

Section 2: Instruction to Proposers¹

Definitions

- a) “*Contract*” refers to the agreement that will be signed by and between the UNDP and the successful proposer, all the attached documents thereto, including the General Terms and Conditions (GTC) and the Appendices.
- b) “*Country*” refers to the country indicated in the Data Sheet.
- c) “*Data Sheet*” refers to such part of the Instructions to Proposers used to reflect conditions of the tendering process that are specific for the requirements of the RFP.
- d) “*Day*” refers to calendar day.
- e) “*Government*” refers to the Government of the country that will be receiving the services provided/rendered specified under the Contract.
- f) “*Instructions to Proposers*” (Section 2 of the RFP) refers to the complete set of documents that provides Proposers with all information needed and procedures to be followed in the course of preparing their Proposals
- g) “*LOI*” (Section 1 of the RFP) refers to the Letter of Invitation sent by UNDP to Proposers.
- h) “*Material Deviation*” refers to any contents or characteristics of the proposal that is significantly different from an essential aspect or requirement of the RFP, and : (i) substantially alters the scope and quality of the requirements; (ii) limits the rights of UNDP and/or the obligations of the offeror; and (iii) adversely impacts the fairness and principles of the procurement process, such as those that compromise the competitive position of other offerors.
- i) “*Proposal*” refers to the Proposer’s response to the Request for Proposal, including the Proposal Submission Form, Technical and Financial Proposal and all other documentation attached thereto as required by the RFP.
- j) “*Proposer*” refers to any legal entity that may submit, or has submitted, a Proposal for the provision of services requested by UNDP through this RFP.
- k) “*RFP*” refers to the Request for Proposals consisting of instructions and references prepared by UNDP for purposes of selecting the best service provider to perform the services described in the Terms of Reference.
- l) “*Services*” refers to the entire scope of tasks and deliverables requested by UNDP under the RFP.
- m) “*Supplemental Information to the RFP*” refers to a written communication issued by UNDP to prospective Proposers containing clarifications, responses to queries received from prospective

¹ Note: this Section 2 - Instructions to Proposers shall not be modified in any way. Any necessary changes to address specific country and project information, shall be introduced only through the Data Sheet..

Proposers, or changes to be made in the RFP, at any time after the release of the RFP but before the deadline for the submission of Proposals.

- n) *“Terms of Reference”* (TOR) refers to the document included in this RFP as Section 3 which describes the objectives, scope of services, activities, tasks to be performed, respective responsibilities of the proposer, expected results and deliverables and other data pertinent to the performance of the range of duties and services expected of the successful proposer.

A. GENERAL

1. UNDP hereby solicits Proposals in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP). Proposers must strictly adhere to all the requirements of this RFP. No changes, substitutions or other alterations to the rules and provisions stipulated in this RFP may be made or assumed unless it is instructed or approved in writing by UNDP in the form of Supplemental Information to the RFP.
2. Submission of a Proposal shall be deemed as an acknowledgement by the Proposer that all obligations stipulated by this RFP will be met and, unless specified otherwise, the Proposer has read, understood and agreed to all the instructions in this RFP.
3. Any Proposal submitted will be regarded as an offer by the Proposer and does not constitute or imply the acceptance of any Proposal by UNDP. UNDP is under no obligation to award a contract to any Proposer as a result of this RFP.
4. UNDP implements a policy of zero tolerance on proscribed practices, including fraud, corruption, collusion, unethical practices, and obstruction. UNDP is committed to preventing, identifying and addressing all acts of fraud and corrupt practices against UNDP as well as third parties involved in UNDP activities. (See http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Transparency/UNDP_Anti_Fraud_Policy_English_FINAL_june_2011.pdf and <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/protestandsanctions/> for full description of the policies)
5. In responding to this RFP, UNDP requires all Proposers to conduct themselves in a professional, objective and impartial manner, and they must at all times hold UNDP’s interests paramount. Proposers must strictly avoid conflicts with other assignments or their own interests, and act without consideration for future work. All Proposers found to have a conflict of interest shall be disqualified. Without limitation on the generality of the above, Proposers, and any of their affiliates, shall be considered to have a conflict of interest with one or more parties in this solicitation process, if they:
 - 5.1 Are or have been associated in the past, with a firm or any of its affiliates which have been engaged UNDP to provide services for the preparation of the design, specifications, Terms of Reference, cost analysis/estimation, and other documents to be used for the procurement of the goods and services in this selection process;
 - 5.2 Were involved in the preparation and/or design of the programme/project related to the services requested under this RFP; or
 - 5.3 Are found to be in conflict for any other reason, as may be established by, or at the discretion of, UNDP.

In the event of any uncertainty in the interpretation of what is potentially a conflict of interest, proposers must disclose the condition to UNDP and seek UNDP's confirmation on whether or not such conflict exists.

6. Similarly, the Proposers must disclose in their proposal their knowledge of the following:
 - 6.1 That they are owners, part-owners, officers, directors, controlling shareholders, or they have key personnel who are family of UNDP staff involved in the procurement functions and/or the Government of the country or any Implementing Partner receiving services under this RFP; and
 - 6.2 All other circumstances that could potentially lead to actual or perceived conflict of interest, collusion or unfair competition practices.

Failure of such disclosure may result in the rejection of the proposal or proposals affected by the non-disclosure.

7. The eligibility of Proposers that are wholly or partly owned by the Government shall be subject to UNDP's further evaluation and review of various factors such as being registered as an independent entity, the extent of Government ownership/share, receipt of subsidies, mandate, access to information in relation to this RFP, and others that may lead to undue advantage against other Proposers, and the eventual rejection of the Proposal.
8. All Proposers must adhere to the UNDP Supplier Code of Conduct, which may be found at this link: http://www.un.org/depts/ptd/pdf/conduct_english.pdf

B. CONTENTS OF PROPOSAL

9. Sections of Proposal

Proposers are required to complete, sign and submit the following documents:

- 9.1 Proposal Submission Cover Letter Form (see RFP Section 4);
- 9.2 Documents Establishing the Eligibility and Qualifications of the Proposer (see RFP Section 5);
- 9.3 Technical Proposal (see prescribed form in RFP Section 6);
- 9.4 Financial Proposal (see prescribed form in RFP Section 7);
- 9.5 Any attachments and/or appendices to the Proposal.

10. Clarification of Proposal

- 10.1 Proposers may request clarifications of any of the RFP documents no later than the date indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 16) prior to the proposal submission date. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing via courier or through electronic means to the UNDP address indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 17). UNDP will respond in writing, transmitted by electronic means and will transmit copies of the response (including an explanation of the query but without identifying the source of inquiry) to all Proposers who have provided confirmation of their intention to submit a Proposal.
- 10.2 UNDP shall endeavor to provide such responses to clarifications in an expeditious manner,

but any delay in such response shall not cause an obligation on the part of UNDP to extend the submission date of the Proposals, unless UNDP deems that such an extension is justified and necessary.

11. Amendment of Proposals

- 11.1 At any time prior to the deadline of Proposal submission, UNDP may for any reason, such as in response to a clarification requested by a Proposer, modify the RFP in the form of a Supplemental Information to the RFP. All prospective Proposers will be notified in writing of all changes/amendments and additional instructions through Supplemental Information to the RFP and through the method specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS No. 18).
- 11.2 In order to afford prospective Proposers reasonable time to consider the amendments in preparing their Proposals, UNDP may, at its discretion, extend the deadline for submission of Proposals, if the nature of the amendment to the RFP justifies such an extension.

C. PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS

12. Cost

The Proposer shall bear any and all costs related to the preparation and/or submission of the Proposal, regardless of whether its Proposal was selected or not. UNDP shall in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the procurement process.

13. Language

The Proposal, as well as any and all related correspondence exchanged by the Proposer and UNDP, shall be written in the language (s) specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS No 4). Any printed literature furnished by the Proposer written in a language other than the language indicated in the **Data Sheet**, must be accompanied by a translation in the preferred language indicated in the **Data Sheet**. For purposes of interpretation of the Proposal, and in the event of discrepancy or inconsistency in meaning, the version translated into the preferred language shall govern. Upon conclusion of a contract, the language of the contract shall govern the relationship between the contractor and UNDP.

14. Proposal Submission Form

The Proposer shall submit the Proposal Submission Form using the form provided in Section 4 of this RFP.

15. Technical Proposal Format and Content

Unless otherwise stated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 28), the Proposer shall structure the Technical Proposal as follows:

- 15.1 Expertise of Firm/Organization – this section should provide details regarding management structure of the organization, organizational capability/resources, and experience of organization/firm, the list of projects/contracts (both completed and on-going, both

domestic and international) which are related or similar in nature to the requirements of the RFP, and proof of financial stability and adequacy of resources to complete the services required by the RFP (see RFP clause 18 and DS No. 26 for further details). The same shall apply to any other entity participating in the RFP as a Joint Venture or Consortium.

- 15.2 Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan – this section should demonstrate the Proposer’s response to the Terms of Reference by identifying the specific components proposed, how the requirements shall be addressed, as specified, point by point; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics proposed; identifying the works/portions of the work that will be subcontracted; and demonstrating how the proposed methodology meets or exceeds the specifications, while ensuring appropriateness of the approach to the local conditions and the rest of the project operating environment. This methodology must be laid out in an implementation timetable that is within the duration of the contract as specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS nos. 29 and 30).

