-conflict/post-disaster community rebuilding/recovery, and women, peace, and security. 5 years = 28 points; additional points for more than 5 years up to 40 pts.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>At least five (5) years’ experience in conducting programming or research in the Bangsamoro region related to the Bangsamoro peace process (e.g., CAB, BOL, transition, etc.) or other thematic areas as indicated above. 5 years = 21 points; additional points more than 5 years up to a maximum of 30 pts.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>At least (2) published and/or unpublished work in relevant policy/program areas and/or research outputs from consultancy projects in the last two (2) years. Research works may include applied research studies, e.g. evaluation, action research, policy papers, etc. At least 2 policy/research outputs within the last 2 years = 14 points; more than 2 works in the last 2 years = additional points up to 20 pts.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Section 3 350**

4. In the combined scoring, the Financial Proposal will be computed as a ratio of the Proposal’s offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.

**n. Additional References or Resources**

SPAN Project to provide the ff:
- Project results framework and theory of change
- Documents to be consulted. A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report.