

# Terms of Reference for the Country-Level Evaluation of the Delivering as One United Nations in CAPE VERDE

## 1. Global Context

The Delivering as One (DaO) approach was recommended by the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence in the areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment on 9 November 2006. The Panel was mandated by the Secretary-General as part of the follow-up to the 2005 World Summit. The Panel recommended to the Secretary-General that the UN system should establish UN Country Teams with what they called the four Ones—*One Leader, One Programme, One Budgetary Framework*, and, where appropriate, *One Office*—in order to bring about real progress towards the MDGs and other Internationally Agreed Development Goals. UNCTs should also have an integrated capacity to provide a coherent approach to cross-cutting issues, including sustainable development, gender equality and human rights.

On 22 November 2006, the Secretary-General decided to move forward with some of the recommendations, focusing on the call to establish pilot country initiatives where the One UN approach would be tested. On 3 April 2007, the new Secretary-General presented the report of the High-level Panel to the General Assembly. In his comments, he noted that the exercise would test the principles advocated by the Panel in different countries. The governments of Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam volunteered to pilot the Delivering as One approach. The Secretary-General tasked the UNDG to move forward and support the eight pilot countries. Member States agreed that these concepts should be tested in the pilot countries on a voluntary basis and that the evaluation of lessons learned from these experiences would inform future intergovernmental consultations.

The Delivering as One United Nations (DaO) approach has been implemented in eight programme countries since 2007. The evaluability assessments conducted in 2007 and 2008 suggested that country level evaluations be conducted to assess the progress made against the strategic intent of DaO, record achievements, identify areas for improvement and remaining challenges and most importantly, distil lessons that could inform decision-making processes at the national and intergovernmental levels.

The DaO initiative is intended to make the role and contribution of the UN system at the country level more relevant, effective and efficient. This evaluation is intended to assess how, and the extent to which, the intended and unintended results were achieved in Cape Verde.

The United Nations General Assembly emphasized the need for an independent evaluation of lessons learned from DaO efforts, for consideration by Member States, without prejudice to a future intergovernmental decision. This country-level evaluation should be considered a building block for the independent evaluation which will be commissioned by the UN General Assembly. The independent evaluation would be able to integrate the evaluative evidence from the country-level evaluation, assess systemic efforts of the UN and provide recommendations for decision-making at intergovernmental level.

This Terms of Reference (ToR) is based on the framework ToR developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) at the request of the member states participating in the Delivering as One

pilot initiative to support the conduct of country-level evaluations in line with the resolutions of the General Assembly (GA) contained in the 2007 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR) of operational activities for development of the United Nations system.

The TCPR, contained in General Assembly Resolutions 59/250 (2004) and 62/208 (2007), provides guidance to make the role and contribution of the UN system more coherent, effective and relevant at the country level. In the resolutions, the GA emphasizes that the planning and programming frameworks of the UN system, including the UNDAF, need to be fully aligned with national development planning cycles whenever possible and that they should use and strengthen national capacities and mechanisms.

The ownership, leadership and full participation of national authorities in preparing and developing these planning and programming documents are vital to guaranteeing that they respond to the national development plans and strategies.

The resolutions emphasize that programme countries should have access to and benefit from the full range of mandates and resources of the UN development system. National governments should determine which resident and non-resident UN organizations could best respond to the specific needs and priorities of the individual country, including, in the case of non-resident agencies, through hosting arrangements with resident organizations and the use of advanced information and communication technology, including knowledge management.

## **2. Background on Delivering as One UN in Cape Verde**

The overall goal of the Delivering as One UN Initiative in Cape Verde is to improve programme delivery and results through a more coherent, better coordinated, funded and managed UN.

Under the overall leadership of the Government of Cape Verde and the Resident Coordinator, the UN system in Cape Verde aims at delivering tangible development results as one team through the implementation of one country-owned and relevant UN programme that is consolidated as the UN Development Assistance Framework for 2006-2010, with a one year extension for the period 2010-2011. This overall programme framework is based on the principles of joint programming and includes all UN system entities, members of the UN Country team as well as non-resident agencies. It is implemented within the context of one budgetary framework and overall joint resource mobilization strategy, in close cooperation with other international development partners and national partners, including civil society organizations.

The UN in Cape Verde has been moving towards better coordination and increased alignment. This process has incrementally moved forward with efforts to effectively reposition the UN in the changing aid environment of Cape Verde.

