



TERMS OF REFERENCE

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reference No. | PN/FJI/060/22 |
| Location | Home-based plus at least one or two mission to Suva |
| Application deadline | 31 May 2022 |
| Type of Contract | Individual Contractor |
| Post Level | International Consultant – Mid Term Evaluation |
| Languages required: | English |
| Duration of Initial Contract: | 80 days over a time period of 28 weeks and shall not exceed 8 months date of recruitment |

BACKGROUND

The Governance for Resilient Development in the Pacific (Gov4Res) project aims to increase climate change and disaster resilience in Pacific Island Countries (PICs) through strengthening Pacific led risk- informed development. The project works with Pacific national and local governments and Pacific communities, as well as regional organisations, to strengthen decision-making processes and governance systems towards resilient development. There is a strong emphasis on the integration of gender equality and social inclusion principles and practice into risk-informed development. The project has three end of program outcomes:

Outcome 1: Government planning and financing systems enable gender-sensitive and inclusive risk- informed development.

Outcome 2: Country oversight and accountability systems require gender- sensitive and inclusive risk-informed development.

Outcome 3: Regional organisations, policies and practices are actively supporting gender-sensitive and inclusive risk-informed development.

The project builds on a pilot project (the Pacific Risk Resilience Project, (PRRP) 2012 – 2019), which was funded by the Australian government through Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). The pilot project demonstrated the value of a risk- informed development approach in the Pacific context and the value of work through and with Pacific governments and communities to tailor risk- informed development in ways that are specific to country and local context. It also demonstrated the value of working flexibly, taking opportunities in different locations to influence development processes through a wide variety of strategies. Significantly, it demonstrated the value of supporting Pacific-led development.

Gov4Res has continued to advance a focus on risk-informed development based on the learning and achievements from PRRP. It has expanded to include work with regional organisations, recognising the unique interconnection between regional and national systems in the Pacific. It has given increased attention to Pacific government systems in particular national systems of planning, budgeting, and project implementation, recognising that sustainable change requires that these national systems are themselves risk-informed (rather than establishing parallel systems).

Gov4Res has a particular focus on social inclusion, utilising the perspectives of all groups to inform the definition of risk, and to support processes of risk assessment and management. At present, the project supports work in Fiji, Kiribati, Republic of Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Samoa, Tuvalu and Vanuatu, as well as engaging with regional organisations and regional processes.

The project is implemented by UNDP and supported by the governments of Australia, Korea, New Zealand, Sweden, and more recently the United Kingdom. The various donor partners contribute different levels of support over varying timeframes. The overall value of the project is US\$19 million commenced in 2020, following an inception phase in 2019, and was due for completion in 2024. With the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the project was approved for extension to 2025. In recent months, with revised project scope and directions, the project has been further extended to 2029.

In terms of delivery, the project has a team based at UNDP in Fiji that includes project management and technical specialists. This team is complemented with staff embedded in government and other offices in various Pacific Island countries. It is also supported by a range of short-term technical specialists or advisors on contract. It collaborates with other relevant UNDP programs including an Asia-Pacific Climate Finance Network, bilateral agriculture and disaster management projects, an internal Accelerator Lab, and an Effective Governance programme, and also with other regional and national partner organisations such as Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the Commonwealth Local Government Forum and the Pacific Community. Under the support received from DFAT it is part of a wider program, the Australia Pacific Climate Partnership, which provides particular opportunities for collaboration with other Australian funded programs. The project is overseen and receives strategic guidance by a Board consisting of project donors, and representatives from Pacific Island governments (i.e., countries where the project is being implemented) and the UNDP Pacific Office.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SCOPE OF WORK

The objective for this MTE is to examine the progress of Gov4Res against its original intentions, identify areas for improvement and given the changing governance context, identify new opportunities, recommend changes to update the project plan and approach.