Proposers must be fully aware that the products or services that UNDP requires may be transferred, immediately or eventually, by UNDP to the Government partners, or to an entity nominated by the latter, in accordance with UNDP’s policies and procedures. All proposers are therefore required to submit the following in their proposals:

- a) A statement of whether any import or export licences are required in respect of the goods to be purchased or services to be rendered, including any restrictions in the country of origin, use or dual use nature of the goods or services, including any disposition to end users; and
- b) Confirmation that the Proposer has obtained license of this nature in the past, and have an expectation of obtaining all the necessary licenses, should their Proposal be rendered the most responsive.

- 15.3 Management Structure and Key Personnel – This section should include the comprehensive curriculum vitae (CVs) of key personnel that will be assigned to support the implementation of the proposed methodology, clearly defining the roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the proposed methodology. CVs should establish competence and demonstrate qualifications in areas relevant to the TOR.

In complying with this section, the Proposer assures and confirms to UNDP that the personnel being nominated are available for the Contract on the dates proposed. If any of the key personnel later becomes unavailable, except for unavoidable reasons such as death or medical incapacity, among other possibilities, UNDP reserves the right to consider the proposal non-responsive. Any deliberate substitution arising from unavoidable reasons, including delay in the implementation of the project of programme through no fault of the Proposer shall be made only with UNDP’s acceptance of the justification for substitution, and UNDP’s approval of the qualification of the replacement who shall be either of equal or superior credentials as the one being replaced.

- 15.4 Where the **Data Sheet** requires the submission of the Proposal Security, the Proposal Security shall be included along with the Technical Proposal. The Proposal Security may be forfeited by UNDP, and reject the Proposal, in the event of any or any combination of the following conditions:

- a) If the Proposer withdraws its offer during the period of the Proposal Validity specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 11), or;
- b) If the Proposal Security amount is found to be less than what is required by UNDP as indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 9), or;
- c) In the case the successful Proposer fails:
 - i. to sign the Contract after UNDP has awarded it;
 - ii. to comply with UNDP's variation of requirement, as per RFP clause 35; or
 - iii. to furnish Performance Security, insurances, or other documents that UNDP may require as a condition to rendering the effectivity of the contract that may be awarded to the Proposer.

16. Financial Proposals

The Financial Proposal shall be prepared using the attached standard form (Section 7). It shall list all major cost components associated with the services, and the detailed breakdown of such costs. All outputs and activities described in the Technical Proposal must be priced separately on a one-to-one correspondence. Any output and activities described in the Technical Proposal but not priced in the Financial Proposal, shall be assumed to be included in the prices of other activities or items, as well as in the final total price.

17. Currencies

All prices shall be quoted in the currency indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 15). However, where Proposals are quoted in different currencies, for the purposes of comparison of all Proposals:

- a) UNDP will convert the currency quoted in the Proposal into the UNDP preferred currency, in accordance with the prevailing UN operational rate of exchange on the last day of submission of Proposals; and
- b) In the event that the proposal found to be the most responsive to the RFP requirement is quoted in another currency different from the preferred currency as per **Data Sheet** (DS no. 15), then UNDP shall reserve the right to award the contract in the currency of UNDP's preference, using the conversion method specified above.

Proposals submitted by two (2) or more Proposers shall all be rejected if they are found to have any of the following :

- a) they have at least one controlling partner, director or shareholder in common; or
- b) any one of them receive or have received any direct or indirect subsidy from the other/s; or
- c) they have the same legal representative for purposes of this RFP; or
- d) they have a relationship with each other, directly or through common third parties, that puts them in a position to have access to information about, or influence on the Proposal of, another Proposer regarding this RFP process;
- e) they are subcontractors to each other's Proposal, or a subcontractor to one Proposal also submits another Proposal under its name as lead Proposer; or
- f) an expert proposed to be in the team of one Proposer participates in more than one Proposal received for this RFP process. This condition does not apply to subcontractors being included in more than one Proposal.

18. Documents Establishing the Eligibility and Qualifications of the Proposer

The Proposer shall furnish documentary evidence of its status as an eligible and qualified vendor, using the forms provided under Section 5, Proposer Information Forms. In order to award a contract to a Proposer, its qualifications must be documented to UNDP's satisfaction. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a) That, in the case of a Proposer offering to supply goods under the Contract which the Proposer did not manufacture or otherwise produce, the Proposer has been duly authorized by the goods' manufacturer or producer to supply the goods in the country of final destination;
- b) That the Proposer has the financial, technical, and production capability necessary to perform the Contract; and
- c) That, to the best of the Proposer's knowledge, it is not included in the UN 1267/1989 List or the UN Ineligibility List, nor in any and all of UNDP's list of suspended and removed vendors.

19. Joint Venture, Consortium or Association

If the Proposer is a group of legal entities that will form or have formed a joint venture, consortium or association at the time of the submission of the Proposal, they shall confirm in their Proposal that : (i) they have designated one party to act as a lead entity, duly vested with authority to legally bind the members of the joint venture jointly and severally, and this shall be duly evidenced by a duly notarized Agreement among the legal entities, which shall be submitted along with the Proposal; and (ii) if they are awarded the contract, the contract shall be entered into, by and between UNDP and the designated lead entity, who shall be acting for and on behalf of all the member entities comprising the joint venture.

After the Proposal has been submitted to UNDP, the lead entity identified to represent the joint venture shall not be altered without the prior written consent of UNDP. Furthermore, neither the lead entity nor the member entities of the joint venture can:

- a) Submit another proposal, either in its own capacity; nor
- b) As a lead entity or a member entity for another joint venture submitting another Proposal.

The description of the organization of the joint venture/consortium/association must clearly define the expected role of each of the entity in the joint venture in delivering the requirements of the RFP, both in the Proposal and the Joint Venture Agreement. All entities that comprise the joint venture shall be subject to the eligibility and qualification assessment by UNDP.

Where a joint venture is presenting its track record and experience in a similar undertaking as those required in the RFP, it should present such information in the following manner:

- a) Those that were undertaken together by the joint venture; and
- b) Those that were undertaken by the individual entities of the joint venture expected to be involved in the performance of the services defined in the RFP.

Previous contracts completed by individual experts working privately but who are permanently or were temporarily associated with any of the member firms cannot be claimed as the experience of the joint venture or those of its members, but should only be claimed by the individual experts themselves in their presentation of their individual credentials.

If a joint venture's Proposal is determined by UNDP as the most responsive Proposal that offers the best value for money, UNDP shall award the contract to the joint venture, in the name of its designated lead entity. The lead entity shall sign the contract for and on behalf of all other member entities.

20. Alternative Proposals

Unless otherwise specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS nos. 5 and 6), alternative proposals shall not be considered. Where the conditions for its acceptance are met, or justifications are clearly established, UNDP reserves the right to award a contract based on an alternative proposal.

21. Validity Period

Proposals shall remain valid for the period specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 8), commencing on the submission deadline date also indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 21). A Proposal valid for a shorter period shall be immediately rejected by UNDP and rendered non-responsive.

In exceptional circumstances, prior to the expiration of the proposal validity period, UNDP may request Proposers to extend the period of validity of their Proposals. The request and the responses shall be made in writing, and shall be considered integral to the Proposal.

22. Proposer's Conference

When appropriate, a proposer's conference will be conducted at the date, time and location specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 7). All Proposers are encouraged to attend. Non-attendance, however, shall not result in disqualification of an interested Proposer. Minutes of the proposer's conference will be either posted on the UNDP website, or disseminated to the individual firms who have registered or expressed interest with the contract, whether or not they attended the conference. No verbal statement made during the conference shall modify the terms and conditions of the RFP unless such statement is specifically written in the Minutes of the Conference, or issued/posted as an amendment in the form of a Supplemental Information to the RFP.

D. SUBMISSION AND OPENING OF PROPOSALS

23. Submission

23.1 The Financial Proposal and the Technical Proposal Envelopes MUST BE COMPLETELY SEPARATE and each of them must be submitted sealed individually and clearly marked on the outside as either "TECHNICAL PROPOSAL" or "FINANCIAL PROPOSAL", as appropriate. Each envelope MUST clearly indicate the name of the Proposer. The outer envelopes shall bear the address of UNDP as specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS no.20) and shall include the Proposer's name and address, as well as a warning that state "*not to be opened before the time and date for proposal opening*" as specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 24). The Proposer shall assume the responsibility for the misplacement or premature opening of Proposals due to improper sealing and labeling by the Proposer.

23.2 Proposers must submit their Proposals in the manner specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS nos. 22 and 23). When the Proposals are expected to be in transit for more than 24 hours, the

Proposer must ensure that sufficient lead time has been provided in order to comply with UNDP's deadline for submission. UNDP shall indicate for its record that the official date and time of receiving the Proposal is the actual date and time when the said Proposal has physically arrived at the UNDP premises indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 20).

