

REQUEST FOR TENDERS

RFT: 2021/077
File: AP_5/4/5
Date: 6 October, 2021
To: Interested suppliers
From: Raymond Schuster, Project Assistant

Subject: Request for tenders: End of Project Evaluation for the Pacific Partnership on Ocean Acidification (PPOA) Project

1. Background

- 1.1. The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) is an intergovernmental organisation charged with promoting cooperation among Pacific islands countries and territories to protect and improve their environment and ensure sustainable development.
- 1.2. SPREP approaches the environmental challenges faced by the Pacific guided by four simple Values. These values guide all aspects of our work:
 - We value the Environment
 - We value our People
 - We value high quality and targeted Service Delivery
 - We value Integrity
- 1.3. For more information, see: www.sprep.org.

2. Specifications: statement of requirement

- 2.1. SPREP would like to call for tenders from qualified and experienced individuals who can offer their services to undertake an end of project evaluation for the Pacific Partnership on ocean acidification project.
- 2.2. The successful applicant will need to provide the details of works required as referred to in Annex A: Terms of Reference within a period of 35 days from the date of contract signing.
- 2.3. The Terms of Reference and the specific statement of work for this engagement are set out in Annex A.
- 2.4. The successful consultant must supply the services to the extent applicable, in compliance with SPREP's Values and Code of Conduct. https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Corporate_Documents/sprep-organisational-values-code-of-conduct.pdf.

3. Conditions: information for applicants

- 3.1. To be considered for this tender, interested suppliers must meet the following conditions:
 - i. Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement
 - ii. Strategic thinking ability and research and analysis skills.
 - iii. Understanding of gender, human rights, inclusive development and environmental issues and how to effectively evaluate these in Activity.

- iv. Ability to engage with, listen to, and learn from a broad range of evaluation stakeholders, encouraging their meaningful participation.
- v. *Knowledge of best practice in programme evaluations and experience* in preparation of Evaluations for Development Activities.
- vi. Ability to work in an interdisciplinary team.
- vii. Ability to work dynamically and flexibly to suit the COVID-19 environment.
- viii. Experience in preparing and presenting an Evaluation Report in a manner that increases the likelihood that they will be used and accepted by a diverse group of stakeholders.
- ix. Experience working in the Pacific and the ability to understand the context of the programme and how it affects programme planning, implementation, outcomes and even the evaluation.
- x. Must prioritize building trust with colleagues, demonstrating professionalism and working well with stakeholders.
- xi. Excellent written and cross-cultural communication skills.
- xii. Complete the tender application form provided – noting you are required to complete all areas in full, particularly the statements to demonstrate you meet the selection criteria. Failure to do so may result in your application NOT being considered.
- xiii. Sign the Conflict-of-Interest Form provided.

4. Submission guidelines

- 4.1. Tender documentation should demonstrate that the interested supplier satisfies the conditions stated above and is capable of meeting the specifications and timeframes. Documentation must also include supporting examples to address the evaluation criteria.
- 4.2. Tender documentation should outline the interested consultant's complete proposal: methods, personnel (and their skill sets/curricula vitae), timeframes and costs:
 - i. Submissions must include a TECHNICAL PROPOSAL that include a detailed workplan, methodology, schedule of activities and other items as deemed necessary by the applicant.
 - ii. Submissions must include a FINANCIAL PROPOSAL that has an annotated budget listing for each task
 - iii. Submissions must include a Curriculum Vitae for the individual or each member of a proposed team, demonstrating relevant experience, skills, and qualifications to carry out the required statement of works.
 - iv. Provide three referees relevant to this tender submission, including the most recent work completed.
- 4.4 Tenderers/Bidders must insist on an acknowledgement of receipt of tenders/proposals/bids.

