TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

INTERNATIONAL/NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANCY

For the Final Evaluation of the joint programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type:</th>
<th>External vacancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title:</td>
<td>Evaluation Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Environment and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Station:</td>
<td>Kigali, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline:</td>
<td>30th of May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of contract:</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL/National/Local Individual Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected starting date:</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of assignment:</td>
<td>26 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background and Context

The adverse effects of climate change as well as early lessons learnt during the implementation of EDPRS I led to the development of Rwanda’s national strategy for Green Growth and Climate Resilience (GGCRS). The Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy has significantly influenced the inclusion of the “Green Economy Approach” as a priority of EDPRS II (2013-2018) under the Economic Transformation thematic area. The main objective of the Economic Transformation thematic area is to propose an ambitious, prioritized and coherent cross-sectorial strategy to sustain rapid growth and facilitate Rwanda’s process of economic transformation to meet revised targets in the context of Vision 2020. The Government of Rwanda identified the need to pursue a green economy approach to economic transformation by reducing economic costs through going ‘green’ and exploiting new ‘green’ economic opportunities.

Through a Joint Programme under its new support framework: the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) 2013-2018, the UN Country Team is supporting the implementation of this priority area. In addition to alignment to EDPRS II, the UNDAP takes serious consideration of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17 Area of Work 1 that elaborates sustainable development pathways that can eradicate extreme poverty and reduce social and economic inequality and exclusion. Area of Work 1 includes the development of sustainable and inclusive productive
capacities, including Green Economy policies, sustainable energy access and improved energy efficiency and is in alignment with the EDPRS II priorities that is supported by the Joint Programme.

The Joint Programme titled: “Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Economy Approach to Rwanda’s Economic Transformation” will support Rwanda to have in place improved systems for sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources and energy access, to achieve greater environmental and climate change resilience by:

- Supporting sustainable urbanisation with a clear focus on resiliency and green growth;
- Supporting the scaling up of renewable energy, energy efficiency and energy access;
- Supporting the Government in facilitating an increased level of public and private investment in sustainable environment and natural resource management and climate change;
- Strengthening sectoral capacity to develop and/or acquire appropriate technologies and skills for resource efficiency and cleaner production; and
- Strengthening the capacity of national and local institutions to reduce carbon footprint in human settlements through the planning and implementation of green cities and villages;
- The establishment of Centres of Excellence.

The Ministry of Environment (MoE) and its affiliate institutions, the Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) and the National Fund for Environment and Climate Change (FONERWA) have been mandated to lead the implementation of Priority 5 of the Economic Transformation thematic area of EDPRS II. MINECOFIN, as the Ministry responsible for national economic planning and therefore green economic transformation, will continue to provide guidance and advice. In this regard, therefore, the Joint Programme is being led by MoE on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. The Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA) is implementing a significant proportion of the planned joint programme activities. Other Implementing Partners (IPs) include University of Rwanda under MINEDUC, the Rwanda National Police (RNP) in collaboration with REMA, and the Private Sector Federation (PSF) as a partner of the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM).

UN support for the Joint Programme as articulated in the UNDAP is led by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as the Administrative Agent (AA) of the OneUN Fund. Other supporting UN agencies include the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The Green Economy Joint Programme will contribute to achievement of the UNDAP Result 1 of Inclusive Economic Transformation through its Outcome 1: “Pro-poor growth and economic transformation enhanced for inclusive economic development and poverty reduction”. Outcome 1 will be realised by supporting activities aimed at improving systems to pursue a green economy approach to economic transformation through, among others, the development
of green cities and villages, green industries and services, codes and standards for energy efficiency, framework and assessment tools for renewable energy development to expand energy access as well as the establishment of Centres of Excellence on environment and climate change. UNDAP’s Outcome 1 is also directly aligned to the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17 Area of Work 1 that includes Green Economy policies, sustainable energy access and improved energy efficiency through following outputs:

**Output 1:** Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established and linked to relevant institutions

**Output 2:** Public and private investment in Green Urbanisation approaches to Economic Transformation increased

**Output 3:** Planning and implementation of integrated rural settlements (Smart Green Villages) especially for vulnerable women and men strengthened.