- 23.3 Proposers submitting Proposals by mail or by hand shall enclose the original and each copy of the Proposal, in separate sealed envelopes, duly marking each of the envelopes as "Original Proposal" and "Copy of Proposal" as appropriate. The 2 envelopes shall then be sealed in an outer envelope. The number of copies required shall be as specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS No. 19). In the event of any discrepancy between the contents of the "Original Proposal" and the "Copy of Proposal", the contents of the original shall govern. The original version of the Proposal shall be signed or initialed by the Proposer or person(s) duly authorized to commit the Proposer on every page. The authorization shall be communicated through a document evidencing such authorization issued by the highest official of the firm, or a Power of Attorney, accompanying the Proposal.
- 23.4 Proposers must be aware that the mere act of submission of a Proposal, in and of itself, implies that the Proposer accepts the General Contract Terms and Conditions of UNDP as attached hereto as Section 11.

24. Deadline for Submission of Proposals and Late Proposals

Proposals must be received by UNDP at the address and no later than the date and time specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS nos. 20 and 21).

UNDP shall not consider any Proposal that arrives after the deadline for submission of Proposals. Any Proposal received by UNDP after the deadline for submission of Proposals shall be declared late, rejected, and returned unopened to the Proposer.

25. Withdrawal, Substitution, and Modification of Proposals

- 25.1 Proposers are expected to have sole responsibility for taking steps to carefully examine in detail the full consistency of its Proposals to the requirements of the RFP, keeping in mind that material deficiencies in providing information requested by UNDP, or lack clarity in the description of services to be provided, may result in the rejection of the Proposal. The Proposer shall assume the responsibility regarding erroneous interpretations or conclusions made by the Proposer in the course of understanding the RFP out of the set of information furnished by UNDP.
- 25.2 A Proposer may withdraw, substitute or modify its Proposal after it has been submitted by sending a written notice in accordance with Clause 23.1, duly signed by an authorized representative, and shall include a copy of the authorization (or a Power of Attorney). The corresponding substitution or modification of the Proposal must accompany the respective written notice. All notices must be received by UNDP prior to the deadline for submission and submitted in accordance with RFP Clause 23.1 (except that withdrawal notices do not require copies). The respective envelopes shall be clearly marked "WITHDRAWAL," "SUBSTITUTION," or "MODIFICATION".
- 25.3 Proposals requested to be withdrawn shall be returned unopened to the Proposers.

25.4 No Proposal may be withdrawn, substituted, or modified in the interval between the deadline for submission of Proposals and the expiration of the period of proposal validity specified by the Proposer on the Proposal Submission Form or any extension thereof.

26. Proposal Opening

UNDP will open the Proposals in the presence of an ad-hoc committee formed by UNDP of at least two (2) members. If electronic submission is permitted, any specific electronic proposal opening procedures shall be as specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 23).

The Proposers' names, modifications, withdrawals, the condition of the envelope labels/seals, the number of folders/files and all other such other details as UNDP may consider appropriate, will be announced at the opening. No Proposal shall be rejected at the opening stage, except for late submission, for which the Proposal shall be returned unopened to the Proposer.

27. Confidentiality

Information relating to the examination, evaluation, and comparison of Proposals, and the recommendation of contract award, shall not be disclosed to Proposers or any other persons not officially concerned with such process, even after publication of the contract award.

Any effort by a Proposer to influence UNDP in the examination, evaluation and comparison of the Proposals or contract award decisions may, at UNDP's decision, result in the rejection of its Proposal.

In the event that a Proposer is unsuccessful, the Proposer may seek a meeting with UNDP for a debriefing. The purpose of the debriefing is discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the Proposer's submission, in order to assist the Proposer in improving the proposals presented to UNDP. The content of other proposals and how they compare to the Proposer's submission shall not be discussed.

E. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

28. Preliminary Examination of Proposals

UNDP shall examine the Proposals to determine whether they are complete with respect to minimum documentary requirements, whether the documents have been properly signed, whether or not the Proposer is in the UN Security Council 1267/1989 Committee's list of terrorists and terrorist financiers, and in UNDP's list of suspended and removed vendors, and whether the Proposals are generally in order, among other indicators that may be used at this stage. UNDP may reject any Proposal at this stage.

29. Evaluation of Proposals

29.1 UNDP shall examine the Proposal to confirm that all terms and conditions under the UNDP General Terms and Conditions and Special Conditions have been accepted by the Proposer without any deviation or reservation.

29.2 The evaluation team shall review and evaluate the Technical Proposals on the basis of their

responsiveness to the Terms of Reference and other documentation provided, applying the evaluation criteria, sub-criteria, and point system specified in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 32). Each responsive Proposal will be given a technical score. A Proposal shall be rendered non-responsive at this stage if it does not substantially respond to the RFP particularly the demands of the Terms of Reference, which also means that it fails to achieve the minimum technical score indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 25). Absolutely no changes may be made by UNDP in the criteria, sub-criteria and point system indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 32) after all Proposals have been received.

29.3 In the second stage, only the Financial Proposals of those Proposers who achieve the minimum technical score will be opened for evaluation for comparison and review. The Financial Proposal Envelopes corresponding to Proposals that did not meet the minimum passing technical score shall be returned to the Proposer unopened. The overall evaluation score will be based either on a combination of the technical score and the financial offer, or the lowest evaluated financial proposal of the technically qualified Proposers. The evaluation method that applies for this RFP shall be as indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS No. 25).

When the Data Sheet specifies a combined scoring method, the formula for the rating of the Proposals will be as follows:

<p><u>Rating the Technical Proposal (TP):</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">TP Rating = (Total Score Obtained by the Offer / Max. Obtainable Score for TP) x 100</p> <p><u>Rating the Financial Proposal (FP):</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">FP Rating = (Lowest Priced Offer / Price of the Offer Being Reviewed) x 100</p> <p><u>Total Combined Score:</u></p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 10px;"> $\frac{\begin{aligned} &(\text{TP Rating}) \times (\text{Weight of TP, e.g. 70\%}) \\ &+ (\text{FP Rating}) \times (\text{Weight of FP, e.g., 30\%}) \end{aligned}}{\text{Total Combined and Final Rating of the Proposal}}$ </div>

29.4 UNDP reserves the right to undertake a post-qualification exercise aimed at determining, to its satisfaction the validity of the information provided by the Proposer. Such post-qualification shall be fully documented and, among those that may be listed in the **Data Sheet** (DS No.33), may include, but need not be limited to, all or any combination of the following :

- a) Verification of accuracy, correctness and authenticity of information provided by the Proposer on the legal, technical and financial documents submitted;
- b) Validation of extent of compliance to the RFP requirements and evaluation criteria based on what has so far been found by the evaluation team;
- c) Inquiry and reference checking with Government entities with jurisdiction on the Proposer, or any other entity that may have done business with the Proposer;
- d) Inquiry and reference checking with other previous clients on the quality of performance

- on ongoing or previous contracts completed;
- e) Physical inspection of the Proposer's offices, branches or other places where business transpires, with or without notice to the Proposer;
- f) Quality assessment of ongoing and completed outputs, works and activities similar to the requirements of UNDP, where available; and
- g) Other means that UNDP may deem appropriate, at any stage within the selection process, prior to awarding the contract.

30. Clarification of Proposals

To assist in the examination, evaluation and comparison of Proposals, UNDP may, at its discretion, ask any Proposer for a clarification of its Proposal.

UNDP's request for clarification and the response shall be in writing. Notwithstanding the written communication, no change in the prices or substance of the Proposal shall be sought, offered, or permitted, except to provide clarification, and confirm the correction of any arithmetic errors discovered by UNDP in the evaluation of the Proposals, in accordance with RFP Clause 32.

Any unsolicited clarification submitted by a Proposer in respect to its Proposal, which is not a response to a request by UNDP, shall not be considered during the review and evaluation of the Proposals.

31. Responsiveness of Proposal

UNDP's determination of a Proposal's responsiveness will be based on the contents of the Proposal itself.

A substantially responsive Proposal is one that conforms to all the terms, conditions, TOR and other requirements of the RFP without material deviation, reservation, or omission.

If a Proposal is not substantially responsive, it shall be rejected by UNDP and may not subsequently be made responsive by the Proposer by correction of the material deviation, reservation, or omission.

32. Nonconformities, Repairable Errors and Omissions

Provided that a Proposal is substantially responsive, UNDP may waive any non-conformities or omissions in the Proposal that, in the opinion of UNDP, do not constitute a material deviation.

Provided that a Proposal is substantially responsive, UNDP may request the Proposer to submit the necessary information or documentation, within a reasonable period of time, to rectify nonmaterial nonconformities or omissions in the Proposal related to documentation requirements. Such omission shall not be related to any aspect of the price of the Proposal. Failure of the Proposer to comply with the request may result in the rejection of its Proposal.

Provided that the Proposal is substantially responsive, UNDP shall correct arithmetical errors as follows:

- a) if there is a discrepancy between the unit price and the line item total that is obtained by multiplying the unit price by the quantity, the unit price shall prevail and the line item total

shall be corrected, unless in the opinion of UNDP there is an obvious misplacement of the decimal point in the unit price, in which case the line item total as quoted shall govern and the unit price shall be corrected;

- b) if there is an error in a total corresponding to the addition or subtraction of subtotals, the subtotals shall prevail and the total shall be corrected; and
- c) if there is a discrepancy between words and figures, the amount in words shall prevail, unless the amount expressed in words is related to an arithmetic error, in which case the amount in figures shall prevail subject to the above.

If the Proposer does not accept the correction of errors made by UNDP, its Proposal shall be rejected.

