

**Final Project Evaluation Terms of Reference**  
**UNDP Country Office and Ministry of Foreign Affairs**  
**Kingdom of Saudi Arabia**

**1. Background and context**

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) spans the vast majority of the Arabian Peninsula, with a land area of approximately 2,150,000 km<sup>2</sup> (830,000 sq mi). Saudi Arabia is the largest country in the Middle East, and the second-largest country in the Arab world with a rapidly growing population of 35,013,414 in 2020. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's diplomatic relations, to achieve and preserve national interests, and to promote the Kingdom's role in establishing security, stability, and prosperity in the region and the world. MOFA derives its core values from the Islamic social and professional principles as a key element in its organizational philosophy and inculcate the values in employees and organizational units at all levels.

In April 2016, the Saudi Vision 2030, an ambitious blueprint for development, was launched. Vision 2030 is the forward-thinking initiative of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman. It sets down a plan for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's future with several goals aimed at inspiring economic, political, and social development. And in 2016 the National Transformation Programme 2020 (NTP 2020) was launched across 24 governmental bodies, operating in the economic and development sectors. In achieving this vision, it is expected that all ministries and Government bodies would strive for organizational excellence, improving their services, personnel, and building high-performing manpower. The vision urges Saudi Arabia to open up to the external world, and to improve the consular services, as well as strengthening the positive image of the Kingdom, enhancing the regional relations. This accentuates the role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in realization of the Vision 2030. The Umbrella Programme for Advisory Services to MOFA project is a national project benefiting the whole of the Kingdom and all governmental agencies in addition to contributing to the UNDP CPD (2017- 2021) Outcome 1 (Improved knowledge-based equitable and sustainable development, underpinned by innovation and improved infrastructure) and CPD output 1.1 (National policies developed to promote economic diversification with a focus on increased employment of nationals). It also contributes to SDG 16. Target:16. a Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime.

The project is implemented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

On the basis of the outputs of MOFA Strategic Plans and UNDP Projects, as well as considering the UN and Saudi strategy and policy documents, the final evaluation will look into the progress of the following outputs:

1. Strengthening the public diplomacy
2. Supporting Prince Saudi Al-Faisal institute of Diplomatic Studies
3. Providing advisory services to the organizational units at MOFA: political, economic, specialized, consular, general affairs, technical affairs, planning and development, legal unit, and human resources unit.
4. Promoting the international representation of Saudi Arabia.
5. Supporting recruitment of Saudi nationals in the UN System.
6. Enhanced capacity of the Strategic Planning and Development Directorate (SPDD) to deepen MoFA reforms based on change management, systematic analysis, and strategic planning.
7. Technical and Administrative Support to the General Directorate for Human Resources (GDHR)

The project benefits youth in the third output per the revision: Output 3: Increasing Saudi Representation in the UN- which specifically target the Saudi youth.

The evaluation requires working with all heads of departments involved with the various outcomes as well as all consultants on the project and other relevant project and authority staff.

The project duration was originally for 4 years (2018- 2021). The project extension period (August 2021 to December 2022) provides the necessary time for the project to complete ongoing activities and deliver the revised outputs to achieve a more significant impact. The aim of the revision was to expand the scope of the project by including outputs relevant to the support of the Strategic Development and Planning Directorate (SPDD), and to the General Directorate for Human Resources (GDHR). The revised project prioritizes the provision of technical support and capacity development interventions to enable both departments to guide and facilitate MOFA reform and restructuring process.

The Revised Outputs are:

Output 1: Enhanced Capacity of the strategic Planning and Development Directorate (SPDD) to deepen MOFA based on change management, systematic analysis, and strategic planning.

Output 2: Technical and administrative support to the General Directorate for Human Resources (GDHR)

Output 3: Advisory services to MOFA: Including the key pillars under the umbrella programme.

COVID 19 had impacted the project by delaying some planned activities and official needed approvals from MOFA on certain proposals.