**Output 4:** Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals in the Energy Sector of Rwanda Advanced

**Output 5:** Indicatives in support of policy, advocacy, and capacity development for Green Economy Effectively Coordinated

The Joint Programme (JP) is funded through multiple sources of funds including the OneUN Fund, which is a pooled fund mechanism, in addition to core and vertical resources from different UN agencies including UNDP. UNDP is the Administrative Agent of the One UN Fund.

In addition to UNDP corporate requirements, the guidelines on monitoring framework and evaluation under the joint programme document stipulate that the JP is subject to an external programme review linked to the EDPRS II midterm review with respect to timing. Against this background, One UN Rwanda is looking for an individual national consultant to undertake the final evaluation of the abovementioned joint programme.

### 2. Purpose and objective of the Final Evaluation

The Final Evaluation is backward looking and will effectively capture lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, to the extent possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the joint programme as well as inform the design of the next phase of the programme.

The evaluation will assess the design, scope, implementation and sustainability of the JP and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes. This will collate and analyze lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation period which will inform the next phase of the programme which will be designed during the spiring of 2018. The main objectives of the final evaluation are the following:

- Assess the achievements of the programme against its stated outputs and its contribution to the achievement of UNDAP and EDPRS outcomes;
- Assess the Programme’s implementation strategy;
- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the interventions;
- Assess the Programme’s processes, including budgetary efficiency;
- Assess the extent to which planned activities and outputs have been achieved;
• Identify the main achievements and impacts of the JP’s activities;
• Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets;
• Document lessons learnt;
• Assess the programme exit strategy;
• Inform the design of the next programme phase.

The emphasis on lessons learnt will speak to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future programme. The evaluation will assess the performance of the JP against planned results. This will also assess the preliminary indications of potential impact and sustainability of results including the contribution to capacity development and achievement of the country’s development agenda stipulated in EDPRS II and Vision 2020 and potentially to sustainable development goals. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation who are the Government of Rwanda – through the Ministry of Environment (MoE), Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA), Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA), Rwanda Housing Authority (RHA), University of Rwanda (UR) under Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), Rwanda National Police (RNP) in collaboration with REMA, and the Private Sector Federation (PSF) as a partner of the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM) – UNDP and other One UN agencies, especially those partaking in the joint programme.

3. Scope and Objective of the Final Evaluation

The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the level of achievement of the Joint Programme during February 2015- June 2018, since the initiation of its implementation. The geographic coverage of the evaluation is the whole country (Rwanda). The scope of the final evaluation covers all activities undertaken in the framework of the JP. This refers to:

• Planned outputs of the JP compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the JP objectives;
• Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments for future programmes;
• Efficiency of JP management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.;
• Likely outcomes and impact of the JP in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the JP.

The evaluation comprises the following elements:
(i) Assess whether the JP design is clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
(ii) An evaluation of the JP’s progress towards achievement of its overall objectives;
(iii) An evaluation of JP performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Joint Programme Document; An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the JP outputs produced during the implementation period in relation to expected results; Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the
implementation of the JP and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the JP;

(iv) An evaluation of the JP’s contribution to the achievements of UNDAP’s outcome and outputs;

(v) Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Joint Programme Document;

(vi) An evaluation of JP coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:
   a. Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in JP arrangements and execution;
   b. The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms in monitoring on a day to day basis, progress in JP implementation;
   c. Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the JP;
   d. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Programme Steering Committee (PSC);
   e. Financial management of the JP, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.

(vii) A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the JP are likely to be met;

(viii) Progress towards sustainability and replication of JP activities;

(ix) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the JP have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach

(x) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated the environmental sustainability concerns and make recommendation accordingly

(xi) Lessons learned during JP implementation;

(xii) Evaluate the programme’s exit strategy in terms of quality and clarity.

4. Evaluation Questions

Evaluation criteria

The JP will be evaluated on the basis of the DAC evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance**: measures whether the JP addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid.
- **Effectiveness**: measures whether the JP activities achieve its goal.

---

1For more guidance on this, the consultants will be requested to use UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation: http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616
• **Efficiency**: measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results.