F. AWARD OF CONTRACT

33. Right to Accept, Reject, or Render Non-Responsive Any or All Proposals

UNDP reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal, to render any or all of the Proposals as non-responsive, and to reject all Proposals at any time prior to award of contract, without incurring any liability, or obligation to inform the affected Proposer(s) of the grounds for UNDP's action. Furthermore, UNDP shall not be obliged to award the contract to the lowest price offer.

UNDP shall also verify, and immediately reject their respective Proposal, if the Proposers are found to appear in the UN's Consolidated List of Individuals and Entities with Association to Terrorist Organizations, in the List of Vendors Suspended or Removed from the UN Secretariat Procurement Division Vendor Roster, the UN Ineligibility List, and other such lists that as may be established or recognized by UNDP policy on Vendor Sanctions. (See <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/protestandsanctions/> for details)

34. Award Criteria

Prior to expiration of the period of proposal validity, UNDP shall award the contract to the qualified Proposer with the highest total score based on the evaluation method indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS nos. 25 and 32).

35. Right to Vary Requirements at the Time of Award

At the time of award of Contract, UNDP reserves the right to vary the quantity of services and/or goods, by up to a maximum twenty five per cent (25%) of the total offer, without any change in the unit price or other terms and conditions.

36. Contract Signature

Within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of the Contract, the successful Proposer shall sign and date the Contract and return it to UNDP.

Failure of the successful Proposer to comply with the requirement of RFP Clause 35 and this provision shall constitute sufficient grounds for the annulment of the award, and forfeiture of the Proposal Security if any, and on which event, UNDP may award the Contract to the Proposer with the second highest rated Proposal, or call for new Proposals.

37. Performance Security

A performance security, if required, shall be provided in the amount and form provided in Section 9 and by the deadline indicated in the **Data Sheet** (DS no. 14), as applicable. Where a Performance Security will be required, the submission of the said document, and the confirmation of its acceptance by UNDP, shall be a condition for the effectivity of the Contract that will be signed by and between the successful Proposer and UNDP.

38. Bank Guarantee for Advanced Payment

Except when the interests of UNDP so require, it is the UNDP's preference to make no advanced payment(s) on contracts (i.e., payments without having received any outputs). In the event that the Proposer requires an advanced payment upon contract signature, and if such request is duly accepted by UNDP, and the said advanced payment exceeds 20% of the total proposal price, or exceed the amount of USD 30,000, UNDP shall require the Proposer to submit a Bank Guarantee in the same amount as the advanced payment. A bank guarantee for advanced payment shall be furnished in the form provided in Section 10.

39. Vendor Protest

UNDP's vendor protest procedure provides an opportunity for appeal to those persons or firms not awarded a purchase order or contract through a competitive procurement process. In the event that a Proposer believes that it was not treated fairly, the following link provides further details regarding UNDP vendor protest procedures:

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/protestandsanctions/>

Instructions to Proposers

DATA SHEET

The following data for the services to be procured shall complement, supplement, or amend the provisions in the Instruction to Proposers. In the case of a conflict between the Instructions to Proposers, the Data Sheet, and other annexes or references attached to the Data Sheet, the provisions in the Data Sheet shall govern.

DS No.	Cross Ref. to Instructions	Data	Specific Instructions / Requirements
1		Project Title :	Coordination Project
2		Title of Services/Work:	Consultancy Services for the Final Evaluation Common Country Programme Document from UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF Cabo Verde
3		Country / Region of Work Location:	Cabo Verde
4	C.13	Language of the Proposal:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English
5	C.20	Conditions for Submitting Proposals for Parts or sub-parts of the TOR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not allowed
6	C.20	Conditions for Submitting Alternative Proposals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shall not be considered
7	C.22	A pre-proposal conference will be held on:	None
8	C.21	Period of Proposal Validity commencing on the submission date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 90 days
9	B.9.5 C.15.4 b)	Proposal Security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Required
10	B.9.5	Acceptable forms of Proposal Security	N/A

11	B.9.5 C.15.4 a)	Validity of Proposal Security	N/A
12		Advanced Payment upon signing of contract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allowed for Travel and Living Expenses where necessary, up to a maximum of 20% of contract
13		Liquidated Damages	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Will be imposed under the following conditions : Percentage of contract price per day of delay : 0.5% Max. no. of days of delay : 1 Month After which UNDP may terminate the contract.
14	F.37	Performance Security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Required
15	C.17, C.17 b)	Preferred Currency of Proposal and Method for Currency conversion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United States Dollars (US\$) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or any convertible currency; at the UN Exchange rate when the proposal is being evaluated
16	B.10.1	Deadline for submitting requests for clarifications/ questions	5 working day days before the submission date.
17	B.10.1	Contact Details for submitting clarifications/questions ²	Focal Person in the Joint Office: Pedro Gomes Address: Av. OUA, Achada Santo Antonio, Praia, Cape Verde Fax No. :238 262 1404 E-mail address dedicated for this purpose: procurement.cv@cv.jo.un.org
18	B.11.1	Manner of Disseminating Supplemental Information to the RFP and responses/clarifications to queries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct communication to prospective Proposers by email or fax
19	D.23.3	No. of copies of Proposal that must be submitted [if transmitted by courier]	Original : 1 Copies : 1 Soft Copy – in case submission by courier
20	D.23.1 D.23.2 D.24	Proposal Submission Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF Av. OUA, Achada de Santo Antonio Praia, Cabo Verde <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Via our secured email address: procurement.cv@cv.jo.un.org
21	C.21	Deadline of Submission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Date: May 23, 2016

² This contact person and address is officially designated by UNDP. If inquiries are sent to other person/s or address/es, even if they are UNDP staff, UNDP shall have no obligation to respond nor can UNDP confirm that the query was officially received.

	D.24		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time: 15:00 – Cabo Verde – Local Time
22	D.23.2	Allowable Manner of Submitting Proposals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Courier/Hand Delivery <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic submission of Bid
23	D.23.2 D.26	Conditions and Procedures for electronic submission and opening	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Official Address for e-submission: procurement.cv@cv.io.un.org <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Free from virus and corrupted files <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Format : PDF files only, password protected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Password <u>must</u> not be provided to UNDP until the date and time of Bid Opening as indicated in No. 24 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Password for Financial Proposal will be requested from those Proposers whose Technical proposals found to be Technically Qualified by Technical Evaluation Panel. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For electronically transferred data, the maximum capacity is 8MB . Thus, if the size of the file is greater than 8MB attach them with two or more emails. In this case you are kindly advised to label each email as “ Attachment 1 of 3; 2 of 3; and 3 of 3 ”. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No. of copies to be transmitted: only One (1) , do not send the proposals time and again to avoid mistake in identifying the appropriate proposals. UNDP/Procurement Unit will not be liable for failing to locate a right proposal owing to repetitively sending proposals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory email subject line: your Technical and Financial proposals shall be sent into two separate emails or envelops as per the following subject lines*** : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Technical Document: <u>RFP – Final Evaluation Common Country Programme Document from UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF Cabo Verde</u> 2. – Technical Proposal – [insert Proposing Firm Business Name] 3. For Financial Document: <u>RFP – Final Evaluation Common Country Programme Document from UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF Cabo Verde</u> 4. – Financial Proposal – [insert Proposing Firm Business Name] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Zone to be Recognized: <i>CABO VERDE</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other conditions: <i>Any proposal sent to the private email addresses of any procurement staff will be automatically disqualified.</i>
24	D.23.1	Date, time and venue for opening of Proposals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Date and Time: May 23, 2016 15:30 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Venue :UN House, Praia, Cape Verde

25	E.29.2 E.29.3 F.34	Evaluation method to be used in selecting the most responsive Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Combined Scoring Method, using the 70%-30% distribution for technical and financial proposals, respectively, where the minimum passing score of technical proposal is 70%, 70 points .
26	C.15.1	Required Documents that must be Submitted to Establish Qualification of Proposers (In "Certified True Copy" form only)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Company Profile, which should <u>not</u> exceed fifteen (15) pages, including printed brochures and product catalogues relevant to the goods/services being procured <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tax Registration/Payment Certificate issued by the Internal Revenue Authority evidencing that the Bidder is updated with its tax payment obligations, or Certificate of Tax exemption, if any such privilege is enjoyed by the Bidder <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certificate of Registration of the business, including Articles of Incorporation, or equivalent document if Bidder is not a corporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Official Letter of Appointment as local representative, if Bidder is submitting a Bid in behalf of an entity located outside the country <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Audited Financial Statement (Income Statement and Balance Sheet) including Auditor's Report for the past Year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statement of Satisfactory Performance from the Top 3 Clients in terms of Contract Value the past 2 Years <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All information regarding any past and current litigation during the last three (3) years, in which the bidder is involved, indicating the parties concerned, the subject of the litigation, the amounts involved, and the final resolution if already concluded. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A minimum of 1 example of recent evaluation assignments conducted by the firm of which must be an evaluation report completed under the supervision of the proposed Team Leader <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical proposal as outlined in Section 7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial proposal as outlined in Section 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Signed and stamped Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and/or Partnership Agreement by parties in agreement if Proposer form Joint Venture or Partnership or Consortium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Signed and stamped Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with proposed Contractor if Proposer will Subcontract portion of the Consultancy Assignment
27		Other documents that may be Submitted to Establish Eligibility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer to the Term of Reference (ToR)
28	C.15	Structure of the Technical Proposal (<i>only if different from the provision of Section 12</i>)	As per section 12 of the Instruction to Proposers, and reference to the ToR