Basic Project information can also be included in table format as follows:

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
<b>Project title:</b>	Umbrella Programme for Advisory Services to MOFA	
<b>Atlas ID</b>	SAU10-106301	
<b>Corporate outcome and output</b>	Equitable, accountable, effective, and efficient public sector	
<b>Country</b>	Saudi Arabia	
<b>Region</b>	RBAS	
<b>Date project document signed</b>	12 September 2018	
<b>Project dates</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>Planned end</b>
	1 September 2018	31 December 2022
<b>Project budget</b>	US\$ 9,504,069	
<b>Project expenditure at the time of evaluation</b>	US\$ 2,237,775	
<b>Funding source</b>	Government	
<b>Implementing party<sup>1</sup></b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	

## 2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

Evaluation purpose and objectives:

This final evaluation is conducted as part of a planned intervention aimed at re-positioning the project to help MOFA meet its mandate. The project has been ongoing since September 2018 and has, thus far, never been evaluated. In view of the pandemic and the drastic changes that has been taking place in the country, the project has had to adapt to the changes over recent years. To ensure the project has delivered its intended objectives and to provide recommendations for the way forward, it is

<sup>1</sup> It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

imperative to conduct a final evaluation and ensure the project has delivered. This evaluation will benefit the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in their planning for future years to meet Saudi Vision 2030 and highlight the impacts this project has had over the past few years. The evaluation and ensuing recommendations will help build a new project document serving MOFA to better deliver its intended task and learn lessons from previous activities.

Scope of the evaluation:

- The final evaluation will look into the progress of the following outputs:
  1. Strengthening the public diplomacy
  2. Supporting Prince Saudi Al-Faisal institute of Diplomatic Studies
  3. Providing advisory services to the organizational units at MOFA: political, economic, specialized, consular, general affairs, technical affairs, planning and development, legal unit, and human resources unit.
  4. Promoting the international representation of Saudi Arabia.
  5. Supporting recruitment of Saudi nationals in the UN System.
  6. Enhanced capacity of the Strategic Planning and Development Directorate (SPDD) to deepen MoFA reforms based on change management, systematic analysis, and strategic planning.
  7. Technical and Administrative Support to the General Directorate for Human Resources (GDHR)
- This evaluation will cover all activities held during the span of the project between (1 September 2018 - 31<sup>st</sup> of Dec 2022) and highlight issues and recommendations in all aspects (technical, financial, management, structural and operational), including the effective use of resources and delivery outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

Issues relate directly to the questions of the evaluation must be answered so that users will have the information they need for pending decisions or action. An issue may concern the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, or sustainability of the intervention. In addition, UNDP evaluations must address how the intervention sought to **mainstream gender in development efforts**, considered disability issues and applied the rights-based approach.

### 3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

Referencing and adopting from Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria ((a) relevance/ coherence; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability (and/or other criteria used), the evaluation will answer the following questions:

#### Project evaluation sample questions:

##### Relevance/ Coherence

- To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, country programme outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the design?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

#### Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved, considering men, women, and vulnerable groups?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?
- Are the project objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame? Do they clearly address women, men and vulnerable groups?

#### Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, male and female staff, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

#### Sustainability

- To what extent will targeted men, women and vulnerable people benefit from the project interventions in the long-term?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent are lessons learned documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability in order to support female and male project beneficiaries as well as marginalized groups?

### Evaluation questions on cross-cutting issues

#### Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women, men and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

### Gender equality

All evaluation criteria and evaluation questions applied need to be checked to see if there are any further gender dimensions attached to them, in addition to the stated gender equality questions.

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker assigned to this project representative of reality?

### Disability

- Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
- What proportion of the beneficiaries of a programme were persons with disabilities?

Guiding evaluation questions will be further refined in the inception report by the evaluation team and agreed with UNDP evaluation stakeholders.

## 4. Methodology

The evaluation should employ a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and male and female direct beneficiaries. Methodological tools and approaches may include:

- **Document review.** This would include a review of all relevant documentation, inter alia
  - Project document (contribution agreement).
  - Theory of change and results framework.
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
  - Annual workplans.
  - Activity designs.
  - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
  - Results-oriented monitoring report.
  - Highlights of project board meetings.
  - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
  - Financial reports for the funding analysis required as per the evaluation questions
- **Interviews and meetings** with key stakeholders (men and women) such as key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, United Nations country team (UNCT) members and implementing partners:
  - **Semi-structured interviews**, based on questions designed for different stakeholders based on evaluation questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.
  - Key informant and **focus group discussions** with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews with men and women should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

- **Surveys and questionnaires** including male and female participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires to other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.
- **Gender and human rights lens.** All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues.

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

## 5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

- **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.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, UNDP expects a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length).**<sup>2</sup> A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within one week of submission of the draft. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** (if required).
- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products agreed in the inception report** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.