The MTE will assess the following:

1. Relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of project
2. Risks to sustainability
3. Extent to which gender equality and social inclusion and human rights aspects have been considered
4. Project structure
5. Monitoring and evaluation approaches of the project

Evaluation Approach and Methodology

Gov4Res utilises a wide range of strategies and pathways to achieve change. It considers both technical and 'political' motivations and influences. It seeks to engage respectfully and effectively in different cultures and contexts, responding to the needs of the countries it works with. It deliberately works across various entry points in countries in order to maximise the likelihood of positive change and invests in systems (i.e., structures and processes) to ensure long-term adoption and sustainability. In several areas of work it seeks to influence others such as regional organisations and interactions between different national actors, working from behind and empowering others, rather than leading on all activities. It has a focus on working in agile and flexible ways, learning from experience and changing strategies as required.

While its original theory of change presents a concise summary of its core assumptions, in practice Gov4Res understands the change it is seeking to achieve is complex and that the connection between all these activities and outcomes is multifaceted, complex and dynamic. Consequently, it is anticipated that the MTE approach should be based in a **critical epistemology**, able to engage effectively with a non-linear systems-based project approach.

Gov4Res recognises that its various stakeholders have overlapping and different views about what changes are important. The donor partners have clear but different strategies and outcomes they wish to achieve. Pacific government partners, Pacific people and communities and regional organisations all have their views on the prioritisation and significance of the changes that might be achieved through the project. The MTE needs to be **gender-sensitive and socially inclusive**, able to accommodate and give attention to assessment from these various different worldviews.

The MTE approach will accommodate and identify differences in assessment, values, and understanding of impact for stakeholders, and provide methodological approaches that **create dialogue and exchange between stakeholders** and their different perspectives. The approach should be sensitive to Pacific Island approaches, and **respectful of the knowledge of Pacific Islanders**.

Methodology

Specific data collection, analysis and engagement techniques will be agreed as part of the evaluation plan prior to commencement of the MTE. However, it is anticipated that the evaluation team will demonstrate considerable **skill in analysis and sense making that is inclusive** of project stakeholders and provides opportunities for women, marginalised groups and Pacific country stakeholders to engage with and assist in data analysis and recommendation development. The methodologies proposed by the evaluation team should also support and **facilitate active dialogue between stakeholders and their different perspectives**.

Gov4Res has an established Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MELF) based on its original project theory of change. It has a comprehensive data management system which includes evidence against outcomes and outputs and the project reports regularly against its outputs and outcomes to its various donors and oversight Board. As noted, the original theory of change has clearly defined pathways and strategies for change and evidence has been

collected against these pathways. In preparation for this evaluation the project has undertaken an extensive audit of existing information and evidence in each of its country locations and its regional work. These country and regional briefs, annotated against the existing evidence, will be provided to the MTE team in order to assist the team to efficiently understand the scope and variety of work by the project to date. While some verification of these briefs will be required, this extensive preparation will enable the MTE team to **focus its data collection and analysis on areas which are outside of the present project MELF**, identifying new information and insight for the project stakeholders.

It is expected that the MTE will make use of this existing evidence base and develop additional methodologies for data collection, analysis and examination that complement rather than duplicate the existing information. The team will be expected to have **extensive expertise in qualitative and quantitative methodologies** including, as indicated, the capacity to use data collection, analysis and engagement techniques that are **appropriate to different stakeholders**.

The team should be familiar with **Pacific approaches to evaluation**. Ideally the evaluation team will bring expertise in **feminist and/or indigenous methodologies** and/or other methodologies drawn from critical evaluation approaches, alongside experience in traditional methodologies (ie. interviews, surveys, observation, focus groups etc).

DETAILED SCOPE OF MTE

The MTE team will assess the following categories of project progress:

1. Relevance

The MTE will assess the ongoing relevance of Gov4Res, given the changing context since project commencement. This will require examination of the initial project analysis and strategy development, how adequately this has been updated in response to changing context, wider examination of key contextual influences (both enabling and disabling), and how adequately the project has responded to or is positioning to respond to these conditions.