29	C.15.2	Latest Expected date for commencement of Contract	Upon Contract Signature
30	C.15.2	Expected duration of contract (Target Commencement Date and Completion Date)	40 (forty) Working days, over a maximum period of 3 (three) months
31		UNDP will award the contract to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One Proposer only
32	E.29.2 F.34	Criteria for the Award of Contract and Evaluation of Proposals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer to the below Table and to sections 29.2, 29.3 and 29.4 of the Instructions to Proposers.
33	E.29.4	Post-Qualification Actions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verification of accuracy, correctness and authenticity of the information provided by the bidder on the legal, technical and financial documents submitted; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inquiry and reference checking with Government entities with jurisdiction on the bidder, or any other entity that may have done business with the bidder; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inquiry and reference checking with other previous clients on the quality of performance on ongoing or previous contracts completed; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Validation of extent of compliance to the RFP requirements and evaluation criteria based on what has so far been found by the evaluation team.
34		Conditions for Determining Contract Effectivity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Signature of Contract by duly authorized persons representing both parties, UNDP and the selected bidder.
35		Other Information Related to the RFP	UNDP shall effect payments to the Contractor after acceptance by UNDP of the invoices submitted by the contractor, upon achievement of the corresponding deliverables as set in the Terms of Reference (ToR). All prices/rates quoted must be exclusive of all taxes, since the UNDP is exempt from taxes.

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable
1.	Expertise of Firm / Organization & Proposed Team	15%	15
2.	Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan	45%	45
3.	Project Management Structure and Key Personnel	40%	40
Total			100

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 1		Points obtainable
Expertise of the Firm/Organization		
1.1	Reputation of Organization and Staff / Credibility / Reliability / Industry Standing	2.5
1.2	General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial stability - age/size of the firm - Quality Assurance Procedure - 	2.5
1.3	Expertise / Experience of the firm and organization:	10
	Experience in leading complex evaluations, especially in the field of development cooperation or UN agencies and/or other international organizations evaluations	
	Experience working and knowledge in evaluating child and maternal mortality health, environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction, social and economic governance, and child protection and human right (including gender equality and Gender Based Violence) results;	
	Working knowledge in Portuguese and fluency in English	
Total Part 1		15

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 2		Points Obtainable
Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan		
2.1	To what degree does the Proposer understand the task and propose a consistent methodological and approach	10
2.2	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task and corresponding to the TOR?	15
2.3	Innovation and relevance of the proposed methodology, including capacity building approach and specialist contributions and working plan	10
2.4	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation of the evaluation?	10
Total Part 2		45

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3			Points Obtainable
Management Structure and Key Personnel			
3.1 Team Leader			
3.1	Academic Qualification		3
	Team Leader/coordination experience		5
	Language qualification		2
		Sub-Score	10
3.2 Additional Evaluation Staff			
Evaluator(s) and others members			
	Academic Qualification		7
	Professional experience in the relevant area (evaluation)		10
	Knowledge and experience in evaluating child and maternal mortality health, environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction, social and economic governance, and child protection and human right (including gender equality and Gender Based Violence) results		8
	Knowledge and understanding of Cabo Verde context		5
			Sub-Score
Total Part 3			40

Only candidate obtaining a minimum of **70 points** out of 100 points at the technical evaluation will be considered for the financial evaluation.

The financial score for the financial proposal will be calculated in the following manner:

- $S_f = 100 \times F_m/F$, in which S_f is the financial score, F_m is the lowest price and F the price of the proposal under consideration.
- (Total Financial Maximum points = 100 points);
- Total Score.

The technical score attained by each proposal will be used in determining the Total score as follows:

The weights given to the technical and financial proposals are: $T= 0.7$, $F=0.3$

The Total score will be calculated by formula: $TS = T \times 0.7 + F \times 0.3$

- TS - Is the total score of the proposal under consideration;
- T - Is technical score of the proposal under consideration;
- F - Is financial score of the proposal under consideration.

Section 3: Terms of Reference (TOR)

Final Evaluation Common Country Programme Document from UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF Cabo Verde

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The current 2012-2017 Common Country Programme (CCPD) of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF is aligned with national priorities, described in the Government's 2012-2016 Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (DECRP III). In particular it contributes to the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (DECRP) axes; of the seven strategic priorities outlined in the Government's programme, the CCPD contributes directly contributes to the following three (i) "Build a dynamic, competitive, innovative, and sustainable economy, with shared prosperity for all"; (ii) "Promote social development and cohesion, and facilitate access to basic services"; and (iii) "Consolidate democracy, and good governance". The programme also responds to the four pillars identified by the UNDAF, namely: (i) inclusive growth and poverty reduction; (ii) consolidation of institutions, democracy and citizenship; (iii) reduction of disparities and promotion of equity; and (iv) environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation.

The CCPD (DP/FPA/OPS-ICEF/DCCP/2011/CPV/1) was presented to the Executive Board for discussion and comments at its 2011 second regular session (12-15 September 2011). The document was subsequently revised, and this final version was approved at the 2012 first regular session of the Executive Board on 10 February 2012.

In February 2016, following the UNDAF extension requested by the Government the CCPD was also approved for extension until 2017. The CCPD 2012-2016 followed the principle of alignment with the agencies strategic plan with particular emphasis on focusing on priorities, avoiding duplication or fragmentation, building on lessons learned and a coherent response to country development priorities. As a result, there was a consolidated effort to strengthen evidence-based programming articulated around three levels of assistance: (i) support to human rights and gender-based macro-economic policy choices; (ii) consolidation of institutional capacities for adequate management of the country's multiple transitions; and (iii) development of local and community capacities for direct impacts on the improvement of living conditions. The interventions are intended to benefit essentially children, youth and women of Cabo Verde.

Cabo Verde became the first pilot Joint Office (JO) of the Ex-Com agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP) on 1 January 2006. This was a major step of UN reform towards the harmonization and simplification of UN activities in small countries, a common premises for the UN already existed since the early 1990s, but a call for further cost-effective and cohesive UN country programmes had led to the initiative to merge the organizations of these four agencies to one. Since 2010, WFP ended its operations in Cabo Verde. The JO, now comprising only 3 agencies – UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA - is presently implementing the second UNDAF/One UN Programme covering the period 2012-2016 under four pillars – Inclusive growth and poverty reduction, Consolidation of institutions, democracy and citizenship, and Environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation - for a total estimated amount of US\$16.8 million. The budget of the Joint Office represents approximately 60 per cent of this amount.

A Joint Office model consists of a single UN office of the participating agencies, led by one representative who equally represents all the participating agencies and is also the UN Resident Coordinator. The JO has one organizational structure and a single programme (Common Country Programme – CCPD) encompassing the activities and mandates of the three participating agencies (UNDP, UNFP and UNICEF),

and uses one set of business processes, rules and regulations under a “support agency” arrangement. It was decided that UNDP processes, systems and contracting arrangements would be adopted by the Joint Office.

The Joint Office is structured in Operation and Programme. For the programme implementation the Office is organized in four Units: Democratic Governance, Population and Poverty Reduction, Human Capital Development and Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction.

COUNTRY CONTEXT

Cabo Verde is a small insular state in development, graduated from least developed country (LDC) status in 2008. The country is experiencing a demographic dividend, a rapid and fleeting process which is expected to last until the 2020s and which represents a historical opportunity for driving inclusive social and economic growth. Despite being transitory, the impacts of this demographic process may bring decisive and long-lasting benefits, as long as the country adopts strategies to transform the quantitative advantage of the working-age population into a qualitative advantage, mainly through investments in human capital qualification. The total resident population is around half million, 54 per cent of whom are under 24 and the annual population growth is 1.2 per cent. The country achieved the most of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) targets, in particular for poverty reduction, education and health, and many of its development indicators stand out as exceptions for the region (West Africa). Universal access to primary and secondary schools has been achieved, a strong social safety net has been set up, and the benefits of growth have been distributed through an inclusive approach to policy making and nation-building. According to the last Human Development Report (2015), Cabo Verde ranks 122nd out of 187 countries in the UNDP’s Human Development Index (HDI).

However, disaggregated analyses show that the country faces some geographical, gender and group-specific disparities. Poverty rates reach 27% of the population and around 16 per cent are unemployed. Gender-based disparities include access to employment and social protection. As regards the political participation of women it remains modest in the legislative branch and at the municipal level (where women occupy about one fourth of elected positions). In addition, although better qualified on the whole, young people suffer more acutely from unemployment.

Despite its exceptional progress, Cape Verde still faces economic vulnerabilities associated with its previous LDC status. Two key contributors to the economy, tourism and remittances, are highly dependent on the overall global financial climate. The informal sector contribute for 12% of GDP. For the last three years, Cabo Verde’s GDP growth rate has languished between 1 and 2%, far below the 6-7% rates experienced prior to the 2008/09 international crisis. The public debt is currently estimated at 114% of GDP and is estimated to reach 120% in 2017.

Environmentally, the country is also facing challenges, including groundwater scarcity, recurrent drought, fragile ecological systems and soil erosion. The insularity and climate change are expected to have serious consequences on what are already sensitive ecosystems and may significantly reverse progress made on development and reducing poverty. The mainstreaming of a risk-reduction and resilience-building approach into the national development process is important to reduce climatic risks and build the country’s adaptive capacity, while addressing underlying causes of vulnerability, including those pertaining to gender inequality.