5. Tender Clarification

- 5.1. Any clarification questions from applicants must be submitted by email to procurement@sprep.org before 13 October 2021. A summary of all questions received with an associated response will be posted on the SPREP website www.sprep.org/tender by 15 October 2021

6. Evaluation criteria

- 6.1. SPREP will select a preferred supplier on the basis of SPREP's evaluation of the extent to which the documentation demonstrates that the tenderer offers the best value for money, and that the tenderer satisfies the following criteria:

(A) Qualifications and Experience

- i. Bachelor's Degree in environmental, marine or natural sciences or other closely related fields. Minimum 10 years of relevant experience, with minimum 2 years demonstrated experience in conducting end of project evaluations – please provide examples and link to work/reports **15%**
 - ii. Demonstrated experience in the field of Ocean Acidification/Marine Sciences. Experience or working knowledge in the Pacific Region including experience **15%**
 - iii. Proven experience in stakeholder consultations. Fluent in English (oral and written), excellent communication and interpretation skills. **15%**
- (B) Technical Proposal / Proposed project Methodology
- i. Detailing activities to be conducted over the term of the engagement, with specific mention of:
 - a. Evaluation plan (methodology) indicating the evaluators approach to undertake this project evaluation **35%**
- (C) Financial Proposal
- i. Based on value for money considering (but not limited to) cost, experience of evaluator(s), product scope and depth etc. **20%**

7. Deadline

- 7.1. The due date for submission of the tender is: **20 October 2021, midnight (Apia, Samoa local time).**
- 7.2. Late submissions will be returned unopened to the sender.
- 7.3. Please send all tenders clearly marked '**2021/077: End of Project Evaluation for the Pacific Partnership on Ocean Acidification**' to one of the following methods:

Mail: SPREP
Attention: Procurement Officer
PO Box 240
Apia, SAMOA

Email: tenders@sprep.org (MOST PREFERRED OPTION)

Fax: 685 20231

Person: Submit by hand in the tenders box at SPREP reception,
Vailima, Samoa.

Note: Submissions made to the incorrect portal will not be considered by SPREP. If SPREP is made aware of the error in submission prior to the deadline, the applicant will be advised to resubmit their application to the correct portal. However, if SPREP is not made aware of the error in submission until after the deadline, then the application is considered late and will be returned unopened to the sender.

SPREP reserves the right to reject any or all tenders and the lowest or any tender will not necessarily be accepted.

For any complaints regarding the Secretariat's tenders please refer to the Complaints section on the SPREP website
<http://www.sprep.org/accountability/complaints>

TERMS OF REFERENCE

THIS DOCUMENT SPECIFIES THE TERMS OF REFERENCE TO DELIVER THE END OF PROJECT EVALUATION OF THE NZ PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION PROJECT

INTRODUCTION:

The Activity Design Document of the *New Zealand Pacific Partnership on Ocean Acidification* (PPOA) project is set out to undertake a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation of all activities. This Terms of reference (TOR) outlines the expectations of the terminal evaluation.

Background

Ocean acidification (OA) is rapidly emerging as a significant regional and global threat to ocean ecosystems and fisheries. Globally, it is driven by the emission of carbon dioxide (CO₂) into the atmosphere, which is then partially absorbed by the oceans. In this regard it can be viewed as a long-term climate change stressor similar to sea level rise and increasing sea surface temperatures, with dramatic consequences for key marine and coastal organisms highly likely to occur well before the end of this century. Local factors, such as nutrient and organic loading into coastal waters, can drive acidification locally, on top of the global CO₂ absorption, complicating adaptation.

In August 2014 the United States of America and New Zealand, in partnership with SPREP, hosted a two-day workshop on Ocean Acidification: State of the Science Considerations for Small Island Developing States (SIDS), as an official side event to the 3rd United Nations (UN) SIDS Conference in Apia, Samoa. During the workshop, participating countries identified and called for more local research and monitoring, capacity building and coordination of activities at the national and regional level as well as taking an integrated approach to monitoring, resilience building and practical adaptation strategies. As a follow-up to the SIDS International OA workshop, the outcomes of this event paved the way for the development of the New Zealand PPOA Project. The PPOA project is a collaborative effort between the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the University of the South Pacific (USP), and the Pacific Community (SPC) to build resilience to OA in Pacific Island communities and ecosystems with financial support from the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and the government of the Principality of Monaco.