The UN System in Cape Verde comprises of twenty agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP, WHO) with physical in-country presence, and with 7 other agencies (UNIDO, UNIFEM, UNODC, UNESCO, UNHABITAT, UNV, IOM) non-resident agencies but with permanent staff in the country, and other 7 agencies (ILO, ITC, ITU, UNCTAD, UNISDR, UNEP, UNAIDS) covering Cape Verde from other countries, regional offices or Headquarters.

### **2.1 Re-positioning of the UN**

In order to respond more effectively to the challenges of meeting the MDGs, the UN in Cape Verde has in recent years been moving towards improved coordination and increased alignment with national priorities. The implementation of UN reforms and the rapidly evolving development assistance environment in Cape Verde, characterized by a move towards more flexible aid modalities, due to the increased capacity of the Government for the management of the development aid, have provided the UN family with an opportunity to accelerate reform activities at country level. This process has enabled the UN Country Team to work more closely together, acting as one family and speaking with one voice.

The UN system in Cape Verde has viewed the evolving aid environment as an opportunity to initiate reflection at the country level on the future role of the UN in the new General Budget Support (GBS) environment, and to expedite the implementation of the UN Reform, joint programming modalities and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. It is therefore very important to place the One UN Initiative in the framework of the ongoing efforts and initiatives in Cape Verde. The rapidly evolving development assistance environment in Cape Verde, with an increased focus on GBS and sector wide funding, has provided the UN family with an opportunity to accelerate UN Reform activities at country level.

The UN works closely with the Government in the new environment, based on its neutrality, impartiality, regulatory/normative role, technical expertise, more general expertise in capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, provision of services, enhancing the voice of the civil society, sudden onset emergency and ability to create and nourish partnerships. There are also increased preparedness and response to efforts by the UN to play a pro-active role in upstream policy dialogue under the Joint Review process and the UNCT has moved forward in engaging more proactively in taking on various convening roles.

A number of areas of **comparative advantage of the UN** system in Cape Verde have been identified:

- **Advocacy** for UN core values, including human rights, gender equality, human security and the Millennium Development Goals;
- **Normative and technical advisory support**, setting standards and ensuring quality control, in addition to providing technical advice according to the agencies respective mandates;
- **Strengthening of national capacity** at both central and decentralized levels, particularly strengthening Government capacity to deliver the additional resources channeled to the State Budget;
- **Support to national scale-up** of evidence-based programmes;
- **Bringing the voice of civil society to the table.** The UN can play a strategic role in ensuring that the voice of civil society is heard. In so doing, it would also ensure that municipalities are given similar opportunities and access to make their voices heard and to influence central government policy.
- **Building partnerships between all stakeholders.** Given its impartiality, the UN is an ideal mediator and facilitator to foster partnerships.

## 2.2 The “Five Ones” of the Delivering as One UN in Cape Verde

The “**Five Ones**” in Cape Verde are the following:

- **One Programme:** focusing on a sub-set of selected, strategic UNDAF outputs highlighting joint programmes. The 2006 – 2010 UNDAF, both in substance and cycle, is fully in line with the national development framework. In order to be fully in line with the next national development plan in Cape Verde, and based on guidance from the Government, the UNDAF was extended by one year (2010-2011). The overall strategies and approaches of the UNDAF 2006-2010 will remain consistent in the extension period. The next UN plan will then be developed based on the actual PRSP (2008-2011). Strategic inclusiveness in the One Programme focuses on the contribution of all UN agencies, specialized and non-specialized, resident and non-resident in areas of UN comparative advantage to achieve greater impact in the context of Cape Verde development priorities and of the new aid environment;
- **One Leader:** an empowered and accountable Resident Coordinator, with the competencies and authority to guide the development and management of the UN in Cape Verde and speak with one voice on behalf of the UN and supporting Agency representatives leading agency specific representation in-country, while exploring opportunities for clustering of representation where more effective and efficient;
- **One Budgetary Framework and One Fund:** consolidating all contributions to support a coherent and joint resource mobilization, allocation and disbursement of donor resources to the UNDAF and the Delivering as One UN Operational Plan – ONE PROGRAMME;
- **One Management System:** a results-based management system, with integrated support services, under which all agencies share joint premises and common services, wherever cost-efficient, with an aim to ensure efficient and effective delivery of operations support for programmatic activities of all agencies in the country. This arrangement ensures that cooperative arrangements are in place to build on synergies and maximize the use of available capacities and infrastructure; and
- **One Communication Strategy:** a common approach to communication and advocacy, in which there is a rational use of communication assets to raise and advance issues related to the mandate of the UN. The strategy would lead to greater coherence and effectiveness in the UN’s approach to advocacy, resulting in measurable results.

