

**Request for Proposal (RFP -34908-2010-005)  
International Consultancy**

Date: 05 February 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Subject: RFP for conducting the Country-Led Evaluation of the Delivering as One (DaO) Programme in Rwanda.**

1. You are requested to submit a proposal for services, as per enclosed Terms of Reference (TOR).
2. To enable you to submit a proposal, attached are:
  - i. Instructions to Offerors ..... (Annex I)
  - ii. General Conditions of Contract..... (Annex II)
  - iii. Terms of Reference (TOR)..... (Annex III)
  - iv. Proposal Submission Form .....(Annex IV)
  - v. Price Schedule .....(Annex V)
3. Interested parties may obtain an electronic copy of the complete solicitation documents by visiting the Procurement Notices link on the UNDP Rwanda website: <http://www.undp.org.rw/procurement.html>.
4. Your offer comprising of technical proposal and financial proposal, in separate sealed envelopes, should reach the following address no later than **21<sup>st</sup> February 2010 at 11hrs, Kigali Time(GMT + 2)**  
**Registry, UNDP Rwanda**  
**12, Avenue de l'Armée**  
**P.O. Box 445, Kigali**  
**Attention: Head of Procurement Unit**  
**Telephone number: + 250-0252-590 400**  
**Telefax number: +250 -0252- 576 263.**
5. Electronic submission of Offers indicating "Do Not Open in Advance" on the subject line should be sent e to [offers.rw@undp.org](mailto:offers.rw@undp.org).
6. If you request additional information, UN Rwanda will endeavour to respond quickly in the form of a Bulletin, which will be published on the UNDP Rwanda website. If you are considering submitting a proposal, please refer to this website regularly for information updates. Please do not hesitate to contact UNDP Rwanda with any queries by emailing [procurement.rw@undp.org](mailto:procurement.rw@undp.org)
7. You are requested to acknowledge receipt of this letter and to indicate whether or not you intend to submit a proposal.

(Original signed by)  
Janvier Wussinu  
Deputy Country Director (Operations)

## **Instructions to Offerors**

### **A. Introduction**

#### **1. General**

Purpose of RFP

#### **2. Cost of proposal**

The Offeror shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of the Proposal, the UNDP will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the solicitation.

### **B. Solicitation Documents**

#### **3. Contents of solicitation documents**

Proposals must offer services for the total requirement. Proposals offering only part of the requirement will be rejected. The Offeror is expected to examine all corresponding instructions, forms, terms and specifications contained in the Solicitation Documents. Failure to comply with these documents will be at the Offeror's risk and may affect the evaluation of the Proposal.

#### **4. Clarification of solicitation documents**

A prospective Offeror requiring any clarification of the Solicitation Documents may notify the procuring UNDP entity in writing at the organisation's mailing address or fax number indicated in the RFP. The procuring UNDP entity will respond in writing to any request for clarification of the Solicitation Documents that it receives earlier than two weeks prior to the deadline for the submission of Proposals. Written copies of the organisation's response (including an explanation of the query but without identifying the source of inquiry) will be sent to all prospective Offerors that has received the Solicitation Documents.

#### **5. Amendments of solicitation documents**

At any time prior to the deadline for submission of Proposals, the procuring UNDP entity may, for any reason, whether at its own initiative or in response to a clarification requested by a prospective Offeror, modify the Solicitation Documents by amendment.



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
Unity in Diversity

All prospective Offerors that have received the Solicitation Documents will be notified in writing of all amendments to the Solicitation Documents.

In order to afford prospective Offerors reasonable time in which to take the amendments into account in preparing their offers, the procuring UNDP entity may, at its discretion, extend the deadline for the submission of Proposals.

## C. Preparation of Proposals

### 6. Language of the proposal

The Proposals prepared by the Offeror and all correspondence and documents relating to the Proposal exchanged by the Offeror and the procuring UNDP entity shall be written in the English/French/Spanish language. Any printed literature furnished by the Offeror may be written in another language so long as accompanied by an English/French/Spanish translation of its pertinent passages in which case, for purposes of interpretation of the Proposal, the English /French /Spanish translation shall govern.