Project Summary:

Project Name	New Zealand Pacific Partnership on Ocean Acidification
Objective	A collaborative effort between the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the University of the South Pacific, and the Pacific Community to build resilience to ocean acidification (OA) in Pacific Island communities and ecosystems.
Donor/Fund	New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade Principality of the Government of Monaco
Partners	University of the South Pacific (USP) Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
Participating Countries	Fiji Kiribati Tokelau
SPREP Program	<u>Climate Change Resilience</u>
Related Information Portals	<u>PPOA on the Pacific Met Website</u> <u>Pacific Climate Change Portal</u>

The Long-term outcome of PPOA Project was to ensure that Resilience to OA impacts was strengthened through improved management of vulnerable fisheries and marine ecosystems. PPOA envisioned to achieve these outcomes through 3 primary outputs and associated action's:

1. **Research and Monitoring**

Research and ecosystem monitoring data that were collected during the implementation of the project in the selected pilot OA adaptation activities (related to reduction of local stressors and ecosystem rehabilitation) were used to inform policy development and provide further support to monitoring OA in the pacific islands region.

2. **Practical adaptation actions**

As a bottom-up, stakeholder driven project, PPOA worked in close consultation with community and government stakeholders at these pilot sites (Fiji, Tokelau, and Kiribati) to build capacity and to determine stakeholder priorities for appropriate adaptation actions. Adaptation actions being considered include:

- a. Enhancing primary producers (mangroves, seagrass) to locally buffer pH in the vicinity of a coral reef ecosystem
- b. Coral restoration to enhance reef resilience
- c. Reducing reef stressors via:
 - i. Locally managed marine areas (LMMAs)
 - ii. Reducing reef fishing pressure by supporting alternative livelihood opportunities for reef-dependent communities, e.g., aquaculture

Data from research and monitoring, as well as from the implementation of practical adaptation actions, went in to inform policy development. Specific focus areas included:

- a. incorporation of projected OA impacts on pelagic fisheries into fisheries management guidelines; and
- b. development of policy options, pilot adaptation activities, and monitoring to support OA adaptation actions based on Ecosystem and Social Resilience Assessment and Mapping (ESRAM) studies.

3. **Capacity building and awareness raising**

Throughout the implementation of adaptation activities, the project aimed to build capacity within the local communities and partners, to address OA and to develop effective coastal zone management. Additionally, the project intended to enhance the awareness of Ocean Acidification at all levels from international, the region and from national to community stakeholders.

OBJECTIVE:

The overall objective of the Terminal Evaluation is to review the achievements made to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes under the PPOA project as indicated in the Activity Design Document (ADD). It will establish the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, performance, and success of the project including the sustainability of results.

EVALUATION APPROACH:

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, SPREP and other key stakeholders that were involved with the PPOA project. Due to the restrictions imposed by COVID-19, travel at this point in time remains restricted indefinitely. As such, all forms of stakeholder engagement will be held via online platforms. The evaluator(s) will review all relevant sources of information, such as project documents, project reports, project publications and all other project related materials that the evaluator(s) considers useful for the conduct of an evidence-based Terminal Evaluation. A list of the beforementioned documents will be provided to the evaluator(s) to provide support in their review. Additionally, a team of consultants can be considered if a lead or

support consultant has reliable experience and is based in either Fiji, Kiribati or Tokelau that can undertake in-person consultation with pilot-project communities.

SCOPE OF WORK:

This evaluation will review the achievements of the PPOA Project from the initial implementing period October 2015 to December 2021. The terminal evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance and procedures outlined in the evaluation standards (below). The evaluation will assess the project based on the following key questions:

- Effective development – did the activity do the right things; did it achieve its outcomes?
- Inclusive development – how did the activity address exclusions and ensure benefits are shared?
- Resilient development – how the activity strengthened environment, economic and social resources to withstand shocks and protect future well-being
- Sustained development – how did the activity contribute to progress that is lasting and owned by partner countries
- Key achievements
- Key lessons learned

The findings of the evaluation will aid in the overall enhancement in planning of future programme collaborations between the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.

