Terms of Reference (ToR)

NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANCY

Final evaluation: “Joint Programme on Support to Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs MIDIMAR”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title:</th>
<th>National Consultant for the Final Evaluation of “Support to Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR) to address Disaster Management”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Station:</td>
<td>Kigali, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of contract:</td>
<td>National consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected starting date:</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of assignment:</td>
<td>35 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Background and context

UNDP and MIDIMAR initiated “Building national and local capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda” project in 2013, a Disaster Risk Management (DRM) capacity development initiative. This 5-year project built upon the Project Initiation Plan for National Capacity Building for Disaster Risk management Programme signed in 2011 by UNDP and Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR) and whose implementation ended in 2013. The project started its implementation in June 2013 and is designed to end in June 2018. It aims to support the national development framework, the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS II 2013-2018) where disaster Management has been mainstreamed as a cross cutting issue. The project is geared towards helping the Government of Rwanda
strengthen its DRM capacity, enhance preparedness and reduce risks, and achieve its global commitment to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and the MDGs. It aims at building national capacities for disaster risk management through advisory, policy and technical support to render fully operational an effective disaster risk management system at the national and local levels.

Furthermore, the project is in line with Outcome 3 of the United Nations Development Assistance Plan 2013 – 2018 (UNDAP): “Rwanda has in place improved systems for: sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources, energy access and security, for environmental and climate change resilience, in line with Rio+20 recommendations for sustainable development.”

In 2014, the project was incorporated in the One UN Joint Programme on “support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management”. The revised joint programme has five inter-related outputs.

- **Output 1**: Technical and financial assistance for capacity development of central and local bodies dealing with disaster management, early warning and monitoring.
- **Output 2**: Support to risk, vulnerability and emergency assessments.
- **Output 3**: Policy and strategy formulation, including integration of cross-cutting issues in disaster management and preparedness.
- **Output 4**: Increased Public Awareness on Disaster Risk Reduction and reduced community vulnerabilities in selected high risk districts
- **Output 5**: Technical and financial support to respond to Disasters

The joint programme aimed to reinforce and develop MIDIMAR’s capacity to fulfill its mandate and implement the national disaster management policy which was developed in 2012. It also aimed to enable MIDIMAR to coordinate disaster management and facilitate mainstreaming of disaster risk management in national programmes, policies and plans as stipulated in the EDPRS II. This joint programme is aligned with the country’s vision 2020 and the second Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013-2018) both of which point at some of the impacts of natural disasters on the country’s economy, and proposes to develop strategic plans for disaster preparedness, risk analysis, mitigation measures and response.

The joint programme employed a three-pronged strategy towards institutional strengthening of MIDIMAR on disaster management. The key strategy adopted for the joint programme includes research and

---

1 UNDAP is the business plan of all the UN agencies, funds and programmes in Rwanda for the period July 2013 to June 2018. UNDAP Rwanda supports the realization of the Millennium Declaration, the related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the other international development aspirations, the transition from the MDGs to the post-2015 framework, the country’s medium-term national development priorities as set out in the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS 2) for the period 2013-2018, as well as the Rwanda Vision 2020.
assessment; building a solid disaster information management system and strengthening coordination (including the use of joint GoR/UN appeal process to respond to disasters). Gender, human rights and sustainability mainstreaming are cross-cutting strategies within the three elements. Finally, the joint programme aimed at strengthening human security, enhancing resilience, and improving disaster risk management of high-risk communities and most vulnerable populations of the most disaster prone areas District of Rwanda (United Trust Fund for Human Security joint programme).

The joint programme is jointly supported by the One UN Rwanda specifically combining technical expertise, financial support and mandates of different UN Agencies namely UNHCR, UNDP, WFP, UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA, IOM, UNHABITAT and UNV. The joint programme consolidated all the disaster management initiatives and support of the abovementioned UN agencies and integrated under this One UN Disaster Management Joint Programme. It will be implemented within a duration of 4 years (starting from mid-2014 - mid 2018).

The main implementing partner for this Joint Programme is the Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR). The MIDIMAR, with its DRR mandate is required to “develop a highly proficient mechanism for preventing, mitigating, responding to, recovering, securing, monitoring and responding in a timely manner in order to promote management of natural and man-made disasters including volcanic activity, earthquakes, floods, landslides, mudslides, storms, fire and drought.

II. Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the Final Evaluation (FE) is to examine the results, achievements and constraints of UNDP funded activities of the Joint Programme to support MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management. The Project was initiated in 2013 and is planned to end in June 2018. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation and lessons learned from its implementation will inform for the upcoming project cycle. The Evaluation also aims at assessing UNDP’s contribution to the achievement of UNDAP Outcome 3.

The consultant is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation, and to come up with recommendations regarding the overall design and orientation of the project and on the work plan for the next programming cycle, after evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of implementation, as well as assessing the achievements the project outputs and outcomes. The evaluation will also assess early signs of project success or failure and prompts adjustments. The results and recommendations of the evaluation would therefore help UNDP and MIDIMAR to document lessons learnt and best practices for the next project cycle.
III. Evaluation scope and objectives

Objectives

In line with the project’s objectives, UNDP Rwanda, in collaboration with the project’s implementing partner (MIDIMAR), plans to conduct a final evaluation of UNDP funded interventions of the Joint programme on Support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management. The evaluation aims to assess the achievements of the outputs and outcomes. The final evaluation main objectives are the following:

- 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 programme’s activities
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets
- Document lessons learnt
- Make recommendations for the next project cycle

Scope

The evaluation covers the implementation period of the project, from July 2013 up to September 2017. It covers the specific UNDP funded interventions of the One UN Joint Programme on support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management. 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 project. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the project compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the project objectives.
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments to document lessons learnt.
- Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.
- Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the programme.