### 3. Purpose and Use of the Country-Led Evaluation

It is anticipated that the evaluation of the Delivering as One initiative will be carried out in two phases: (a) a country-led evaluation, which will need to be carried out by the Governments of each DaO pilot country in conjunction with the UNCT and other key stakeholders by mid-2010; and (b) an independent global evaluation, which will commence in July 2010 and will be completed by mid-2011, in time for presentation at the 66th Session of the General Assembly in September 2011.

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess to what extent the DaO in Cape Verde is on track to achieve its targets against its strategic intent.
- Assess how the DaO initiative is contributing to national development goals

- Identify challenges and lessons learnt from the implementation of the DaO in Cape Verde
- Make specific recommendations on actions that should be undertaken by the different stakeholders (UN, Government and donors) in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the DaO in Cape Verde”

The Cape Verde country-led evaluation is based on a number of key principles:

- **Country ownership and oversight:** the evaluation will be overseen by the Government of Cape Verde with a view to ensuring that the results and recommendations are aligned with the national development agenda and can be fully incorporated into key processes and plans;
- **Primacy of national context:** the evaluation process and methodology will be developed with full recognition of the national context and working modalities of Government and development partners – there will be no attempt to create parallel processes or structures;
- **Focus on evaluation of results:** the evaluation will focus on reviewing the contributions of the UN Delivering as One to the overall national development agenda and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals in Cape Verde;
- **Transparency and credibility:** the evaluation will be carried out in an open and transparent manner, with high level, independent professional expertise contracted to support the process, outcome document and core set of recommendations in conformity with international evaluation standard; and
- **Comparability:** while flexible and based on the national context, the evaluation process will also ensure comparability of methodology and results with similar country-led evaluations being carried out in other DaO pilot countries.

The country-level evaluation, including the recommendations, will be used by the stakeholders as an input to the discussion on how to enhance the role and contribution of the United Nations development system in support of national policies and strategies for the achievement of national development results. The evaluation will assess the progress made against the strategic intent of DaO in the country, record achievements, identify areas for improvement and remaining challenges and distil lessons to inform decision-making processes in the country.

The evaluation will also ascertain the level of effectiveness of the DaO initiative in bringing to the country’s benefit the whole potential of the UN development system. The evaluation will be used by the UN and stakeholders to enhance its approach and processes to reach the related national development goals as outlined in the second national Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Document (DECRP) and also the internationally agreed development goals. It is also intended that this evaluation will be an opportunity to learn from the other pilot experiences and also will be an opportunity for South-South cooperation.

#### 4. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the UN’s response to addressing the identified key development priorities in the country. When assessing that response, the evaluation will analyze the implementation of the Delivering as One approach expressed in the above mentioned five Ones, namely – *One Programme*,

*One Leader, One Budgetary Framework and One Fund, One Management System and One Communication Strategy* – in order to assess its contribution towards the achievement of national development goals. The evaluation will also assess compliance with UN normative frameworks and cross cutting issues including gender and human rights, and their concrete translation in the DAO initiative.

More specifically:

- **One leader** and the extent to which the position of Resident Coordinator enabled a more coherent UN approach to address national development challenges;
- **One programme** and the feasibility and progress made in establishing joint programming and joint programmes which led to enhanced results that were greater than the sum of the individual UN agency specific programmes;
- **One budgetary framework** and establishment of a resource mobilization framework and One Fund, including the extent to which the administrative systems in place were able to achieve one financial management system;
- **One management system** and the extent to which common support services and shared business units increased efficiency; and
- **One communication strategy** and the extent to which it supported a more effective role and contribution of the UN system in the country.

The evaluation will assess the operational initiatives initiated and conducted within the DaO process since its inception. This should entail, all programme activities falling under the One Programme and also the extent of joint programming related to the implementation of the UNDAF more generally. The timeframe under evaluation should cover initiatives implemented since the initiation of the DaO in mid-2008. The emphasis of the evaluation is on the contribution of DaO to development results.

## 5. Evaluation Framework

This **formative evaluation** will assess the **relevance**, which includes the responsiveness to the needs and priorities on gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights of the countries as well as from UN conventions, resolutions and treaty bodies such as CEDAW Committee, etc.. It will assess **effectiveness**, which includes the implementation of better processes and production of development outputs including improved results on gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights, and when possible the assessment of development outcomes and impacts. Further it will assess **efficiency**, which includes the reduction of transaction costs for the countries and the increased collaboration and coordination of the UN system in achieving gender equality and human rights results. Finally it will assess the **sustainability** of the DaO initiatives, which includes the probability of long term benefits of continuing the approach over time and assessing the extent to which gender and human rights components of the One Programme have been integrated into government systems to ensure national ownership and strengthen capacities for results on these areas.