The relevance of Gov4Res should be considered from the perspective of different stakeholders including partner governments and Pacific Island communities, civil society organisations, and private sector. The projects coherence with other interventions, especially those of the donor partners, regional organisations and UNDP should also be reviewed.

The MTE will recommend options to support ongoing project relevance and coherence, giving due attention to these different perspectives. To assess relevance and coherence, the following should be considered (but should not limit the evaluation):

- How well does the project and its outcomes align with the priorities of local government and local communities in the focal PICs?
- How well does the project and its outcomes align with PIC's National Government development priorities and with regional development priorities?
- How well does the project align with national and regional gender equality and other social protection commitments?

- Does the project objective fit UNDP Pacific strategic priorities?
- How well does the project align with similar interventions in the region, especially those supported by its donor partners?
- In what ways has the project responded and adapted to maintain relevance and coherence for all stakeholders?

2. Effectiveness

The MTE will verify project effectiveness utilising available information (see discussion around methodology below), together with additional evidence collected as required. The MTE will consider in particular, how effectively the Gov4Res project has progressed against its original outcomes and outputs as outlined in the original project theory of change. As required, the MTE will examine core assumptions under the original theory of change and test how well these have held throughout project implementation to date. The MTE will recommend options for further development and maturing of the project theory of change that will support increased project effectiveness.

To assess effectiveness, the following should be considered (but should not limit the evaluation):

- What have been the key results and changes achieved by the project to date?
- To what extent will the project meet its original outcomes within the current program phase? Do these remain practical and feasible?
- Do the project assumptions and project theory of change continue to address the key factors which are likely to enable or challenge the progress of this project?
- Has the project been able to respond effectively to new emerging opportunities?
- In what ways should the project theory of change be further developed, given progress to date and changes in project context?
- What implications do recommended changes to the project theory of change have for project strategies, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting?

3. Efficiency

Gov4Res operates through a range of strategies and pathways to achieve change. The MTE is an opportunity to review the efficiency of the major project strategies. That is, given the resources available, which of these strategies most efficiently contributes to project implementation? In particular the MTE will examine the value being achieved from the following strategies:

- “From within” approach of embedding focal points within government
- Agile/adaptive programming
- Demonstration of risk-informed development through community infrastructure and development program
- Regional policy support and research to achieve scale
- Portfolio approach of interventions, that integrate across difference governance levels
- The MTE will recommend options to further develop the current project strategies and/or expand or change strategies, in order to support efficient progress towards project outcomes.

- To assess efficiency, the following should also be considered (but should not limit the evaluation):
- Has the project been efficient in leveraging resources and partnerships that are currently contributing to, or have contributed to achieving outcomes?
- In what way have changes in the context affected project cost effectiveness?
- What changes ought to be made in project strategies in order to ensure the most efficient approaches to project implementation?

4. Sustainability

Gov4Res works with and through PIC governance systems and practices to promote sustainability of the reform agenda. The MTE will assess the extent of take up of project activities by in-country systems. It will recommend options and areas of work where the project should expand or undertake further activity to support sustained PIC led outcomes.

Considering the progress of work in this current phase and the likely options for future phases of the program, the MTE will examine how the project can most effectively support sustained Pacific Islands-led action for risk-informed development.

The MTE will also identify areas for further research and enquiry is required in order to develop additional activities and strategies that will support sustained outcomes beyond the life of this project. In considering sustainability of outcomes the MTE will give particular attention to the principle of localisation.

To assess sustainability, the following should be considered (but should not limit the evaluation):

- How effectively has the project worked through PIC governments' systems and practices to introduce reform measures?
- In what ways has the project partnered with key actors on the ground (including communities and local government) to ensure program benefits are sustained?
- What further development of work areas is required to increase the sustainability of project outcomes?
- In what ways does this project support the core principles of localisation in the Pacific? In what ways could this be further improved?