Important factors that contributed to Cabo Verde’s transformation include strong governance, sound democratic institutions, transparent and participative electoral processes and a free media.

Cabo Verde has held legislative elections in March 2016 and will hold presidential and local still in 2016. In 2016 the new PRSP (Strategy Document for Growth and Poverty Reduction – DECRP IV) will be

elaborated and programmatic lines the period 2017-2021. The period 2012-2016 in Cabo Verde was characterized by the search for sustainable policy solutions at the end of the transition period after graduation from LDC status, in a post-global financial crisis world, and with the vulnerabilities typical of a Small Island Developing Country (SIDS).

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE

This CCPD evaluation will be conducted in fulfilment of UN regulations and rules guiding evaluations. The Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF in Cabo Verde is commissioning this evaluation to ascertain the outcomes and outputs of the common country programme measured against its original purpose, objectives whilst in the process capturing the evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of this strategic programme document, which will set the stage for new programme cycle. It is anticipated that the evaluation will outline lessons learned and recommendations which will be useful in contributing to the growing body of knowledge for the coming CCPD and UNDAF planning cycle. The evaluation serves as an important accountability function, providing CO, RO's, HQ's, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results.

III. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

This end of programme evaluation will cover the period 2012 – 2015 and will be conducted from May 2016 through to July 2016, highlighting the key lessons learned to provide informed guidance to future programming. The evaluation will cover all activities planned and/or implemented during the period 2012-2015 and will give a special focus on the contribution to child and maternal mortality reduction, environmental sustainability, good governance, protection and human rights (See [Annex CCPD](#)).

The overall objective of this evaluation is to analyze the relevance, performance and the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF strategic positioning during the next strategic programming cycle 2018-2021. The specific objectives of the evaluation of the CCPD of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF:

1. to provide the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF in Cabo Verde, national stakeholders, the Regional Offices, the headquarters as well as the wider audience with an assessment of the relevance and performance of the Common Country Programme and alignment with agencies strategic plan;
2. Determine the strategic positioning of the three agencies UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF in adding value to the evolving national priorities and development context;
3. Assess the existing frameworks and strategies adopted by the UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA in providing support to the government of Cabo Verde including partnership strategies, engagements, and whether they were well conceived for achieving planned objectives;
4. Appraise the sustainability of the programme, including the institutionalization of interventions;
5. Assess relevance and utilization of M&E processes
6. to draw key lessons from past and current cooperation and: (i) provide a set of clear and forward-looking options leading to strategic and actionable recommendations for the next programming cycle; (ii) provide inputs to inform the strategic repositioning of the Country Office in light of the three agencies new business model in middle income countries.

The evaluation will cover all activities implemented during the period 2012- 2015 within each programme area (Child protection, nutrition, health, education, environment, disaster risk reduction, poverty reduction, reproductive health and rights, youth, population dynamics and sustainable development, and south-south cooperation, governance, gender, poverty reduction).

A special focus should be placed on four specific areas aiming to assess the contribution of the CCPD for: i) child and maternal mortality reduction; ii) environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction; iii) social and economic governance, and; iv) child protection and human right (including gender equality and Gender Based Violence). Besides the assessment of the intended effects of the programme, the evaluation also aims at identifying potential unintended results. Concerning the geographical scope, the evaluation will cover the action of the three agencies in entire archipelago.

The evaluation has two components: a) the analysis of the programmatic areas, b) the analysis of the strategic positioning. The component b should provide inputs to support the three agencies in best strategic positioning to increase its added value in the Cabo Verde context and in line with the new modalities of engagement of these agencies in middle income Countries. It will be also important for repositioning these agencies for the next UNDAF cycle.

The country programme evaluation should make recommendations on strengthening the programme monitoring system and particularly data collection and results reporting to support programmatic efficacy and efficiency. From this perspective, evaluation users and target audience are the Joint office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF and the Country Programme counterparts (government, NGOs, academic institutions and the private sector), as well as other United Nations System agencies in Cabo Verde, the UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF Regional Offices (WCARO), Headquarters and the Executive Board.

In summary, the CCPD Terminal Evaluation has as its main objectives:

1. To ensure accountability for the achievement of the CCPD of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF objectives
2. To enhance organizational and development
3. To enable informed decision-making regarding the strategic positioning of the Joint Office next programme cycle

IV. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation seeks to answer, but is not limited, to the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as well as coordination and added value.

1. Relevance (including responsiveness): The criteria of relevance brings into focus the extent to which the objectives of the CCPD of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF are consistent with country development priorities and policies, and were aligned throughout the programme period with government priorities and with agencies global policies and strategies. The ability of the CO to respond to: a. changes, emerging development priorities and/or additional requests from the national counterparts, and b. shifts caused by external factors in an evolving country context. Relevance also consider the coherence between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the planners and the reality of what the needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries. In this regard the appropriateness is very important to analyze the acceptance and feasibility of the proposed interventions.

- Proposed questions are: To what extent are the programme results (i) responsive to the needs of the country (in particular the needs of vulnerable groups), (ii) aligned with government priorities (iii) as well as with UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF global policies and strategies and international

partners' policies (including the Millennium Development Goals and global references such as rights-based approach, gender equality, equity focus, human development principles, etc.).

- To what extent is UNDP, UNICEF & UNFPA's engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including their role in the particular development context in Cabo Verde based on their comparative advantage?
- Are the intended outputs and outcomes aligned with the key development strategies of the country? Are they consistent with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Do the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the development goals of the country?
- To what extent has the selected method of delivery been appropriate to the changes in the development context?
- Has the three agencies been influential in country debates based on their comparative advantage and has it influenced national policies?

Efficiency: Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

Proposed questions are:

- Are the approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?
- Has UNDP's CCPD strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective over a reasonable time period;
- To what extent did the country office take advantage of existing opportunities for synergies to maximize use of resources?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation systems employed helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?
- **Effectiveness:** This criteria seeks to analyze the extent to which the CCPD outputs have been achieved, and the extent to which the outputs have contributed to the achievement of the CCPD outcomes. Proposed questions under this criterion are:
 - To what extent have the CCPD outputs been achieved? Did the outputs contribute to the achievement of the CCPD outcomes?
 - If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outcomes has been made as measured by the outcome indicators presented in the results framework. What evidence is there that the CCPD has contributed towards an improvement in national body's capacity, including institutional strengthening? What contributing factors enhance or impede UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF performance in this area.
 - How effective have UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA been in partnering with civil society (where applicable) and the private sector to promote the envisaged development in in the country?

- To what extent has the programme supported domestication of key regional frameworks, experiences and international best practices through national development plans and strategies?
- Have the agencies utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming?
- **Sustainability:** This criteria focuses on analyzing the continuation of benefits from the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF financed intervention after external development assistance has come to an end, linked, in particular, to their continued resilience to risks. Proposed question under this criterion is:
 - What is the likelihood that UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF supported interventions are sustainable?
 - Were there exit strategies in place?
 - What mechanisms have been set in place to support the government/ institutional partners to sustain improvements made through the interventions?
 - What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?

The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from CCPD interventions

Gender Equality

- To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring the different interventions?
- To what extent has programme support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?

Capacity Building

- Did the programme adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency
- Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc.) delivered by the programme utilized by the country?

Coordination:

- To what extent did the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF contribute to the coordination mechanisms in the UN system in Cabo Verde?
- To what extent the JO model contribute to a more coherent and efficient response to national priorities as well as to ensure greater coherence in planning, implementation and operational management?

Added Value:

- What is it that UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF does particularly and distinctively well as compared to other development partners in the country?

- What could be specific roles that the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF could play or products that could deliver to mobilize resources and enhance its contribution to development results in the country?

The questions listed above are only indicative; the final set of evaluation questions will be determined during the design phase, after a discussion with the evaluation reference group. The evaluation questions must be included in the evaluation matrix in Annex B.

Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions results in the different areas of support, as well as recommendations on how the JO could adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the different portfolio fully achieves current planned outcomes and is positioned for sustainable results in the future. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer lessons for support in country and elsewhere based on this analysis.

V. METHODOLOGY

The CCPD evaluation will be carried out by an external team of evaluators, and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments where programmes or advisory support were provided, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives etc.

The evaluators will review all relevant sources of information, such as the programme document, projects document, projects evaluation, annual and project reports, UNDAF midterm review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the CO team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex C](#) of this Terms of Reference (ToR). The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the CCPD implementation.

The Task Manager will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

This evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change” (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFP and UNICEF has supported, and observed progress in human development. The evaluator will develop in consultation with the CO team, a logic model of how CCPD interventions are expected to lead to improved national and local service delivery. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of the three agencies support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The evaluation exercise will be wide-ranging, consultative, and participatory ensuring representation of both women and men, entailing a combination of comprehensive desk reviews, analysis and interviews.

While interviews are a key instrument, all analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence and data. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and generalizable.

One week after contract signing, the evaluation team will produce an Inception Report. The Inception Report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The Inception Report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables, and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the Country Office and Regional Office before the evaluator proceed with site mission.