### 7. Documents comprising the proposal

The Proposal shall comprise the following components:

- (a) Proposal submission form;
- (b) Operational and technical part of the Proposal, including documentation to demonstrate that the Offeror meets all requirements;
- (c) Price schedule, completed in accordance with clauses 8 and 9;
- (d) Proposal security.

### 8. Export License

All bidders/vendors must be aware that the goods and services are for the benefit of the Government under UNDP's development assistance framework and goods purchased will normally be transferred to the national partners, or to an entity nominated by it, in accordance with UNDP's policies and procedures.

The bidder/vendor shall include in their proposal:

- A statement whether any import or export licenses are required in respect of the goods to be purchased or service to be rendered including any restrictions on the country of origin, use/dual use nature of goods or services, including and disposition to end users;



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
Unity in Diversity

- Confirmation that he has obtained licenses of this nature in the past and have an expectation of obtaining all the necessary licenses should their bid be successful.

## 9. Proposal form

The Offeror shall structure the operational and technical part of its Proposal as follows:

### (a) Management plan

This section should provide corporate orientation to include the year and state/country of incorporation and a brief description of the Offeror's present activities. It should focus on services related to the Proposal.

This section should also describe the organisational unit(s) that will become responsible for the contract, and the general management approach towards a project of this kind. The Offeror should comment on its experience in similar projects and identify the person(s) representing the Offeror in any future dealing with the procuring UNDP entity.

### (b) Resource plan

This should fully explain the Offeror's resources in terms of personnel and facilities necessary for the performance of this requirement. It should describe the Offeror's current capabilities/facilities and any plans for their expansion.

### (c) Proposed methodology

This section should demonstrate the Offeror's responsiveness to the specification by identifying the specific components proposed, addressing the requirements, as specified, point by point; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics proposed warranty; and demonstrating how the proposed methodology meets or exceeds the specifications.

The operational and technical part of the Proposal should not contain any pricing information whatsoever on the services offered. Pricing information shall be separated and only contained in the appropriate Price Schedules.

It is mandatory that the Offeror's Proposal numbering system corresponds with the numbering system used in the body of this RFP. All references to descriptive material and brochures should be included in the appropriate response paragraph, though material/documents themselves may be provided as annexes to the Proposal/response.

Information which the Offeror considers proprietary, if any, should be clearly marked "proprietary" next to the relevant part of the text and it will then be treated as such accordingly.

## **10. Proposal prices**

The Offeror shall indicate on an appropriate Price Schedule, an example of which is contained in these Solicitation Documents, the prices of services it proposes to supply under the contract.

## **11. Proposal currencies**

All prices shall be quoted in US dollars or any convertible currency.

## **12. Period of validity of proposals**

Proposals shall remain valid for sixty (60) days after the date of Proposal submission prescribed by the procuring UNDP entity, pursuant to the deadline clause. A Proposal valid for a shorter period may be rejected by the procuring UNDP entity on the grounds that it is non-responsive.

In exceptional circumstances, the procuring UNDP entity may solicit the Offeror's consent to an extension of the period of validity. The request and the responses thereto shall be made in writing. An Offeror granting the request will not be required nor permitted to modify its Proposal.

## **13. Format and signing of proposals**

The Offeror shall prepare two copies of the Proposal, clearly marking each "Original Proposal" and "Copy of Proposal" as appropriate. In the event of any discrepancy between them, the original shall govern.

The two copies of the Proposal shall be typed or written in indelible ink and shall be signed by the Offeror or a person or persons duly authorised to bind the Offeror to the contract. The latter authorisation shall be indicated by written power-of-attorney accompanying the Proposal.

A Proposal shall contain no interlineations, erasures, or overwriting except, as necessary to correct errors made by the Offeror, in which case such corrections shall be initialled by the person or persons signing the Proposal.

## **14. Payment**

UNDP shall effect payments to the Contractor after acceptance by UNDP of the invoices submitted by the contractor, upon achievement of the corresponding milestones.

## **D. Submission of Proposals**

### **15. Sealing and marking of proposals**

The Offeror shall seal the Proposal in one outer and two inner envelopes, as detailed below.