5. Human Rights

line with UNDP principles the MTE should assess to what extent human rights considerations are included in the project design and implementation

- To what extent does the project adhere to and further supports human rights principles?
- To what extent does the project integrate or consider human rights-based approaches in the design and implementation of the project?

6. Gender Equality and Social Inclusion

Gov4Res proposes that it is impossible to risk-inform development without understanding and addressing the underlying vulnerabilities that arise due to structural inequalities that

prevent women and marginalised groups from contributing to and benefitting from that development. To ensure that the process is equitable, and benefits reach marginalised groups, the development process must be informed by diverse voices.

The project has recently developed a Gender Action Plan. The MTE is timely as the project will use the outcomes of the review to further refine its strategies for implementing its Gender Action Plan and refine its GESI indicators for the project

The MTE will assess the quality and value of the Gov4Res gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) strategies, as outlined in its GESI Action Plan, including how comprehensively and effectively the project has partnered with women, marginalised groups, including people living with a disability, and those marginalised by other intersecting social identities (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, living in rural or remote areas, etc.), in project activity planning, implementation and assessment.

The MTE will provide detailed recommendations for further improvement in the Gov4Res strategies for GESI, including opportunities to engage with other organisations and practitioners working on these issues (e.g., Ministry of Women, UN Women)

To assess the integration of GESI into Gov4Res, the following should be considered (but should not limit the evaluation):

- How has the project contributed to gender equality, particularly in terms of women's empowerment?
- How has the project contributed to equality and empowerment for other marginalised groups (e.g., people living with a disability, or people marginalised by other intersecting social identities (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity, geography etc.) through project activity planning, implementation and assessment.
- How is this participation of men, women and vulnerable groups contributing towards achievement of the project outcomes?
- How effectively have the measures or processes as outlined in the GESI Action Plan integrated GESI into project?
- How could the project further improve and assess its strategies for gender equality and social inclusion?
- What additional strategic partnerships should be cultivated to advance GESI in risk-informed development?

7. Project Structure

Gov4Res is currently designed as a project under the UNDP Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit. It receives funding from several donors and allocates those funds to different areas of project activity and in some cases, different locations. Going forward, the project seeks to make the most efficient use of donor partner funds, as well as provide the maximum accountability for those funds.

The MTE will explore options for the project structure going forward, considering likely future phases of the project, and identify options for how the project can be most efficiently

structured to meet UNDP processes and respond to donor partner accountability and reporting requirements.

To assess the appropriateness of the project structure, the following should be considered (but should not limit the evaluation):

- How should the project be structured to meet UNDP processes, respond to donor partner accountability and reporting requirements and meet its intended outcomes?
- Does the team have the required skills and experience, or technical partnerships in place to deliver the outcomes of the project?
- Are there additional activities, relevant to project stakeholders and in line with project outcomes, which could be included in future development of this project?

8. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

To assess the appropriateness of the project monitoring and evaluation, the following should be considered (but should not limit the evaluation):

- How comprehensively has the project collected, analysed and reported verifiable information about its progress?
- Are there missing indicators that are cost-effective and more impactful to measure?
- In what way could the project Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework be further developed and improved to ensure accountability to all stakeholders and support further project improvement?
- How is the projects' learning being captured and shared, and are there ways to improve information capture and its communication to various audiences?

EXPECTED OUTCOMES AND DELIVERABLES

The following deliverables in line with UNDP's evaluation guidelines:

| # | Deliverable | Description | Days ¹ | Due Date |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Inception report | The inception report should be prepared by the MTE team before going into the full-fledged MTE exercise. It should include full review of the country and regional project briefs (to be provided on contract signing), initial observations of the proposed evaluation objectives, proposed evaluation approach and methodology with detail around evaluation questions, data collection, analysis and dissemination processes, sampling strategy, and detailed examination of any limitations to the evaluation. The plan should be in line with the scope as outlined in the terms of reference and in line with UNDP evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. | 10 | July 2022 |