A utilization-focused evaluation methodology will be used to guide the identification of the specific evaluation issues and questions, and also the related tools, to make the evaluation a meaningful exercise for national stakeholders: the detailed list of issues and questions will be prepared during the inception phase.

In addition to the specific evaluation questions, the following questions could be canvassed to identify the contextual elements related to the DaO process which would also enable some analysis between the various pilot counties:

- What were the national political drivers for the country to become a DaO pilot?
- What was the UNCT environment and experience of joint work at the time of launching the process?
- To what extent have the findings and recommendations from the evaluability assessment been accepted and implemented?
- What is the progress made towards mainstreaming the RBM approach in the joint programming and joint programmes?
- Is there an M&E system that supports effectively the planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the One Operational Plan and the One Programme in particular?
- Have there been missed opportunities for the DaO process so far and if so, which?

## **6. Institutional Arrangements for the Evaluation**

### ***6.1. Evaluation Management Group***

The overall guidance for the evaluation will be provided by an Evaluation Management Group (EMG) which will consist of the two representatives from the Government of Cape Verde, a representative of the UN, a representative of the civil society, one One UN Fund donors, a representative of the private sector and two representatives of Academia. It will be chaired by the National Director of Policies Affairs and International Cooperation from the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation. The members of the EMG will commission the evaluation. The EMG will oversee the conduct of the evaluation and will meet at key points during the evaluation process. This involves participating in the design of the evaluation, managing the evaluation process, including the identification and selection of the evaluation team and assuring the evaluation process and the final product complies with the highest standards in evaluation. It will include the following activities: revising and approving this Terms of Reference (ToR), coordinating and managing the evaluation process and identifying an evaluation team. The EMG would be supported by a joint Secretariat (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the UN Resident Coordinator's Office).

To ensure the compliance of the country-led evaluation with international quality standards, the EMG will be supported by an external advisory panel. The panel will enhance the quality of the country-led evaluation by reviewing all deliverables, including terms of reference, inception reports, draft and final evaluation reports.

### ***6.2 Secretariat***

The Secretariat will be supporting EMG in the implementation of the evaluation. The Evaluation Secretariat will be co-chaired by the designated focal points from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the UN Resident Coordinator's Office with the administrative support of their respective offices. The responsibilities of the Secretariat are to:

- Support the implementation of the evaluation as defined by the EMG
- Act as liaison between the EMG and the evaluation team
- Manage the evaluation budget under the guidance of the EMG
- Support the selection process of the evaluation team
- Facilitate the work of the evaluation team by ensuring that all relevant information and contacts are available
- Coordinate stakeholder workshops in consultation with the evaluation team and other evaluation related meetings, with responsibility for: drafting the agendas, identifying materials for consultation and distribution and coordinating with participants
- Ensure the editing, publication and distribution of the evaluation report
- Perform any other technical and administrative duty as required

### **6.3 Evaluation Team**

The evaluation team will be led by two international and one national recognized evaluator, and will include technical expert in the area of development and management. The team should be able to read and communicate in Portuguese and be familiar with the context of Cape Verde, or a similar development context.

The team leader should have following qualifications:

- Master's degree in international development, public administration, social science, evaluation or related field
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in the field of evaluation of international development activities
- A track record of conducting various types of evaluations, including process, outcome and impact evaluations preferably in Cape Verde or at least in the West and Central African Region
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System and UN reform process
- Understanding of the development context of Cape Verde or of other DaO countries would be an advantage
- Excellent report writing skills

## **7. Methodology**

### **7.1. Evaluation Methods**

During the Inception phase, the team members will formulate in detail the methodology for the evaluation. The evaluation will be informed by the key methodological principles below:



- The evaluation is formative and forward looking and will focus on the process aspects of the DaO initiative;
- The evaluations will adopt a highly consultative, iterative and transparent approach with stakeholders, consistent with the utilization-focused approach to evaluation;
- Triangulation of information and data across groups of stakeholders and individuals will be the key method to validate evidence, throughout the whole evaluation process; and
- The evaluations will strictly adhere to the UN Evaluation Group Norms & Standards.