The evaluation comprises the following elements:

(i) Assess whether the programme design was clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
(ii) An evaluation of the project’s delivery of achievement of its overall objectives;
(iii) An evaluation of programme’s performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Project Document; An assessment of
the scope, quality and significance of the programme outputs produced to date in relation to expected results; Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the duration of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the programme;

(iv) An evaluation of the programme’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 Programme Document;

(vi) An evaluation of project coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:
   a. Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in project arrangements and execution;
   b. The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms used by MIDIMAR in monitoring on a day to day basis, progress in project implementation;
   c. Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project;
   d. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Project Steering Committee (PSC);
   e. Financial management of the project, 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 programme were met;

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

(ix) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach²

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

(xi) Lessons learned during programme implementation;

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

² For 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
IV. Evaluation

Evaluation criteria

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

- **Relevance**: measures whether the programme addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid.
- **Effectiveness**: measures whether the programme activities achieve its goal.
- **Efficiency**: measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results.
- **Sustainability**: measures whether the benefits of the programme are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The programme needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.
- **Impacts of intervention**: measure the positive and negative changes produced by the programme, 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 Programme being implemented? How was the Programme site selected? What has been the main focus of the programme implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected? How was the programme aligned to the national development strategy (EDPRS 2, Vision 2020)?
- The extent to which the programme activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
- To what extent did the objectives remain valid throughout the programme duration?
- Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Were the activities and outputs of the programme 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 programme 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 support the achievement of programme 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 programmes?

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

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

Impact of interventions
• What are the stated goals of the Programme? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the programme and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed? How did the programme contribute to the achievement of UNDAP outcomes and outputs?
• What has happened as a result of the programme?
• What have been the main impact of the programme on the Disaster Management framework in Rwanda?
• How many people have been affected?
• Has the programme contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the programme?
• What difference has the programme made to beneficiaries?
V. 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 evaluators and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluators, 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 programme indicators (RRF data) will be used by the evaluation to assess the programme progress and achievements.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

(i) Desk review of 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 datasets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;
(iii) Interviews with the head of SPIU, Programme Manager, Technical Assistant/Project Coordinator and the Administrative Assistant in MIDIMAR
(iv) Interviews with UNDP International DRR Specialist, Head of Poverty and Environment Unit and UNDP Programme Analyst
(v) Interviews with District Disaster Management Officers (DDMOs), Sector Disaster Management Officers (SDMOs) and other programme beneficiaries
(vi) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders involved, including the co-financers, namely the European Union, representative of the Government of Japan as well as the World Bank.
(vii) Focus group discussions with all stakeholders
VI. **Deliverables (Evaluation Products)**

This section presents the key evaluation products the evaluation team 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 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 programme unit and the evaluators 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 MIDIMAR. **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.

- **Presentation of Draft evaluation report (PPT presentation)** to the Project Steering Committee for inputs and comments.

- **Final evaluation report.** The final report should be completed **1 week after receipt of consolidated comments from stakeholders.**

VII. **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 or/and Disaster Management;
- 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 Disaster Management/ Disaster Risk Reduction initiatives;
- Good understanding of gender equality, human-rights 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 added advantage

Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English

VIII. 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

IX. Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[^3]. 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

X. 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 this final evaluation and will contract 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 Analyst

Day-to-day management of the Evaluation Team will be provided by UNDP programme analyst overseeing the project. He will ensure that all issues pertaining to the contract with the Evaluation Team, including payments are completed on schedule and will be responsible for facilitating the work of the Evaluation Team. He will provide all documentation to the team for the desk review, set up interview appointments and field visits and convene focus group meetings.

Steering Committee

The Building National and Local capacities for DM in Rwanda project Steering Committee will oversee the conduct of the 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 MIDIMAR, UNDP Environment Head of Unit, Programme Analyst, the Chief of UNDP Management Support Unit and the International DRR Specialist 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 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.

XI. Time Frame for the evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted in October 2017 for an estimated 35 working days. The evaluation will include the following phases with their respective time frame.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tasks and deliverables</th>
<th>Time-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review and Inception report phase</td>
<td>• Desk review conducted&lt;br&gt;• Briefings of evaluators</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 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.

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 days

Analysis of data and drafting report
• Once the data is collected, the evaluators will analyse them and draft the evaluation report. 8 days

Presentation of draft evaluation report to Stakeholder meeting
• 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. 2 days

Final Report
• The evaluators will revise the final evaluation report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP. 5 days

Total number of working days 35 days

XII. Price 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. Fodé Ndiaye,

UNDP Resident Representative

Signature: .................................................................
Annex: Selection criteria

Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the evaluation criteria as stated below:

The offer will be evaluated by using the best value for money approach. Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70% whereas the financial proposal will be evaluated on 30%. Below is the breakdown for the technical proposal on 10 which will be brought to 70%.

Selection Criteria
Interested candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

a. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
b. Personal CV or P11, indicating all experience from similar evaluations, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
c. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
d. Financial and Technical Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

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.}\n
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>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least master’s degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development studies, International Development, Environmental Sciences or/and Disaster Management;</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 7 years accumulated experiences in project/programme evaluation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of Disaster Management/ Disaster Risk Reduction initiatives;</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</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>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent in English (written and verbal skills) and basic knowledge of French would be a value adding</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>