¹ Indicative

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|----|----------------|
| 2 | Draft initial findings | <p>A presentation of the initial findings from the evaluation will be made to key stakeholders, in particular the evaluation reference group, to provide opportunity to identify where further data collection and analysis may be required and/or to provide stakeholders with an indication of the likely scope and areas covered by the MTE. This presentation is expected to be made either in person or virtually by the evaluation team to the identified stakeholder group prior to report drafting.</p> <p>This will be one of the opportunities for dialogue between stakeholders to explore their different perspectives and assessments about change and project outcomes.</p> | 50 | September 2022 |
| 3 | Draft Evaluation Report | The draft evaluation report should be prepared in line with UNDP evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates, including an analysis of the performance of the project to adequately address gender equality as well as human rights issues, with evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report will be distributed to stakeholders and the evaluation reference group and feedback from stakeholders will be collated for further consideration by the MTE team. | 14 | November 2022 |
| 4 | Final Evaluation Report | The final report will be produced by the team based on feedback received on the draft report. The final report will be shared with all stakeholders and other interested parties. The final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager) should be prepared in line with UNDP evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates. | 5 | January 2023 |
| 5 | Audit Trail Form | The comments and changes by the consultant in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator in form of an audit trail to show they have addressed comments. This document can be submitted as an Annex to the final evaluation report. | 1 | January 2023 |

Institutional Arrangement

The evaluation team will work under the supervision of the UNDP Integrated Results Management Unit (IRMU), with oversight from the RSD team leader. The Gov4Res Monitoring Officer will support the logistical arrangements of MTE travel (if required and possible under Covid restrictions) and stakeholder consultations. Although Gov4Res is administratively responsible for the MTE, it shall not interfere with analysis and reporting, except when requested and at opportunities for comments/feedback.

The MTE will be supported by an Evaluation Reference Group comprising a selection of donor and government partners. The purpose of the Evaluation Reference Group will be to ensure transparency in the evaluation process and support stakeholder engagement with evaluation findings and recommendations.

Duration of the Work

This assignment is anticipated to take place between 1 June 2022 – 31 January 2023. The assignment is home-based, and payments are output based. Travel is **required** to Fiji and may be undertaken to other one or two Pacific locations if COVID restrictions allow. The expected level of effort for the MTR consultant(s) is approximately **80 days** in total.

| Duties | Location | Deliverables | Responsibility |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Country and Regional briefs | Fiji based | Project briefs outlining current activities, theory of change and achievements, annotated with available evidence, prepared for each project country and for the project regional activities. | Gov4Res M&E team |
| Preparation of evaluation plan Inception Report | Home based | Draft Inception report in line with UNDP evaluation norms and standards, following initial discussions with project team and other relevant stakeholders. | Evaluation Team |
| Review of draft evaluation plan Inception Report | Home based | Comments on the draft Inception Report, provided by the Evaluation Reference Group and UNDP, consolidated by the evaluation manager. | IRMU |
| Incorporation of comments | Home based | Revised Inception Report drafted | Evaluation Team |
| Deliverable 1 | Home based | Final Inception report submitted | Evaluation Team |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------|
| Evaluation implementation | Fiji and the other countries if COVID restrictions permit | Data collection, on-site analysis. | Evaluation Team |
| Deliverable 2 | Homebased or Fiji | Initial findings presentation to evaluation reference group and other stakeholders as required. Presentation submitted. | Evaluation Team |
| Deliverable 3 | Home based | Draft evaluation report submitted | Evaluation Team |
| Review for quality assurance and scope. Identify factual errors and clarity and comprehension | Home based | Comments on the draft evaluation report, provided by the Evaluation Reference Group and UNDP, consolidated by the evaluation manager. | IRMU |
| Consideration of comments | Home based | Revised draft evaluation report | Evaluation Team |
| Final review by UNDP IRMU | Home based | Revised draft evaluation report submitted to UNDP IRMU; draft Evaluation Brief submitted | IRMU |
| Incorporation of comments and finalisation of report and Evaluation Brief | Home based | Revised draft evaluation report, with comments from UNDP IRMU consolidated | Evaluation Team |
| Deliverable 4 | Home based | Final evaluation report; Evaluation Brief and presentation of evaluation results. | Evaluation Team |
| Deliverable 5 | Home Based | Audit Trail Form | Evaluation Team |
| Project Management: Finalise | Home based | Final Evaluation Follow-up Plan to be cleared by IRMU | Project Management |