The evaluations will use a wide range of methods and tools, fine-tuned to the national context and to the evaluation questions and in consultation with the EMG. They will preferably include some or all of the following, among others:

- Evaluation matrix relating evaluation issues and questions to evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection (inception phase);
- Mapping exercise of the main focus areas of the DaO work (inception phase);
- Desk review of reference documents (inception and data collection phase);
- Individual and group interviews with representatives from Government, Donors, UN Agencies, UN Resident Coordinator's Office, UN M&E Reference Group, Programme Management Team, Operations Management Team, Communication Group, One Fund Administrative Agent, and other key stakeholders (both during inception and data collection phase);
- Checklists or semi-structured interview protocols for each type of interview;
- Establishment of historical causality: a time-line and narrative about the milestone events in the DaO process within the country (inception and data collection phase);
- Field observation and interviews with stakeholders at various levels (data collection phase);
- Thematic studies on specific areas of focus of the DaO process, as relevant and appropriate (data collection phase); and
- Debriefing session with the EMG.

## **8. Expected Deliverables**

The evaluation team is expected to produce the following deliverables (all in Portuguese and English):

- an inception report outlining the evaluation team's understanding of the issues under evaluation including an evaluation framework and a detailed work plan;
- a presentation with preliminary findings to be shared in a meeting of stakeholders and, following revisions with the EMG;

- a first draft report for circulation among EMG for quality assurance and identification of factual corrections from stakeholders;
- a final evaluation report and presentation.

The basic table of content for the final evaluation reports should include minimally i) an executive summary, ii) introduction and rationale, iii) evaluation methodology, iv) country context, v) findings, vi) conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and vii) annexes.

## 9. Phases and Timeframe

The indicative time schedule is reflected below. The evaluation should take approximately six months, beginning in Mars 2010 and be completed by mid July 2010. It will entail:

- *Establishing the EMG*: The institutional arrangements to conduct the evaluation should be in place before starting the evaluation process. This phase may take approximately one week (mid Mars).
- *Finalize the ToR*: The Terms of Reference should be reviewed and approved by the EMG (mid March).
- *Select independent evaluation team*: The selection of the evaluation team is a critical success factor in the evaluation process. The consultants need to have a proven track record of objective and impartial assessment with the capacity to provide constructive feedback to both, the national government and the UN. A short list should be circulated among members of the EMG and these should be rated and ranked according to mutually agreed criteria. This phase could take five to five weeks (completed by end of April).
- *Initiation of the evaluation and Inception Report*: The first deliverable of the evaluation team is an inception report. The inception report outlines the evaluation team's understanding of the issues to be addressed in the evaluation, the information available and the methods for data collection. It spells out the evaluation framework and a detailed work plan. This could take approximately one week after the evaluation team is hired and starts work (completed by 10-May).
- *Data collection*: The evaluation team will collect data through various means, including desk review, semi-structured interviews, focus group, surveys or field visits. This phase will be linkedged with the following one.
- *Stakeholder meeting on preliminary findings*: After the data collection is finalized, a stakeholder meeting should be organized to present and validate preliminary findings. Participants of the stakeholder meeting should include but not be limited to the people interviewed and all relevant stakeholders in the country. This systematization could be done in a couple of weeks (completed by mid-May).
- *Draft report*: After the stakeholder meeting the evaluation team should present a first draft report to the EMG. This will take two weeks (completed by 7-June).

- *Review of draft report:* The EMG sends the report to the stakeholders for factual corrections and comments to the evaluators (by mid-June).
- *Final report:* The evaluation team will update and finalize the report after receiving comments of the EMG (by end of June).
- *Approval of report:* EMG will review the report for approval (by beginning of July).
- *Publication of report:* After the report is received from the evaluation team, the EMG will send the report to print and make it available on public websites (by 18-July).