• **Sustainability**: measures whether the benefits of the JP are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The JP needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

• **Impacts of intervention**: measure the positive and negative changes produced by the JP, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

**Evaluation Questions**
More specifically, the final evaluation aims at addressing the following questions for each evaluation criteria:

**Relevance**
- Where is this JP being implemented? How was the JP site selected? What has been the main focus of the JP implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected? How was the JP aligned to the national development strategy (EDPRS II, Vision 2020)?
- The extent to which the JP activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
- To what extent are the objectives of the JP still valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the JP consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the JP consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

**Effectiveness**
- To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Did the activities contribute to the achievement of the planned outputs?
- Have the different outputs been achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- To what extent the design, implementation and results of the JP have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach? What should be done to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming?
- What has been the result of the capacity building/trainings interventions? Were qualified trainers available to conduct training?
- How did UNDP and One UN support the achievement of JP outcome and outputs?
- How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP? Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness? What were the synergies with other projects/(joint) programmes?

---

2For more guidance on this, the consultants will be requested to use UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation” http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616
Efficiency

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the JP implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- What was the original budget for the JP? How have the JP funds been spent? Were the funds spent as originally budgeted?
- Are there any management challenges affecting efficient implementation of the JP? What are they and how are they being addressed?

Sustainability

- To what extend the design, implementation and results of the JP have incorporated environment sustainability? What should be done to improve environmental sustainability mainstreaming?
- To what extent will the benefits of the JP continue after donor funding stops?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the JP?
- Does the JP have a clear exit strategy?

Impact of interventions

- What are the stated goals of the JP? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the JP and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed? How did the JP contribute to the achievement of UNDAP outcomes and outputs?
- What has happened as a result of the JP?
- What have been the main impact of the JP on the Green Growth and Climate Change Resilience Strategy or its framework in Rwanda?
- How many people have been affected?
- Has the JP contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the JP?
- What difference has the JP made to beneficiaries?

5. Methodology

General guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, and UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results). UNDP’s Evaluation Policy provides information about the role and use of evaluation within the M&E architecture of the organization.

The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultation among programme staff, the evaluator and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluator, about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.
The evaluation should use a mixed methods approach, drawing on both primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence. Data will be collected through surveys of all relevant stakeholders (national and local Government institutions, development partners, beneficiaries, etc.) and through focus group discussions. Further data on the JP indicators (RRF data) will be used by the evaluation to assess the JP progress and achievements.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

(i) Desk review of Joint Programme Document, monitoring reports (such as minutes of LPAC meeting, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings including other relevant meetings, Programme Annual Implementation Report, quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);

(ii) Review of specific products produced so far, including data sets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;

(iii) Interviews with the head of SPIU, Programme Coordinator, Technical Assistant, and Administrative Assistant in MoE

(iv) Interviews with UNDP Country Director, Head of Poverty and Environment Unit in UNDP and UNDP Programme focal point

(v) Interviews with central and local government officials and other JP beneficiaries

(vi) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders involved, including Resident Coordinator’s Office, Global Green Growth Institute Rwanda Office.

(vii) Focus group discussions with all stakeholders

6. Final Evaluation Products (Deliverables)
This section presents the key evaluation products the evaluator will be accountable for producing. The deliverables are the following:

- **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 evaluator’s 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, the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The inception report will be discussed and approved with UNDP and MoE. *(Timeline: 1 week after signing the contract)*

- **Draft evaluation report**: Submission of draft evaluation report to UNDP for comments and inputs. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will then review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation covers the scope and meets the required quality criteria.
7. Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies

The Individual consultant should have the following skills/competencies and characteristics:

- At least master’s degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Environmental Sciences;
- At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation;
- At least 10 years accumulated experience in programme management support, programme/project formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation;
- Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of green growth/green economy initiatives;
- At least two similar assignments
- Good understanding of gender equality, human-right based approach and environmental sustainability concepts;
- Strong interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality evaluation and research products in a timely manner
- Proven understanding of key elements of result-based programme management in International development cooperation
- Fluent in English and working knowledge of French would be an advantage
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English

Selection criteria

Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the Evaluation Criteria as stated below:

1. The offer will be evaluated by using the Best value for money approach (combined scoring method). Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70%. Whereas the financial one will be evaluated on 30%.