| | | | |
|---|------------|--|--------------------|
| Evaluation Follow-up Plan | | | |
| Project Management: Disseminate final evaluation report | Home based | Final evaluation report disseminated to internal and external stakeholders | Project Management |

Duty Station

The MTE will include travel to Fiji where Gov4Res has its main base. If COVID restrictions allow, travel will be expected to other locations (a minimum of 2 other Pacific countries). If further travel is not possible then the evaluation team will be required to undertake remote data collection and analysis. The team will be expected to manage this remote process in ways which ensure the methodological standards outlined above are maintained.

Limitations and Risks

With restrictions due to COVID-19, and in order to stay within reasonable time and budget limits, it will not be possible for the evaluation team to travel to all project locations nor consult all project stakeholders. As a result, there is a risk that those stakeholders who are more difficult to reach either because of location or other factors, will have limited opportunity to contribute to the evaluation. This is a limitation which will need to be carefully managed in the MTE planning and it is expected that the evaluation team will give due consideration to this risk in the comprehensiveness of their data collection.

There are limits to the expertise that an external evaluation team is able to bring. For a project such as Gov4Res with multiple technical and other work areas, there is some risk that the evaluation team will not be able to fully understand or appreciate all of the work undertaken by the project especially given that strategies and activities are localised to particular countries and sectors. Gov4Res will aim to support the evaluation team as far as possible to access a full understanding of the project activities and achievements, providing country and regional briefs, support in technical and other inquiries and directing the team to additional areas or people who can provide the required information. However, it is acknowledged that there is a risk that the evaluation team will gain a partial or incomplete perspective of the entire project operations. To mitigate this risk the Evaluation Reference Group will be tasked to review the evaluation team findings and analysis and recommend where further data collection might be required. The evaluation team will also be expected to use multiple data collection and analysis methods to test findings and interpretations with different stakeholders as they proceed.

A time bound evaluation is limited in the range of areas and issues it is able to examine in-depth. While the terms of reference for this evaluation have been deliberately limited to those areas of current significance for the project, it is also recognized that each of the MTE objectives will likely involve considerable methodological enquiry. In order manage this it will be important for the evaluation team to maintain communication with the Evaluation Reference Group and with other stakeholders including donor partners, to ensure expectations are realistic and are being satisfactorily addressed.

Ethical Consideration

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The contractor must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners." Contractor will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.

COMPETENCIES

- High quality monitoring and evaluation experience with demonstrated expertise in effective engagement with diverse groups of people including women, and people marginalised because of disability, geography and other factors. Demonstrated knowledge and experience in monitoring evaluation or research with Pacific Island governments and communities.
- Demonstrated ability to conduct evaluations from a critical research perspective making use of diverse and culturally appropriate methodologies. Experience in evaluating adaptive programs and complex governance projects will be looked upon favourably.
- Current experience in resilient Climate Change and Disaster Risk management,
- Technical expertise and experience in financing and planning for resilient and sustainable development.
- Demonstrated experience in supporting and assessing strategies for inclusion of women and marginalised groups, including people living with a disability, and those marginalised by other intersecting social identities (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, living in rural or remote areas, etc.)