	<b>One Programme</b>	<b>One Leader</b>	<b>One Budget</b>	<b>One House</b>	<b>One Voice</b>
<b>Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did the new Programme respond to national priorities?</li> <li>• To what extent does the One Programme mainstream and reflect recommendations from UN conventions, resolutions and treaty bodies (e.g. CEDAW Committee, etc.), as well as national priorities on gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights?</li> <li>• To what extent has the One Programme design been based on a gender analysis and on a human rights analysis?</li> <li>• To what extent does the Government and the UNCT seek advice from across UN agencies on gender equality and human rights issues?</li> <li>• To what extent does the Government and the UNCT understand the linkages between environment and development and in which level they use this knowledge to influence the national development framework and UNDAF priorities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the leadership of the UN RC the most suitable way to represent the depth and breadth of the UN system?</li> <li>• To what extent is leadership in the RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO - able to represent the range of gender and human rights issues that are part of the normative framework of the UN system at country level?</li> <li>• To what extent is leadership in the RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO - to support national counterparts to develop their capacities to lead, manage, achieve and account for their national development priorities, especially related to the MDGs and internationally agreed development goals, as well as human rights obligations in ratified UN conventions and treaties.</li> <li>• To what extent is leadership in the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the One Budget proposal the most suitable way to enhance the financial administration of DAO?</li> <li>• To what extent is the One Budget proposal sufficient to address identified national priorities and needs regarding gender equality and human rights, as well as for gender mainstreaming within the UNCT?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the common support services and shared business units the most suitable way to enhance the administration of DAO?</li> <li>• To what extent do common support services and shared business units contribute to both the achievement gender and human rights results at the national level and enhanced working conditions/empowerment of women within the UN?</li> <li>• To what extent do the common premises accommodate diversified needs of various stakeholders (accessibility, information access, etc.)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is one communication strategy the most suitable way to explain the UN activities and the DAO approach?</li> <li>• Is the Communication Strategy of the DAO suitable for communicating and raising awareness of the work of the UN on gender and human rights at the national level?</li> </ul>

		<p>RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO - enhance the national development capacity development and ownership of national development strategies essential for achievement of internationally agreed development goals;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is leadership in the RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO- able to integrate capacity assessment into country-led efforts in designing and conduct capacity assessment(s) and interpret results to inform country frameworks, and feed into UNDAF preparation?</li> </ul>			
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the DAO process led to improved effectiveness and impact of operational initiatives for development?</li> <li>• Has there been any progress in mainstreaming the UN conventions and resolutions in the joint programming, including human rights, gender,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the UN RC leadership perceived as more effective than previous arrangements?</li> <li>• To what extent has the UN RC, as One Leader, been able to exercise enhanced authority, responsibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the one budget resulted in a more effective allocation and use of funds to the one programme components?</li> <li>• Has the configuration of the One Budget/One Fund progressed and how?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did common support services and shared business units increased the effectiveness of DAO in terms of achieving programme objectives?</li> <li>• What is the progress towards this objective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did one communication strategy support a more effective role and contribution of the UN system in the country?</li> <li>• Is the UN speaking with One Voice in a coherent way and is that one</li> </ul>

	<p>HIV/AIDS, etc, and if so, to what extent?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the one programme generated positive synergies and value added beyond the individual interventions to increase effectiveness?</li> <li>• Has the DAO process led to improved relationships between the national government and the UN agencies?</li> <li>• Has the DAO process progressed in the level of inclusiveness among UN agencies, on one hand, and national institutions, on the other and if so, how?</li> <li>• To what extent does the One Programme include specific gender equality and human rights outputs and outcomes?</li> <li>• Does the monitoring and evaluation framework include gender and human rights baseline, indicators and targets that ensure the collection of relevant and disaggregated data?</li> <li>• Is relevant and sex disaggregated data available on progress to the expected results of the One Programme?</li> <li>• To what extent have the One Programme</li> </ul>	<p>and accountability?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the firewall between UN RC and UNDP working?</li> <li>• Which actions would be required from UN HQ to further enhance the authority and accountability of the One Leader?</li> <li>• Has the RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO - provided leadership in setting gender equality and human rights priorities that provide a framework for coordinating the work of the UNCT?</li> <li>• Does the RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO - include gender equality and human rights advisors to advocate, lobby for and monitor the implementation of national commitments?</li> <li>• To what extent has the RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO - achieved gender parity and reflects diversity?</li> <li>• Does RC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have donors provided unearmarked and multi-year resources to the One Plan Fund in a timely manner?</li> <li>• To what extent have decision-making processes and mechanisms been put in place for gender responsive budgeting and to track subsequent budget allocations and expenditures on gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights?</li> <li>• Has the One Budget led to increased allocations for addressing gender and human rights?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main constraints, including in terms of resources?</li> <li>• Have common support services and shared business units led to the promulgation/ revision/ improvement of UN wide work/life, family friendly and sexual harassment policies and procedures? Have these been effectively implemented to improve working conditions for women and to achieve gender parity?</li> <li>• Has the facility been rendered gender-sensitive, e.g. creation of breast-feeding room, appropriate and sufficient toilets, child care, security, lighting at night, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>voice manifest in the one programme"?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is the UNCT speaking with one voice in a consistent and coordinated manner regarding gender equality and women's empowerment and human rights</li> <li>• How effective has One Voice been in reaching stakeholders otherwise not accessible, such as women from excluded groups, and providing new opportunities for advocacy and the promotion of gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights issues within the country?</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--	---	---