2. A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the proposals, with the technical evaluation being completed prior to any financial proposal being opened and compared. Only proposals that achieve above the minimum of 49 points (i.e. at least 70% of the total 70 points) on the technical proposal shall have their financial proposals reviewed.

3. Evaluation of Financial proposal (30 points)

4. If the technical proposal achieves the minimum of 49 points, the competitiveness of the financial proposal will be considered in the following manner:
5. The total amount of points for the fees component is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among the applicants which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g.

6. \[30 \text{ Points} \times \frac{\text{US$ lowest}}{\text{US$ other}} = \text{points for other proposer’s fees.}\]

Below is the breakdown of technical proposal on 100% which will be brought to 70%:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least master’s degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Environmental Sciences;</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of Green Growth/Green Economy initiatives;</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Methodology (clear demonstration of evaluation methodology and understanding of the ToR)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 10 years’ experience in programme management support including formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent in English (written and verbal skills) and basic knowledge of French would be a value adding</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How to apply

Candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

(i) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

(ii) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects as well as the contact details (e-mail and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

(iii) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology, if applicable, on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment

(iv) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided

All interested applicants should submit the above to UNDP CO Rwanda by emailing procurement.rw@undp.org. Application deadline: **15th of May 2018**
9. Evaluation Ethics
The evaluation in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The critical issues evaluators must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation include evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

10. Implementation Arrangements
This section describes the organization and management structure for the evaluation and defines the roles, key responsibilities and lines of authority of all parties involved in the evaluation process. Implementation arrangements are intended to clarify expectations, eliminate ambiguities, and facilitate an efficient and effective evaluation process.

UNDP
UNDP is responsible for the management of the final evaluation and will contract an independent consultant to conduct the evaluation on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. UNDP will be the focal point for the evaluation and will facilitate the logistical requirements and provide technical assistance during all phases of the evaluation process, including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.

UNDP Programme focal point
Day-to-day management of the Evaluator will be provided by UNDP programme focal point overseeing the JP. She or he will ensure that all issues pertaining to the contract with the Evaluator, including payments are completed on schedule and will be responsible for facilitating the work of the Evaluator. She or he will provide all documentation to the Evaluator for the desk review, set up interview appointments and field visits and convene focus group meetings.

Steering Committee
The Joint Programme Steering Committee will oversee the conduct of the final evaluation and will be responsible for providing guidance and direction for the evaluation process and inputs and comments on the draft evaluation report as well as for approving the final document.

Evaluation Management Team
An Evaluation Management Team led by UNDP composed of a representative of MoE, UNDP Environment Head of Unit and Programme focal point will oversee the conduct of the evaluation at the technical level. The team will provide quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria. The technical committee will oversee the implementation of the agreed schedule of consultation activities, ensure wide stakeholder

3UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. Available at www.uneval.org/ethicalguidelines
consultations, will be in charge of verifying all facts in the report and oversee the production of the final report and the drafting and implementation of follow up actions.

11. Time Frame for the Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tasks and deliverables</th>
<th>Time-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Desk Review and Inception report       | • Desk review conducted  
• Briefings of evaluators  
• An inception report will be prepared by the evaluators detailing 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. | 5 working days |
| Stakeholder consultations and interviews | • The evaluators will consult with all relevant stakeholders and conduct a series of interviews, focus group discussions, and field visits in order to collect the required data.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 15 working days |
| Analysis of data and drafting report   | • Once the data is collected, the evaluators will analyse them and draft the evaluation report.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 5 working days |
| Presentation of draft evaluation report | • Once the draft final evaluation report submitted, it will be presented to all stakeholders for reviewing. The comments shared by the stakeholders will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 1 day      |
| Final Report                           | • The evaluator will revise the final evaluation report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 5 working days |

Total number of working days 31 days

12. Financial Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The consultancy fee will be paid as a Lump Sum (inclusive of all expenses related to the consultancy), and will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components of the consultancy.