(a) The outer envelope shall be:

- addressed to –

The Head,  
Procurement Unit, UNDP Rwanda  
**12, Avenue de l'Armée**  
**P.O. Box 445, Kigali - Rwanda**

Or to

[offers.rw@undp.org](mailto:offers.rw@undp.org) if submitted electronically.

- marked with –

“RFP: Services for **“Conducting the Country-Led Evaluation of the Delivering as One (DaO) Programme in Rwanda.”**”

(b) Both inner envelopes shall indicate the name and address of the Offeror. The first inner envelope shall contain the information specified in Clause 8 (*Proposal form*) above, with the copies duly marked “Original” and “Copy”. The second inner envelope shall include the price schedule duly identified as such.

Note, if the inner envelopes are not sealed and marked as per the instructions in this clause, the procuring UNDP entity will not assume responsibility for the Proposal’s misplacement or premature opening.

## 16. Deadline for submission of proposals

Proposals must be received by the procuring UNDP entity at the address specified under clause *Sealing and marking of Proposals* no later than day/hour, local time.

The procuring UNDP entity may, at its own discretion extend this deadline for the submission of Proposals by amending the solicitation documents in accordance with clause *Amendments of Solicitation Documents*, in which case all rights and obligations of the

procuring UNDP entity and Offerors previously subject to the deadline will thereafter be subject to the deadline as extended.

## **17. Late Proposals**

Any Proposal received by the procuring UNDP entity after the deadline for submission of proposals, pursuant to clause *Deadline for the submission of proposals*, will be rejected.

## **18. Modification and withdrawal of Proposals**

The Offeror may withdraw its Proposal after the Proposal's submission, provided that written notice of the withdrawal is received by the procuring UNDP entity prior to the deadline prescribed for submission of Proposals.

The Offeror's withdrawal notice shall be prepared, sealed, marked, and dispatched in accordance with the provisions of clause *Deadline for Submission of Proposals*. The withdrawal notice may also be sent by telex or fax but followed by a signed confirmation copy.

No Proposal may be modified subsequent to the deadline for submission of proposals.

No Proposal may be withdrawn in the Interval between the deadline for submission of proposals and the expiration of the period of proposal validity specified by the Offeror on the Proposal Submission Form.

## **E. Opening and Evaluation of Proposals**

### **19. Opening of proposals**

The procuring entity will open the Proposals in the presence of a Committee formed by the Head of the procuring UNDP entity.

### **20. Clarification of proposals**

To assist in the examination, evaluation and comparison of Proposals, the Purchaser may at its discretion, ask the Offeror for clarification of its Proposal. The request for clarification and the response shall be in writing and no change in price or substance of the Proposal shall be sought, offered or permitted.

### **21. Preliminary examination**

The Purchaser will examine the Proposals to determine whether they are complete, whether any computational errors have been made, whether the documents have been properly signed, and whether the Proposals are generally in order.

Arithmetical errors will be rectified on the following basis: If there is a discrepancy between the unit price and the total price that is obtained by multiplying the unit price and quantity, the unit price shall prevail and the total price shall be corrected. If the Offeror



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
Unity in Diversity

does not accept the correction of errors, its Proposal will be rejected. If there is a discrepancy between words and figures the amount in words will prevail.

Prior to the detailed evaluation, the Purchaser will determine the substantial responsiveness of each Proposal to the Request for Proposals (RFP). For purposes of these Clauses, a substantially responsive Proposal is one which conforms to all the terms and conditions of the RFP without material deviations. The Purchaser's determination of a Proposal's responsiveness is based on the contents of the Proposal itself without recourse to extrinsic evidence.

A Proposal determined as not substantially responsive will be rejected by the Purchaser and may not subsequently be made responsive by the Offeror by correction of the non-conformity.

## 22. Evaluation and comparison of proposals

A two-stage procedure is utilised in evaluating the proposals, with evaluation of the technical proposal being completed prior to any price proposal being opened and compared. The price proposal of the Proposals will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score of 70% of the obtainable score of 1000 points in the evaluation of the technical proposals.

The technical proposal is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Term of Reference (TOR).

In the Second Stage, the price proposal of all contractors, who have attained minimum 70% score in the technical evaluation, will be compared. The contractor will be awarded to the Contractor offering the lowest price.