The draft of the CCPD 2012-2016 Evaluation Report should will be shared with all staff and stakeholders, and presented in a validation workshop that the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF will organize. Key partners and stakeholders will participate in this workshop. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluation team will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.

A lessons learned report will also be produced and discussed during the validation workshop. Feedback received should be taken into consideration when preparing the lessons learned report. The lessons learned report should cover the different facets of the CCPD interventions and should take into account the mandates of the three agencies. This reports should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

The evaluation report minimum contents and outline will be discussed with evaluation team at the beginning of their assignment. How the information has been obtained and analyzed should be specifically explained and all statements should be properly detailed, supported and explained. The evaluation team will identify any limitations to the evaluation and propose strategies to mitigate them. The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

- Title
- Table of contents
- Acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive Summary
- Introduction Background and context
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and methods
- Data analysis
- Findings and conclusions
- Lessons learned
- Recommendations
- Annexes

The steps in data collection are anticipated but not limited to the following:

Desk reviews: The evaluation team will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following: i) Relevant National documents; ii) programme/project documents and activity reports; iii) past evaluation/ self-assessment reports; iv) deliverables from the programme activities, e.g. published reports and training materials;; v) JO reports; vii) UNDP's corporate strategies and reports; and viii) government, media, academic publications were relevant.

Stakeholder interviews: The evaluation team will conduct face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA staff (managers and programme/project officers) and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups and donors in the country. Focus groups may be organized as appropriate.

Field visits: The evaluation team will visit selected programme sites to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. A case study approach will be used to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the programme

VI. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

- i. **Evaluation inception report** - An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the JO CO and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.
- ii. **Draft evaluation report** - The JO CO and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.
- iii. **Final evaluation report**
- iv. **Lessons learned Report** - The lessons learned report should cover the different facets of the programme implemented by the JO. This report should be annexed in the main evaluation report.
- v. **Evaluation brief and other knowledge**

All deliverables will be elaborated in English and must be submitted in digital form together with all supporting documentation including tables, graphs and diagrams in its original format. The PowerPoint presentation for the dissemination seminar and the final report should be translated in *Portuguese*.

VII. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The evaluation will be undertaken by an external Consultancy Firm, hired as consultants, comprising of a Team Leader and Evaluators.

Required Qualifications of the team

The **Team Leader** will have the overall responsibility for the production of the deliverables defined in item VI above.

- He/she will lead and coordinate the work of the evaluation team and will also be responsible for the quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables;
- Minimum 10 years of professional experience in evaluation of development programme, including in the areas of human development, children rights, gender equality and social services;
- The team leader must have a Master Degree and extensive previous experience in leading complex evaluations, especially in the field of development cooperation for UN agencies and/or other international organizations evaluations;
- Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and policy advice are essential. Familiarity with United Nations operations will be an asset;
- Working knowledge in Portuguese and fluency in English is required.

Evaluator's and others members competencies

- Minimum of 5 years' experience in conducting evaluations of development programmes
- Strong working knowledge of the United Nations and its mandate, and more specifically the work and mandates of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF;
- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies; including experience in applying SMART (**S** Specific; **M** Measurable; **A** Achievable; **R** Relevant; **T** Time-bound) indicators;
- Knowledge and experience in evaluating child and maternal mortality health, environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction, social and economic governance, and child protection and human right (including gender equality and Gender Based Violence) results;
- Excellent reporting and communication skills;
- Work knowledge in Portuguese and English is required;
- knowledge of the national development context is an asset;
- Familiarity with the challenges of developing countries to develop, strengthen and ensure sustainable development;
- Familiarity with Cabo Verde or similar SIDS (Small Islands Developing States) countries;
- Excellent in interpersonal relations, coordination, planning and team work;
- Excellent feedback-giving skills and culture sensitiveness

The size of team will be proposed by the Contractor according to the needs and scope of this evaluation as stated in this ToR. The team must have at least one national member (resident in Cabo Verde) in order to have a good knowledge of local context and at least one Portuguese speaking member.

VIII. EVALUATOR ETHICS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'64. 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 it data. The Consultants 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, UNFPA and UNICEF, and partners.

IX. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The Joint Office of UNDP, UNFP and UNICEF will select the evaluation team through according to UNDP rules and procedures³. The Deputy Representative of the Joint Office of UNDP, UNFP and UNICEF is responsible for the management of the Team of evaluators and will in this regard designate focal persons for the evaluation and any additional staff to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Representative of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report in liaison with the Government.

The designated JO focal point will assist the Evaluation Team in arranging introductory meetings with the relevant parties in the country. The team will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The CO will develop a Management Response to the evaluation within six weeks of report finalization.

While JO will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with national institutions and senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the Evaluation Team to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant interventions sites (if necessary) and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels should be included in the technical proposal and in the Inception Report.

The Representative of the Joint Office will convene an **Advisory Panel** comprising of technical experts from CO and RO's to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

In addition, a Steering Committee chaired by the JO Representative and co-chaired by a high level representative from the Government (Ministry in charge of Foreign Affairs and/or Planning) and composed by JO Head of Units, Civil Society through *Plataforma das Ong's* and others institutions considered relevant for this evaluation. This Steering Committee have responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report and guidance on the definition of management response of this evaluation.

Roles and Responsibilities

Evaluation manager	The manager of a country programme evaluation oversees the entire process of the evaluation, from its preparation to the dissemination of the final evaluation report. He/she: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coordinates the launching of the evaluation process: preparation of the terms of reference, establishment of the evaluation reference group, and the preparation of the background documentations;• Coordinates the selection and hiring process for the team of evaluators, in consultation with the regional office M&E advisers;
---------------------------	--

³ Operationally the JO use UNDP procedures.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervises and guides the evaluation team during the evaluation process; • Provides comments/inputs and approves the initial design report, the first draft and the final evaluation report; • Coordinates the logistical support for the conduction of the fieldwork by the evaluation team; • Conducts the evaluation quality assurance in consultation with the regional office M&E adviser; • Coordinates the preparation of the Management response, the dissemination of the final evaluation report and ensures that it is published in the different agencies database and in the web page of the Country Office;
Advisory Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides input to the ToR of the evaluation and to the selection of evaluation team; • Provides the evaluation team with information and documentation pertaining to the Programme; • Assists with the identification of key stakeholders and facilitates the access of the evaluation team to information sources to support data collection; • Provides comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation, including the draft final report; • Provides comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation, including the final report; • Advises on the quality of work produced by the evaluation; • Assists with feedback on the results, conclusions and recommendations obtained from the evaluation for the design and implementation of the future country programme.
Evaluation Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafts the evaluation design report, including a detailed work plan; • Conducts the fieldwork to collect and process information obtained; • Prepares a presentation on preliminary findings and elements of conclusions and recommendations, the first draft report and the final evaluation report, incorporating the suggestions of the evaluation reference group; • Maintains the Evaluation Manager informed on the progresses and limitations of the work; • Maintains the Steering Committee informed on the progresses and limitations of the work
Steering Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides comments to the design report, first draft and final evaluation report; • Ensure the alignment of this evaluation with the national mechanisms and policies; • Approve the final evaluation report and management response; • Provides inputs to the management response to the evaluation.

X. TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation is expected to take 40 working days for the Consultants, over a maximum period of three months starting after the contract is signed. A tentative date for the Stakeholder Workshop will be set in the inception meeting and the final draft Evaluation Report is due after 35 working days from the

commencement of the assignment. The evaluation team shall work remotely in close communication with the Evaluation Manager and the Advisory Panel and country mission to collect necessary information and for final finding validation should be scheduled. The following table provides an indicative breakout for activities and delivery:

Proposed Evaluation Mission Schedule (30 working days between May and July, 2016)

Activity	Responsible party	Timeframe/Deadline
Desk review, Evaluation design and work plan (Inception report)	Evaluation team	5 days (remotely)
Field visits, interviews with partners, and key stakeholders	Evaluation team	20 days
Drafting of the evaluation reports	Evaluation team	10 days
Debriefing with JO of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF	Evaluation team	Half day
Debriefing with partners	Partners and the Evaluation team	Half day
Finalization and submission of the evaluation reports (incorporating comments received on first drafts)	Evaluation team	4 days
Total No. of Working Days		40

DELIVERABLES PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Deliverables	Payment Schedule
Inception report	10%
Field mission	20%
Draft Evaluation and Lesson Learned Report	50%
Final Evaluation and lesson learned Report	20%

XI. APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

Recommended Presentation of Offer (for detailed information, please refer to the Instruction to proposer of the RFP):

⁴ **Living Conditions:** The Office is based Praia, the capital. Cabo Verde has social and political stability since independence, and there are no major security issues. The living conditions in Praia are good, as well as the access to health services. The level of tropical diseases is very low. There are currently no required vaccines at the entrance to Cabo Verde, unless one comes from West Africa. However, immunization against yellow fever, tetanus and polio, as well as hepatitis A, is recommended. Portuguese is the official language of the country, but informal conversations are held in Crioulo caboverdiano. French is the official diplomatic language in Cabo Verde. The currency used is called: Escudo Caboverdiano (1 EUR = 110 CVE). The Cabo Verdean escudo is not changed in several countries. International credit cards (VISA) are accepted in some shops, hotels and restaurants. It is also possible to withdraw money with an international card in some banks/ATM. Meals at restaurants near the UN Office cost between 2.5€ and 15€.