The results of the evaluation will be reported and disseminated to SPREP, relevant partner government institutions and other key stakeholders.

There is an expectation that the evaluation will be published.

DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION (TE):

The project implementation results will be evaluated against the project outputs, inputs and outcomes as indicated in the results framework (refer to PPOA Activity Design Document).

The TE will assess the project performance against expectations set out in the project logical results framework indicated in the PPOA ADD. The TE will assess the results according to the key questions indicated in the 'scope of work' and based on the completion of each activity as required in each of the outcomes and objectives in the results framework.

The findings section of the TE report will cover but will not be limited to the topics listed below:

1. Project Design/formulation
 - a. National Priorities and country buy-in
 - b. Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - c. Social and environmental standards (safeguards)
 - d. Analysis of results framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - e. Planned stakeholder participation
 - f. Management and institutional arrangements
2. Project Implementation
 - a. Adaptive management (changes to project design, activities, and outputs during implementation)
 - b. Actual stakeholder participation and partnership agreements
 - c. Project finance
 - d. Risk management
3. Project results
 - a. Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements. The reporting on the level of progress and final achievements of each indicator is to be guided by the key questions referred to in the 'scope of work'.
 - b. Country ownership and sustainability of OA planned activities demonstrated through mainstreaming of OA activities into workplans, budgets and other key mechanisms as appropriate.

- c. Gender equality and women's empowerment
- d. Catalytic role/replication effect (were the final outcomes achieved and did it establish future avenues for opportunities to replicate activities)
- e. Progress to impact

MAIN FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS:

The TE evaluator(s) will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.

The section on conclusions will be written considering the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, and respond to key evaluation questions.

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons for activities at the national level (Kiribati, Fiji and Tokelau) as well as future multi-country programmes on ocean acidification in the Pacific. To the extent that recommendations and lessons can be applied in other similar political, geographic, socio-economic contexts, these should also be highlighted.

The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. In addition, country specific recommendations should also be noted by the evaluator(s) for the 3 project related countries (Fiji, Tokelau & Kiribati) to indicate avenues they can take to sustainably continue completed activities. It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

The principal responsibility for managing the progress of this evaluation resides with the SPREP project team in Samoa. The SPREP project team will contract the evaluator(s). The SPREP project team will liaise with the country coordinators/project focal points and provide support to the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews which will be held via online platforms.

EVALUATION DESIGN & METHODS:

In proposing an evaluation design, the evaluation team should identify the most appropriate approach, methodology and tools to generate credible evidence that corresponds to the evaluation's purpose and the questions being asked.

Relevant documents and data will be provided to the successful evaluation team.

Culturally responsive methodological approaches

There are a range of worldviews, and we encourage the use of culturally appropriate evaluation designs, methods and approaches to ensure the evaluation contributes to the body of knowledge of the country and its people which are the focus of the evaluation.

Capacity building

Local capacity and capability building through evaluations are key to improving local knowledge outcomes and is a tangible example of reciprocity in action. It demonstrates a commitment to the empowerment of the local community and partner government and provides an opportunity to build local research and evaluation capacity. We encourage proposals from local-led evaluation teams or from evaluation teams which include emerging local researchers or evaluator(s).

EVALUATION PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS

This evaluation will be 'utility focused', credible, timely, and relevant. The recommendations will be developed in a way so that they are pragmatic, actionable and presented in ways that promote learning.

All sources are to be cited fully and accurately. The findings, conclusions and recommendations must be based on clear evidence presented and documented in a way that allows the reader to follow the logic of the analysis.

Where there is conflicting evidence or interpretations, the report should note the differences and justify the findings.

In conducting the evaluation, the team will be transparent, independent, and operate in partnership to the greatest extent possible. The team must have no vested interest in the outcomes of the evaluation and are independent of those responsible for policy making, design, delivery and management of a development intervention.

All processes and outputs are required to be robust and independent (carried out in a way that avoids any adverse effects of political or organisational influence on the findings) and transparent (process open and understood by all parties). Cross-cutting issues such as human rights, gender and the environment should be considered where applicable.