Standard templates that need to be followed are provided in the Annexes section. It is expected that the evaluator will follow the UNDP evaluation guidelines and UNEG quality check list and ensure all the quality criteria are met in the evaluation report.

In line with UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactory completed due to impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid. Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her/their control.

## 6. Evaluation required competencies

The evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant. The consultant shall be responsible for carrying out and performing all the duties and responsibilities as defined in the implementation arrangements section and required by the evaluation.

- **Required qualifications:** Advanced degree in political science or relevant field, minimum 10 years' experience in evaluations, preferably in the field of political science, international affairs, diplomacy and capacity building for strategic planning. Knowledge of Saudi, region or similar context, a plus.
- **Technical competencies:** Team leadership skills and experience, technical knowledge in UNDP thematic areas, with specifics depending on the focus of the evaluation, data analysis and report writing etc.
- **Technical knowledge and experience:** Gender and disability inclusion competencies are preferable as well as technical knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such equality, disability issues, rights-based approach, and capacity development.
- **Language skills required:** Fluent English, knowledge of Arabic is considered an asset.

Evidence to be presented:

- resume
- work samples
- references

To support claims of knowledge, skills and experience.

Explicit statement of evaluators' independence from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing, or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation should be provided.<sup>3</sup>

## 7. Evaluation ethics

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.<sup>3</sup>

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant 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 consultant 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 with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## 8. Implementation arrangements

The section describes the specific roles and responsibilities of all involved in this evaluation:

1. Evaluation commissioner: The Resident Representative who will approve the inception report and the final evaluation report.

2. Evaluation manager: Lead the evaluation process and participate in all of its stages - evaluability assessment, preparation, implementation, management and use of the evaluation. Ensure quality assurance and manage the ERC portal

3. Evaluator:

- a. Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the TOR
- b. Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix and a gender responsive methodology, in line with the TOR, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines
- c. Conduct data collection and field visits according to the TOR and inception report
- d. Produce draft reports adhering to UNDP evaluation templates, UNDP Evaluation guidelines including the required quality criteria and brief the evaluation manager, programme/ project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations
- e. Consider gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues, check if all and respective evaluation questions are answered, and relevant data, disaggregated by sex, is presented, analysed and interpreted. The evaluator needs to ensure that all the evaluation sections are gender responsive.

f. Finalize the evaluation report, incorporating comments and questions from the feedback/ audit trail. Record own feedback in the audit trail including those of the members of the team, the evaluation manager, the commissioning programme unit, and key stakeholders.

4. Project manager:

- a. Provide inputs/ advice to the evaluation manager and evaluation reference group on the detail and scope of the TOR for the evaluation and how the findings will be used
- b. Ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations
- c. Provide the evaluation manager with all required data (e.g., relevant monitoring data) and documentation (reports, minutes, reviews, studies, etc.), contacts/ stakeholder list etc.
- d. Ensure that data and documentation in general, but in particular related to gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues, are made available to the evaluation manager
- e. Provide comments and clarification on the TOR, inception report and draft evaluation reports
- f. Respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP
- g. Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders including the project board
- h. Implement relevant key actions on evaluation recommendations

#### Institutional Arrangements:

The consultants will take responsibility, with assistance from the project team, for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advance approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The consultants will report directly to the designated evaluation manager and focal point and work closely with the project team. Project staff will not participate in the meetings between consultants and evaluands. The consultants will work home based and will be required to travel to Saudi Arabia for a field visit. limited administrative and logistical support will be provided. The consultant will use his own laptop and cell phone.

## 9. Time frame for the evaluation process

The consultancy should be conducted and completed within 30 days over 2.5 to 3 months. The final timeframe should be agreed in the inception report.

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which the evaluator will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office (e.g., workplan, agreements, briefings, draft report, final report).

- Desk review.
- Briefings of evaluator.
- Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report.
  - In-country data collection and analysis (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires).
  - Preparing the draft report.
  - Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance).
  - Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report.

In addition, the evaluator may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge sharing and dissemination.

**Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (outcome evaluation)**

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
<b>Phase One: Desk review and inception report</b>				
Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	-	At the time of contract signing 1 May 2022	UNDP or remote	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluator	-	At the time of contract signing 1 May 2022	Via email	Evaluation manager
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Within two weeks of contract signing 1-15 May 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	Within two weeks of contract signing 15 May 2022		Evaluator
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report 22 May 2022	UNDP	Evaluation manager
<b>Phase Two: Data-collection mission</b>				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	10 days	Within four weeks of contract signing 29 May - 9 June 2022	In country  With field visits	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day	9 June 2022	In country	Evaluator
<b>Phase Three: Evaluation report writing</b>				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (4-5 pages)	10 days	Within two weeks of the completion of the field mission 12 June - 23 June 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
Draft report submission	-			Evaluator
Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report 7 July 2022	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day	Within one week of receipt of comments 14 July 2022	Remotely UNDP	UNDP, stakeholder and evaluator
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office	3 days	Within one week of final debriefing 21 July 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	Within one week of final debriefing 21 July 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
<b>Estimated total days for the evaluation</b>	<b>30</b>			

Excludes days estimated for UNDP's review

Payment's schedule:

<b>Milestones/Activities</b>	<b>Indicated Timeframe/ Duration (working Days)</b>	<b>% of Payment</b>	<b>Document to be Submitted</b>	<b>Approving Officer accepting the milestone</b>
Phase One: Desk review and inception report A detailed inception report describing initial findings based on the comprehensive documentation review, the evaluation methodology, detailed work plan, the outline of the final report in addition to the inception report. Presentation and approval	5 days	15%	A comprehensive Inception Report	
Phase Two: Data-collection mission and Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders: Collection and analysis by applying methodologies and approaches presented and approved in the inception report	11 days			
Phase Three: Evaluation report A draft evaluation report to be prepared based on collected data	10 days	35%	A draft evaluation report	
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day			
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office	3 days			
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes) along with audit trail		50%	Final evaluation report	
Total	30 days			

## **10. Application submission process and criteria for selection**

As required by the procurement unit.

## **11. TOR annexes**

- **Intervention results framework and theory of change.**
- **Key stakeholders and partners.**
- **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. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
  - MOFA strategy
  - Monitoring plans and indicators.

- Partnership arrangements (e.g., agreements of cooperation with Governments or partners).
- Project Document and Budget Revisions.
- Minutes of all meetings.
- **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

**Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix**

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

- **Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.** Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.
- [Inception report](#)
- [Required format for the evaluation report](#). The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports as mentioned in section 6 of the evaluation guidelines.
- **Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details (annex A)**
- [Pledge of ethical conduct](#) in evaluation. UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations system'.<sup>5</sup>

## **Annex A**

### **UNDP Evaluation dispute resolution process**

#### **Dispute settlement**

Should you or a member of the evaluation team feel unduly pressured to change the findings or conclusions of an evaluation you have been contracted to undertake you are freely able to raise your

concerns with the management within UNDP.

Please send your concerns to the Deputy Director of the Region who will ensure a timely response.

Please also include the Independent Evaluation Office, in your correspondence

([evaluation.office@undp.org](mailto:evaluation.office@undp.org)).

#### **Reporting wrongdoing**

UNDP takes all reports of alleged wrongdoing seriously. In accordance with the [UNDP Legal Framework for Addressing Non-Compliance with UN Standards of Conduct](#), the Office of Audit and

Investigation is the principal channel to receive allegations\*.

Anyone with information regarding fraud against UNDP programmes or involving UNDP staff is strongly encouraged to report this information through the Investigations Hotline (+1-844-595-5206).

People reporting wrongdoing to the Investigations Hotline have the option to leave relevant contact

information or to remain anonymous. However, allegations of workplace harassment and abuse of authority cannot be reported anonymously.

When reporting to the Investigations Hotline, people are encouraged to be as specific as possible, including the basic details of who, what, where, when and how any of these incidents occurred. Specific information will allow OAI to properly investigate the alleged wrongdoing.

The investigations hotline, managed by an independent service provider on behalf of UNDP to protect confidentiality, can be directly accessed worldwide and free of charge in different ways:

[ONLINE REFERRAL FORM](#) (You will be redirected to an independent third-party site.)

**PHONE - REVERSED CHARGES** [Click here for worldwide numbers](#) (interpreters available 24 hours/day) Call +1-844-595-5206 in the USA

**EMAIL** directly to OAI at: [reportmisconduct@undp.org](mailto:reportmisconduct@undp.org)

**REGULAR MAIL**

Deputy Director (Investigations)  
Office of Audit and Investigations  
United Nations Development Programme  
One UN Plaza, DC1, 4th Floor  
New York, NY 10017 USA

---

\* <https://www.undp.org/accountability/audit/investigations>

Recommended Presentation of Offer

For purposes of generating Offers whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative analysis, it is best to recommend the preferred contents and presentation of the Offer to be submitted, as well as the format/sequencing of their presentation. The following documents may be requested:

1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP.
2. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
3. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. The terms "all-inclusive" implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the Proposal. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial Proposal submitted to UNDP.

## Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

### Step I: Screening and desk review:

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology.

**Technical Criteria (CV review and Desk Review/Interview optional) – maximum 70 points.** Only candidates who obtained **at least 70% of points from the CV desk review (who will score at least 49 points)** will be considered for the next evaluation stage, i.e., financial evaluation.

Applications will be first screened and only candidates meeting the following minimum criteria will progress to the pool for shortlisting:

- Advanced degree, preferably a master's level in statistics, economics, or other related fields.
  - Minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience.
  - Full understanding of economic concepts, indicators, and frameworks.
  - Demonstrated expertise in providing coaching and on-the-job-training for the staff
  - Demonstrated expertise in reviewing and enhancing the coverage of the economic platform.
  - Demonstrated expertise in identifying the methodology and econometric techniques.
  - Demonstrated expertise in The ability to validate, analyse, and treat data.
  - Demonstrated expertise in conducting research, and provide statistical technical advice on different sectors.
  - Demonstrated policy expertise and experience in working on any of the statistical packages to analyze data.
- 
- Demonstrated expertise in understanding and practice of capacity development
  - Good understanding of the UN programming principles, Governmental policies and UN capacity development mandate would be an asset.
  - Excellent in English and Arabic is an asset

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

Weight Per Technical Competence	
5 (outstanding): 96% - 100%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated an OUTSTANDING capacity for the analyzed competence.
4 (Very good): 86% - 95%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a VERY GOOD capacity for the analyzed competence.
3 (Good): 76% - 85%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a GOOD capacity for the analyzed competence.

2 (Satisfactory): 70% - 75%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a SATISFACTORY capacity for the analyzed competence.
1 (Weak): Below 70%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a WEAK capacity for the analyzed competence.

## Step II: Financial Assessment:

Financial Proposal – Maximum 30 points

- Duly accomplished Confirmation of Interest and Submission of Financial Proposal Template using the template provided by UNDP (Annex II)

PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

### The contractor shall submit a price proposal as below:

The total professional fee shall be converted into a lump-sum contract and payments under the contract shall be made on submission and acceptance of deliverables under the contract in accordance with the schedule of payment linked with deliverables. The financial Proposal should include all relevant costs (consultancy fees, all envisaged travel costs, living allowances, etc.).

UNDP applies the “**Best value for money approach**” – the final selection will be based on the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal.

Financial proposal – Maximum 30 points

- Duly accomplished Confirmation of Interest and Submission of Financial Proposal Template using the template provided by UNDP (Annex II)

PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

### The consultant shall submit a price proposal as below:

The total professional fee shall be converted into a lump-sum contract and payments under the contract shall be made on submission and acceptance of deliverables under the contract in accordance with the schedule of payment linked with deliverables. The financial proposal should include all relevant

costs (consultancy fees, all envisaged travel costs, living allowances, etc.).

Financial evaluation - Total 30% (30 points)

The following formula will be used to evaluate the financial proposal:

$p = y (\mu/z)$ , where

p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal  $\mu$  = price of the lowest-priced proposal

z = price of the proposal being evaluated

#### 10. Instructions for on-line submissions

Step 1: Please prepare all required documents electronically.

Step 2: Combine all documents in **ONE SINGLE FILE** (preferably in PDF however, Word format can also be accepted) and upload to the UNDP Jobs links

Step 3: After that, you will receive an auto-reply from the UNDP jobs if your offer is received successfully.

*Given the volume of applications that UNDP receives, only shortlisted offerors will be notified.*

**UNDP reserves the right to reject any incomplete applications.**

**UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.**

**UNDP does not tolerate sexual exploitation and abuse, any kind of harassment, including sexual harassment and discrimination. All selected candidates will, therefore, undergo rigorous reference and background checks.**

**Interested applicants are advised to carefully review this advertisement and ensure that they meet the requirements and qualifications described.**

**UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.**

**UNDP does not tolerate sexual exploitation and abuse, any kind of harassment, including sexual harassment and discrimination. All selected candidates will, therefore, undergo rigorous reference and background checks.**