- The Technical Proposal must follow the template in Section 6;
- The Financial Proposal must follow the template in Section 7;

Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer (for detailed information please refer to the Instruction to proposer of the RFP)

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annexes:

Annex A: Common Country Programme Document

Annex B: Evaluation Matrix

Annex C: List of Documents to be consulted

Annex D: List of Key partners, including the implementing agencies and partners

Annex E: List of Projects and budget

ANNEX F: Phases and activities of the Evaluation

ANNEXES

ANNEX B. EVALUATION MATRIX

EVALUATION MATRIX						
Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

ANNEX C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSULTED (NOT EXHAUSTIVE – TO BE COMPLETED)

1. Common Country Programme Document - CCPD 2012-2016
2. United Nation Development Assistance Framework for Cabo Verde - UNDAF 2012-2016 (+1 year Extension)
3. One UN Annual Report (2012, 2013, 2014, 2015) - <http://un.cv/documentos.php>
4. Country Annual Report (2012, 2013, 2014, 2015) from UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF
5. Documento de Estratégia de Crescimento e Redução da Pobreza – DECRPIII
6. UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017
7. UNFPA Strategic Plan 2014-2017
8. UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017
9. UNDAF Annual Workplan (2012, 2013, 2014, 2015) <http://un.cv/documentos.php>
10. CCPD Evaluation Plan
11. Project Evaluation Reports (NAPA, Consolidation of Protected Areas)
12. Relatório de Progresso dos Objectivos de Desenvolvimento do Milenio
13. Human Development Report
14. Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento Sanitário
15. Plano Nacional para a igualdade de Genero
16. Project documents

ANNEX D: LIST OF KEY PARTNERS, INCLUDING THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES AND PARTNERS

Comissão Nacional dos Direitos Humanos e Cidadania (CNDHC)

Comissão Nacional de Eleições (CNE)

Direção Geral da Administração do Processo Eleitoral (DGAPE)

Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE)

Ministério da Juventude, Emprego e Desenvolvimento dos Recursos Humanos - MJEDRH

Direção Geral do Planeamento Orçamento e Gestão

Direção Geral Da Juventude, Direção Geral da Solidariedade Social

Instituto Cabo-verdiano da Criança e do Adolescente - ICCA

Instituto do Emprego e Formação Profissional (IEFP)

Ministério da Saúde (MS)

Direção Geral do Planeamento Orçamento e Gestão

Direção Nacional da Saúde

Comissão De Combate ao SIDA (CCS-SIDA)

VERDEFAM

Instituto Cabo-verdiano da Igualdade e Equidade de Género - ICIEG

Ministério do Ambiente, Habitação e Ordenamento do Território (MAHOT)

Direção Geral do Planeamento Orçamento e Gestão

Direção Geral do Desenvolvimento e Administração Local (DGDAL)

Direção Nacional do Ambiente

Instituto Nacional de Ordenamento do Território

Instituto Nacional de Meteorologia e Geofísica (INMG)

Ministério da Educação e Desporto (MED)

Direção Geral do Planeamento Orçamento e Gestão

Direção Nacional da Educação

Gabinete do Primeiro Ministro - Centro de Políticas Estratégicas (CPE)

Tribunal de Contas

Parlamento de Cabo Verde

Câmara Municipal da Ribeira Brava

Ministério do Desenvolvimento Rural

Instituto Nacional de Investigação Agrária

ANNEX E: LIST OF PROJECTS AND BUDGET

Related Atlas Project n°	Related Atlas Output n°	Fund	Project Name
65571	81987	04000 - TRAC UNDP	SUIVI ET MISE EN OEUVRE CONVENTIONS INTERNATIONALES DH
		30000 - 11929 - DRT	
	82410	89001 - RR UNICEF	
91236	96589	30000 - 11929 - DRT	BDRE -
		30071 - GOV	BDRE -
65647	82050	04000 - TRAC UNDP	ANALYSES PROSPECTIVES
		30000 - DRT PNUD	
		89302 - DRT UNFPA	
	82051	89001 - RR UNICEF	
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
65430	81935	04000 - TRAC UNDP	MUNICIPALITES ET DEVELOPPEMENT LOCAL
		30000 - DRT PNUD	
78797	88893	30079 - European Commission	Project Management (PMU)
	88894	30079 - European Commission	Visibility Communication Proj
	90427	30079 - European Commission	ProPALOP-TL SAI - CABO VERDE
	90777	30079 - European Commission	ProPALOP-TL SAI - TIMOR LESTE
58142	72091	55021 - IBSA Facility	Dessalinisatio L'eau S.Nicolau
58318	87149	62040 - CIDA	ADAPT AUX CHANGEMTS CLIMATIQUE
65442	81945	04000 - TRAC UNDP	Disaster Risk Reduction
		89127 - OR UNICEF	
		89001 - RR UNICEF	
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
	81946	04000 - TRAC UNDP	Low Emission Climate Resilient
		30071 - C SHARING	
		30000 - DRT UNDP	

	93176	04120 - Trac 3 UNDP	Support emergency coord. Fogo
		30000 - Cost Sharing	
58319	72402	62000 - GEF	PIMS 4176 Consolidation of Cape verde Protected Areas
90563	96274	04000 - TRAC UNDP	Mainstreaming biodiversity
		30071	
		62000 - GEF	
61625	78150	62000 - GEF	Third National Communication
88659	95216	04000 - TRAC UNDP	CV Efficiency Energetic
		62000 - GEF	
65432	81936	89001 - RR UNICEF	Renforcement Qualité Service Santé de l'Enfant
		89142 - OR UNICEF	
		89131 - OR UNICEF	
		89148 - OR UNFPA	
	81937	89001 - RR UNICEF	Renforcement réponse multisectorielle au VIH/SIDA
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
		89301 - DRT UNFPA	
		89302 - DRT UNFPA	
	81962	4000	Décentralisation Services SR de Qualité
		89001 - RR UNICEF	
89302 -			
89003 - RR UNFPA			
62393	79874	89001 - RR UNICEF	Renforcement de la qualité du secteur de l'éducation
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
		89125 - OR UNICEF	
		89129 - OR UNICEF	
		89131 - OR UNICEF	
65400	81918	89001 - RR UNICEF	Renforcement des systèmes de protection de l'enfant
		89131 - OR UNICEF	
	81943	89001 - RR UNICEF	Renforcement du secteur de la Santé
		89001 - RR UNICEF	
		89131 - DRT UNICEF	
		89302 - DRT UNFPA	

	82604	30000 - DRT PNUD	Renf Institutionnel Jeunesse
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
		89131 - OR UNICEF	
69933	84201	04000 - TRAC UNDP	Gender Mainstreaming
		89001 - RR UNICEF	
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
		89302 - DRT UNFPA	
65808	82164	89001 - RR UNICEF	RENFORCEMENT DU SYSTEME NATIONAL. STATISTIQUE
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
		89302 - DRT UNFPA	
73136	86104	30000 - DRT PNUD	Programme Social de Transfert
	87830	89130 - OR UNICEF	
79160	89241	30000 - CS - LUX	Progr Appui Stratégie Nat. Emploi
		30000 - DRT PNUD	
65851	82195	04000 - TRAC UNDP	Support to Program Execution
		30000 - Cost Sharing	
		89001 - RR UNICEF	
		89003 - RR UNFPA	
		89111 - OR UNICEF	

ANNEX F. PHASES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE EVALUATION

Phase	Key activity
Preparation phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting of the Terms of Reference in consultation with the Regional Office of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF; • Approval of ToR; • Constitution of the evaluation reference group; • Compilation of initial list of background information and documentation; • Preparation of the preliminary stakeholder’s map; • Selection and hiring of the Evaluation Team.
Design Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting a desk review of all relevant documents (global and country specific) concerning the Common Country Programme 2012-2016; • Preparing the final mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation; • Finalizing the list of evaluation questions outlined in the Terms of Reference; • Establishing the strategy, methods and instruments for data collection and analysis; • Drafting a concrete work plan including the functions, responsibilities and dates due for the field phase. <p>At the end of the design phase, the evaluation team will produce an inception report, displaying the results of the above-listed steps and tasks (as defined above)</p>
Field Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection and analysis of data required in order to answer the evaluation questions; • Analysis of the results with a view to formulate the preliminary findings and recommendations of the evaluation; <p>At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will provide the CO with a debriefing presentation of the preliminary results of the evaluation, with a view to validating preliminary findings and testing tentative conclusions and/or recommendations.</p>
Synthesis Phase	<p>Continuation of the analytical work and preparation of a first draft of the final evaluation report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Evaluation Team incorporates comments made by the reference group and consolidates the first draft of the evaluation report; • The Evaluation Team prepares a second draft of the final evaluation report; • Evaluation manager carries out an Evaluation Quality Assessment; • Comments of reference group; • Validation workshop with national stakeholders; • Suggestions are incorporated by the Evaluation Team and the final evaluation report is prepared; • Perform the EQA with inputs from regional M&E advisers.
Dissemination, management response, dissemination and follow-up phase	<p>Sharing the report with stakeholders in country, as well as in the Regional Offices and in headquarters;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinating the preparation of the management response including the recommendations from UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF RO and HQ, and other interested partners; • Publishing the final evaluation report, according to Un procedures and the management response, on the country office web site;