In support of consultative and participatory approach, the team is expected to engage with stakeholders as appropriate in completing the evaluation.

A list of quality standards for evaluations is presented in

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME:

The consultant should propose a time schedule in line with the suggested time frame below, where total duration of the evaluation is estimated to be 35 days commencing immediately upon signing of contract.

Activity	Timing	Indicative time frame
Signing of contract and submission of workplan including methodology evaluation process & milestones	Upon signing of contract	
Desktop review of all project related documents	5 days	01 – 05 November 2021
Country National stakeholder interviews	15 days	06 – 21 November 2021
Debrief after interviews, presentation of 1 st draft evaluation report, incorporation of feedback	5 Days	22 – 30 November 2021
Collection of final data and submission of 2 nd draft evaluation report	5 Days	01 – 05 December 2021
Submission of final report	5 Days	06 – 10 December 2021
Deadline submission		15 December 2021
Total	35 days	

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES:

Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
Workplan – including methodology evaluation process & milestones	Briefing with SPREP staff to consult with the consultant to discuss the methodology and workplan proposed by the consultant	Refer to Evaluation timeframe (Timing column)	Evaluator(s) submits to SPREP

Desktop Review	Relevant documents associated with the project	Refer to timeframe (Timing column)	Evaluation (Timing)	SPREP to provide the necessary documents to which the consultant deems essential for the evaluation
First draft	Presentation of first draft evaluation report	Refer to timeframe (Timing column)	Evaluation (Timing)	Evaluator(s) submits to SPREP
Second draft	Full report with annexes	Refer to timeframe (Timing column)	Evaluation (Timing)	Evaluator(s) submits to SPREP
Final Report	Revised report	Refer to timeframe (Timing column)	Evaluation (Timing)	Evaluator(s) submits to SPREP

EVALUATION STANDARDS:

The evaluation deliverables must meet the following standards:

Standard	Description
Evaluation plan	
Applies and appropriate evaluation design	The evaluation plan applies an appropriate design to meet the evaluations' purpose. Objectives and questions. The evaluation plan will be published alongside the final evaluation approach.
Evaluation report	
Delivers the evaluation plan	The evaluation is taken as specified in the evaluation plan. Any variation to the agreed evaluation plan is stated in the evaluation report.
Describes the purpose and objectives, and scope of the evaluation	These are clearly described in the evaluation report.
Clearly describes methodology	Methodology as described in the evaluation plan is summarised in the evaluation report. The way in which risks, limitations and/or constraints to the evaluation were managed is explained.
Describes ethical considerations	Ethical considerations described in the evaluation plan are implemented during the evaluation. Names of participants do not appear anywhere in the report (including the appendices) unless permission has been given and this is noted in the report. Cultural/gender sensitivity is evident, and conflicts of interest or any disagreement on findings within the evaluation team declared.
Meets the evaluations' purpose, objectives, and addresses evaluation questions	The report clearly addresses the evaluation purpose, objectives, and evaluation questions.
Findings are supported by evidence	Findings answer the evaluation questions, are supported by evidence (with source of evidence clear), are disaggregated where appropriate (e.g., gender, age), and are separated from opinion and judgements.
Has clear lines of evidence	There is a clear form from evidence-supported findings to conclusions to recommendation and to lessons learned.

Is useful and relevant	Recommendations are relevant and useful and directed to appropriate people/organisations. Lessons learned are also relevant and useful.
Is readable and well structured	Report flows logically, style/tone and length of report is appropriate. Any gaps in information are reported. Report is readable. Executive summary is well written, stands alone and provides a good summary of the evaluation. Report does not contain confidential information which would prevent public release.
Includes value for money assessment	Value for money for the activity is assessed using the most appropriate approach and tools.
Addresses DAC and other evaluation criteria appropriately, including cross-cutting issues as appropriate	Whichever DAC or other evaluation criterion are selected for the evaluation are addressed appropriately. The integration of cross-cutting issues and the treatment of environmental and social impacts are addressed appropriately under the relevant criteria.