	<p>processes (through better coordination and use of comparative advantages of the UNCT) led to improved results on gender equality, women’s empowerment and human rights at the country level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has One Programme led to greater influence and improved capacity of gender focal points and UNCT the Gender Theme Group? To what extent the One Programme supported the national capacities of gender advocates?</li> <li>• To what extent has the UNCT responded to support national priorities on gender equality and human rights?</li> <li>• To what extent has the UNCT, by the UN-supported programmes and projects, anticipate environmental opportunities and constraints as early as possible;</li> <li>• To what extent are the RBM accountability and transparency to sound management of the UN local development system?</li> </ul>	<p>participate in the gender theme group or does he/she appoint any senior staff to head the group?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the performance of the RC/UNCT - with the support of the RCO - on the promotion of gender equality, women’s empowerment and human rights been monitored and assessed?</li> <li>• To what extent has the performance of the UNCT Support stakeholders to track progress towards their national environmental goals, MDG7 goals, targets, and indicators</li> <li>• To what extent the contribution of the UN enhance the national capacity development and development effectiveness?</li> <li>• To what extent has the UN RC, as One Leader, been able to use performance information for management decision-making</li> </ul>			
--	---	---	--	--	--

		and to align UNCT and government resources for greater effectiveness?			
<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the DAO process led to improved efficiency and impact of operational initiatives for development?</li> <li>• To what extent has the one programme generated positive synergies and value added beyond the individual interventions to increase efficiency?</li> <li>• Has the DAO process led to reduced transaction costs for the national government and the UN?</li> <li>• To what extent has the One Programme led to increased collaboration and coordination of the UN system in achieving gender equality and human rights results?</li> <li>• Does the one programme initiate any point programme and or joint programming on promoting gender equality?</li> <li>• Does the division of activities under the One Programme accurately reflect agencies' technical competency on gender and human rights, particularly in joint programmes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the one leader taken leadership and ensured efficiency gains from the harmonization of the programme, budget, office and voice?</li> <li>• To what extent has the one leader ensure that development processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (outputs, outcomes and impacts)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) been implemented?</li> <li>• To what extent have the Cost Norms been harmonized among UN Agencies and with Government and donors and has this led to efficiency gains?</li> <li>• Does enhanced and coordinated financial administration lead to improved results on gender and human rights?</li> <li>• Does the UN country team have a joint or pooled budgetary scheme for supporting gender equality and capacity development of women?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did common support services and shared business units increased the efficiency of DAO?</li> <li>• Has there been any progress in the definition and calculation of transaction costs of the collaboration through DAO for both the Government and the UN?</li> <li>• Does the UN building barrier-free and fully accessible for pregnant women, disabled persons and the elderly, and does it meet the national building code in this regard?</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the one programme initiate facilitate the UN local capacity to create and report on a specific, measurable, achievable and time-bound results framework to measure capacity-building initiatives?</li> </ul>				
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the one programme been integrated into government systems to ensure ownership and sustainability of capacities developed/strengthened or results achieved?</li> <li>• To what extent has the gender and human rights components of the One Programme been integrated into government systems to ensure national ownership and strengthen capacities for results on these areas?</li> <li>• To what extent do the national women's machinery and other gender and human rights stakeholders attend and substantively participate in the national planning processes, the development of One Programme and other UN planning processes and the monitoring commitments on gender equality and human rights in joint programmes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the RCO's capacity to address gender equality and human rights improved?</li> <li>• For reaching the target of 50% - 50%, To what extent has improved gender parity/composition of the RCO influenced improvements in UNCTs?</li> <li>• To what extent has the RCO's adopted the RBM approach as a management strategy that rests on clearly defined accountability for results, and requires monitoring and self assessment of progress towards results, and reporting on performance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the UN RC ultimate authority on the allocation of resources from the OPF?</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the One Programme strengthened the capacities of national actors/rights holders on gender equality and human rights, particularly women belonging to groups subject to multiple discriminations?</li> <li>• To what extent do structures and machinery ensure the systematic incorporation of gender and human rights components into the One Programme?</li> <li>• To what extent does the Government and the UNCT screening for environment during country analysis to get a rapid understanding of any critical environmental issues, how they relate to national development priorities, and how well the country has been able to set and monitor context specific targets for environmental sustainability</li> </ul>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Technical Evaluation Criteria**