The consultancy fee will be paid upon completion of the following milestones:
- 30% after presentation and adoption of the inception report
- 30% after presentation and approval of the draft report
- 40% after the approval of the final report

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and person with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applicants will be treated with the strictest confidence.
Approved by: Mr. Stephen Rodriques,
UNDP Country Director

Signature: .................................................................
### Annex 1: Key stakeholders and partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatina MUKARUBIBI</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmukarubibi@environment.gov.rw">fmukarubibi@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Hodari</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodari@environment.gov.rw">jhodari@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Kayumba</td>
<td>Green Economy Joint Programme Specialist</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TKAYUMBA@environment.gov.rw">TKAYUMBA@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent Musabyimana</td>
<td>SPIU Coordinator</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imusabyimana@environment.gov.rw">imusabyimana@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Habuwera</td>
<td>Finance Specialist</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chabuwera@environment.gov.rw">chabuwera@environment.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP David Bwimba</td>
<td>Director Environment Protection Unit</td>
<td>Rwanda National Police</td>
<td>dep@<a href="mailto:police.gov.rwbwimbadavid1@gmail.com">police.gov.rwbwimbadavid1@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Alex Fata</td>
<td>Director of SPIU</td>
<td>Rwanda National Police</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dspiu@police.gov.rw">dspiu@police.gov.rw</a> <a href="mailto:alexando34@gmail.com">alexando34@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Marie TWAGIRAYEZU</td>
<td>Commissioner for CID</td>
<td>Rwanda National Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy Kyazze</td>
<td>Director of Planning</td>
<td>MININFRA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eddyunited@yahoo.com">eddyunited@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Nyanvumba</td>
<td>Principal Senior Engineer Energy, Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>MININFRA (Energy)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rnyamvumba@edcl.reg.rw">rnyamvumba@edcl.reg.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix GAKUBA</td>
<td>Managing Director EDCL (focal person for SE4ALL)</td>
<td>MININFRA (Energy)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emmanuel.kamanzi@mininfra.gov.rw">emmanuel.kamanzi@mininfra.gov.rw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Kagame</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kfranka04@yahoo.com">kfranka04@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Green Economy Focal Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing Authority</strong></td>
<td><strong>E-mail</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustin Kampayana</td>
<td>Rwanda Housing Authority</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Augustin.kampayana@rha.gov.rw">Augustin.kampayana@rha.gov.rw</a>  <a href="mailto:augustin.kampayana@yahoo.com">augustin.kampayana@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr. Marie Christine Gasingirwa</strong></td>
<td>MINEDUC/UR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cgasingirwa@mineduc.gov.rw">cgasingirwa@mineduc.gov.rw</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remy Twiringiyimana</strong></td>
<td>MINEDUC/UR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rtwiringiyimana@mineduc.gov.rw">rtwiringiyimana@mineduc.gov.rw</a></td>
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Annex 2: Documents to be consulted
The list below details the important documents that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. The list might include other relevant documents identified during the inception phase and the consultation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly narrative reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly financial reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAP 2013-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Strategic Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Growth and Climate Resilient Strategy (GGCRS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 3: Evaluation matrix
The evaluation matrix is a tool that the evaluator creates as a map and Reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

The draft sample evaluation Matrix to be used by the evaluators is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample evaluation matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant evaluation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 4: Evaluation report format
The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports:

I. **Title and opening pages** - Should provide the following basic information:
   - Name of the evaluation intervention
   - Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

II. **Table of contents** - Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

III. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**

IV. **Executive summary** - A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
- Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

V. **Introduction**
- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.

VI. **Description of the intervention**—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDAF priorities, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other programme or country specific plans and goals.
- Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

**VII. Evaluation scope and objectives**—The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- Evaluation scope: The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- Evaluation objectives: The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- Evaluation criteria: The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- Evaluation questions: Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

**VIII. Evaluation approach and methods**—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- Data sources—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview
protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.

- Performance standards—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder engagement—Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).
- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- Major limitations of the methodology—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

IX. **Data analysis**—The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

X. **Findings and conclusions**—The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- Findings—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- Conclusions—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

XI. **Recommendations**—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the
evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

XII. **Lessons learned**—As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

XIII. **Report annexes**—Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

**Annex 5: Code of conduct**

*Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System*