TEAM COMPOSITION:

The evaluation team can be comprised of an individual or team of consultants with knowledge of oceans and/or climate change (knowledge of Ocean acidification will be looked upon favourably). The consultant (s) shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. A team of consultants can be considered if a lead or support consultant has reliable experience and is based in either Fiji, Kiribati or Tokelau that can undertake in-person consultation with pilot-project communities. The attributes (knowledge, skills, experience) required of the evaluation team include:

1. Bachelor's Degree in environmental, marine or natural sciences or other closely related fields
2. Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience, with minimum 2 years of experience with project evaluation
3. Must have experience from the Pacific region
4. Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement
5. Knowledge of best practice in programme evaluations.
6. Strategic thinking ability and research and analysis skills.
7. Understanding of gender, human rights, inclusive development, and environmental issues and how to effectively evaluate these in Activity.
8. Ability to engage with, listen to, and learn from a broad range of evaluation stakeholders, encouraging their meaningful participation.
9. Experience in preparation Evaluations for Development Activities.
10. Ability to work in an interdisciplinary team.
11. Ability to work dynamically and flexibly to suit the COVID-19 environment.
12. Experience in preparing and presenting an Evaluation Report in a manner that increases the likelihood that they will be used and accepted by a diverse group of stakeholders.
13. Experience working in the Pacific and the ability to understand the context of the programme and how it affects programme planning, implementation, outcomes and even the evaluation.
14. Must prioritise building trust with colleagues, demonstrating professionalism and working well with stakeholders.
15. Excellent written and cross-cultural communication skills.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPREP will select a preferred supplier on the basis of SPREP's evaluation of the extent to which the documentation demonstrates that the tenderer offers the best value for money, and that the tenderer satisfies the following criteria:

- (A) Qualifications and Experience

- I. Bachelor’s Degree in environmental, marine or natural sciences or other closely related fields. Minimum 10 years of relevant experience, with minimum 2 years demonstrated experience in conducting end of project evaluations – please provide examples and link to work/reports **15%**
- II. Demonstrated experience in the field of Ocean Acidification/Marine Sciences. Experience or working knowledge in the Pacific Region including experience **15%**
- III. Proven experience in stakeholder consultations. Fluent in English (oral and written), excellent communication and interpretation skills. **15%**

(B) Technical Proposal / Proposed project Methodology

- I. Detailing activities to be conducted over the term of the engagement, with specific mention of:
 - a. Evaluation plan (methodology) indicating the evaluators approach to undertake this project evaluation **35%**

(C) Financial Proposal

- I. Based on value for money considering (but not limited to) cost, experience of evaluator(s), hours invested timelines, product scope and depth etc. **20%**

EVALUATOR ETHICS:

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. The evaluation will consider the following principles:

- Respect for human beings (respect and protect the rights and dignity of participants)
- Maximise benefit and minimise harm (research that is of value to participants and avoids harm)
- Research merit and integrity (research that meets relevant quality criteria, is independent and impartial, transparent and responsible)
- Social justice (research that is inclusive, equitable and fair).

The evaluation design will outline how privacy, cultural, safety, and ethical issues will be managed in the evaluation. For example:

- full disclosure i.e. how participants will be fully informed of the evaluation purpose, how the information they provide will be used, and their rights regarding information they provide
- informed consent - how it will be obtained (verbal or written)
- potential possible harm to participants that has been identified and how this will be mitigated
- how confidentiality of participants will be ensured (e.g. no names in the body of the report, and participants will be asked at the start of interviews if they consent to their names being included in an appendix listing evaluation participants), and
- how considerations of gender and cultural safety and appropriateness will be addressed.

REMUNERATION SCHEDULE:

%	Milestone
20%	Upon signing of contract & submission of workplan
30%	Post submission and approval of the ‘first draft’ terminal evaluation report
30%	Post submission and approval of the ‘second’ evaluation report
20%	Post submission and approval of the ‘final report’

APPLICATION PROCESS:

Interested candidates are invited to submit applications including a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (daily fee). The application should contain a current and complete CV in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.