The team is expected to reflect a balance of gender. At least one person in the team should be from a Pacific Island country relevant to the project. Ideally the team will also reflect other diversities including lived experience with disability.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

Educational Qualifications:

- Minimum Master's Degree in evaluation, international development, public policy, governance or other closely related field (10%)

Experience

- Relevant experience (minimum 4 years) to conduct evaluations from a critical research perspective making use of diverse and culturally appropriate methodologies (15%)
- Experience in Theory of Change for complex systems programs (5%)
- Technical expertise and experience in financing and planning for resilient and sustainable development (15%)

- Experience in monitoring evaluation or research with Pacific Island governments and communities (15%)
- Experience in supporting and assessing strategies for inclusion of people including women and people marginalized by disability, age, geography, sexuality and other factors (10%)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered as an asset

Language requirements

- Fluency in English (written and verbal) language is required

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The Evaluator must send a financial proposal based on the total cost of the evaluation (including all travel):

- As applicable, travel or daily allowance cost (for work undertaken outside of home base) should be identified separately. Travel payments will be reimbursed following the travel.
- In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the consultants wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.
- 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.

Payment Schedule

The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will fix output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payment will be made after satisfactory acceptance and upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

- Deliverable 1: Final Inception Report: **20% of total contract amount**
- Deliverable 3: Draft Evaluation Report: **30% of total contract amount**
- Deliverable 4 and 5: Final Evaluation Report and Audit Trail Form: **50% of total contract amount**

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

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

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the team 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)

- Criteria 1: Minimum Master's Degree in evaluation, international development, public policy, governance or other closely related field – **Max 10 points**
- Criteria 2: Relevant experience (minimum 4 years) to conduct evaluations from a critical research perspective making use of diverse and culturally appropriate methodologies – **Max 15 points**
- Criteria 3: Experience in Theory of Change for complex systems programs – **Max 5 points**
- Criteria 4: Technical expertise and experience in financing and planning for resilient and sustainable development – **Max 15 points**
- Criteria 5: Experience in monitoring evaluation or research with Pacific Island governments and communities – **Max 15 points**
- Criteria 6: Experience in supporting and assessing strategies for inclusion of people including women and people marginalized by disability, age, geography, sexuality and other factors– **Max 10 points**

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:

- **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 (no more than 4 pages)**: including a) a brief description of why the team considers itself as the most suitable for the assignment, with reference to technical criteria outlined above.
- **Financial proposal**, as per template provided in Annex II. Note: National consultants must quote prices in United States Dollars (USD).

Incomplete proposals may not be considered. 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 procurement.fj@undp.org or for technical questions to nicola.glendining@undp.org

ANNEX III. LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS FOR THE DESK REVIEW

This list is indicative only and will be further refined by the evaluation team.

- Project briefs which identify current progress against each outcome area with links to all relevant evidence sources
- Historical documents including PRRP overview and related completion reports.
- Gov4Res Project Document (pro doc)
- GESI Action Plan
- MERL Framework
- Briefs on key program strategies and related evidence sources.
- Project reporting to date
- UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021²
- UNDP website: UNDP and the Sustainable Development Goals³
- UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (SRPD) 2018-2022⁴
- Donor performance monitoring frameworks/strategies (e.g., from DFAT, MFAT, KOICA, SIDA and FCDO)
- UNDP evaluation resource centre⁵

² <http://strategicplan.undp.org/>

³ <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>

⁴ http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/operations/legal_framework/_jcr_content/centerparsys/download_13/file.res/Pacific_SRPD_2018-2022.pdf

⁵ <https://erc.undp.org/>

ANNEX IV. LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

The list of stakeholders will be further refined by the evaluation team, in consultation with project/programme management IEU and IRMU. The evaluation team should also request interviews with other relevant stakeholders.

| Type ⁶ | Organisation ⁷ | Name | Designation ⁸ | Location | Email |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------|--------------------------|----------|-------|
| UN | | | | | |
| UNDP field | | | | | |
| UNDP field | | | | | |
| UNDP field | | | | | |

⁶ Please include the information, if this person is e.g., an implementing partner, donor, recipient, UNODC HQ, UNODC field, UN agency, etc.

⁷ Please include the name of the organisation the person is working for.

⁸ Please include the designation/job title of the person.