			<b>Company / Other Entity</b>
--	--	--	-------------------------------

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
				A	B	C	D	E
1.	Expertise of Firm / Organization submitting Proposal	30%	240					
2.	Proposed Work Plan and Approach	50%	400					
3.	Personnel	20%	160					
<b>Total</b>			<b>800</b>					

Evaluation forms for technical proposals follow on the next two pages. The obtainable number of points specified for each evaluation criterion indicates the relative significance or weight of the item in the overall evaluation process. The Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms are:

Form 1: Expertise of Firm / Organisation Submitting Proposal

Form 2: Proposed Work Plan and Approach

Form 3: Personnel

Note: The score weights and points obtainable in the evaluation sheet are tentative and should be changed depending on the need or major attributes of technical proposal.

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 1		Points obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
Expertise of firm / organization submitting proposal							
1.1	Reputation of Organization and Staff (Competence / Reliability)	40					
1.2	Litigation and Arbitration history	15					
1.3	General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation (i.e. loose consortium, holding company or one firm, size of the firm / organization, strength of project management support e.g. project financing capacity and project management controls)	35					
1.4	Extent to which any work would be subcontracted (subcontracting carries additional risks which may affect project implementation, but properly done it offers a chance to access specialised skills.	15					
1.5	Quality assurance procedures, warranty	25					
1.6	Relevance of: - Specialised Knowledge - Experience on Similar Programme / Projects	110					

	- Experience on Projects in the Region Work for UNDP/ major multilateral/ or bilateral programmes						
<b>Total Part 1</b>		<b>240</b>					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 2		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
Proposed Work Plan and Approach							
2.1	To what degree does the Offeror understand the task?	30					
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	25					
2.3	Are the different components of the project adequately weighted relative to one another?	20					
2.4	Is the proposal based on a survey of the project environment and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposal?	55					
2.5	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task?	65					
2.6	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	120					
2.7	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?	85					
<b>Total Part 2</b>		<b>400</b>					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Task Manager</b>	<b>80</b>					
	Sub-Score						
	General Qualification	65					
	Suitability for the Project						
	- International Experience	10					
	- Training Experience	10					
	- Professional Experience in the area of specialisation	35					
	- Knowledge of the region	10					
	- Language Qualifications	15					
		80					
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Senior Expert</b>	<b>60</b>					
	Sub-Score						
	General Qualification	50					
	Suitability for the Project						

	- International Experience	5							
	- Training Experience	5							
	- Professional Experience in the area of specialisation	35							
	- Knowledge of the region	5							
	- Language Qualifications		10						
			60						
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Junior Expert</b>			<b>20</b>					
			Sub-Score						
	General Qualification		15						
	Suitability for the Project								
	- International Experience	5							
	- Training Experience	0							
	- Professional Experience in the area of specialisation	10							
	- Knowledge of the region	0							
	- Language Qualification		5						
			20						
<b>Total Part 3</b>				160					

Updated 06 April 2010

	Key Activities	M	A	M	J	J	Responsible Parties
1	Country specific ToR (CSTOR) of the Evaluation (first version)	15					Secretariat
2	ToR for EMG members	20					Secretariat
3	CSTOR submitted to Quality Assurance Panel (QAP)	22					Secretariat
4	First comments received from QAP and included in CSTOR	22					QAP
5	Advertising in websites and newspapers	24	20				Secretariat
6	Second Comments received from QAP and included in CSTOR		1-6				QAP
7	Establishment of EMG members		16				EMG
8	Reception of Bidding Proposals		20				Secretariat
9	Opening of bidding proposals		21				EMG/ QAP
10	Selection of evaluation team (First EMG Meeting)		21-26				EMG/ QAP
11	Initiation of the evaluation and <b>Inception Report</b> is due			1-10			Evaluation team
12	Data collection			1-10			Evaluation team
13	Stakeholder meeting on preliminary findings			13			Evaluation team
14	<b>Draft report due</b>				7		Evaluation team
15	<b>Hanoi meeting</b>				14-16		
16	Review of draft report (Second EMG Meeting)				17		EMG/ QAP
17	<b>Final report due</b>				21		Evaluation team
18	Approval of report (Third EMG meeting)					4	EMG/ QAP
19	Public Official Presentation of Report					18	EMG/ QAP and Evaluation team

Done



Process



Deliverables



Meetings