### *Technical Evaluation Criteria*

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
				A	B	C	D	E
1.	Expertise of Firm / Team of Consultants or Organisation submitting Proposal	30%	300					
2.	Proposed Work Plan and Approach	50%	500					
3.	Personnel	20%	200					
<b>Total</b>			<b>1000</b>					

Evaluation forms for technical proposals follow on the next two pages. The obtainable number of points specified for each evaluation criterion indicates the relative significance



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
 Unity in Diversity

or weight of the item in the overall evaluation process. The Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms are:

**Form 1: Expertise of Firm / Organisation Submitting Proposal**

**Form 2: Proposed Work Plan and Approach**

**Form 3: Personnel**

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

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 1		Points obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
Expertise of firm / organisation submitting proposal							
1.1	Reputation of Organisation and Staff (Competence / Reliability)	40					
1.2	Litigation and Arbitration history	15					
1.3	General Organisational Capability which is likely to affect implementation (i.e. loose consortium, holding company or one firm, size of the firm / organisation, strength of project management support e.g. project financing capacity and project management controls)	35					
1.4	Extent to which any work would be subcontracted (subcontracting carries additional risks which may affect project implementation, but properly done it offers a chance to access specialised skills.	15					
1.5	Quality assurance procedures, warranty	25					
1.6	Relevance of: - Specialized Knowledge - Experience on Similar Programme / Projects - Experience on Projects in the Region Work for UNDP/ major multilateral/ or bilateral programmes	110					
		240					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 2		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
Proposed Work Plan and Approach							
2.1	To what degree does the Offeror understand the task?	30					
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been	25					



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
 Unity in Diversity

	addressed in sufficient detail?						
2.3	Are the different components of the project adequately weighted relative to one another?	20					
2.4	Is the proposal based on a survey of the project environment and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposal?	55					
2.5	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task?	65					
2.6	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	120					
2.7	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?	85					
		400					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3			Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
				A	B	C	D	E
3.1	Task Manager		80					
		Sub-Score						
	General Qualification	65						
	Suitability for the Project							
	- International Experience	10						
	- Training Experience	10						
	- Professional Experience in the area of specialisation	35						
	- Knowledge of the region	10						
	- Language Qualifications	15						
		80						
3.2	Senior Expert		60					
		Sub-Score						
	General Qualification	50						
	Suitability for the Project							
	- International Experience	5						
	- Training Experience	5						
	- Professional Experience in the area of specialisation	35						
	- Knowledge of the region	5						
	- Language Qualifications	10						
		60						
3.3	Junior Expert		20					
		Sub-Score						
	General Qualification	15						
	Suitability for the Project							
	- International Experience	5						

- Training Experience	0								
- Professional Experience in the area of specialisation	10								
- Knowledge of the region	0								
- Language Qualification		5							
		20							
<b>Total Part 3</b>			160						

## F. Award of Contract

### 23. Award criteria, award of contract

The procuring UNDP entity reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal, and to annul the solicitation process and reject all Proposals at any time prior to award of contract, without thereby incurring any liability to the affected Offeror or any obligation to inform the affected Offeror or Offerors of the grounds for the Purchaser's action

Prior to expiration of the period of proposal validity, the procuring UNDP entity will award the contract to the qualified Offeror whose Proposal after being evaluated is considered to be the most responsive to the needs of the organisation and activity concerned.

### 24. Purchaser's right to vary requirements at time of award

The Purchaser reserves the right at the time of award of contract to vary the quantity of services and goods specified in the RFP without any change in price or other terms and conditions.

### 25. Signing of the contract

Within 30 days of receipt of the contract the successful Offeror shall sign and date the contract and return it to the Purchaser.

### 26. Performance security

Within 30 days of the receipt of the Contract from the Purchaser, the successful Offeror shall provide the performance security on the Performance Security Form provided in the Solicitation Documents and in accordance with the Special Conditions of Contract.

Failure of the successful Offeror to comply with the requirement of Clause 24 or Clause 25 shall constitute sufficient grounds for the annulment of the award and forfeiture of the Proposal security if any, in which event the Purchaser may make the award to the next lowest evaluated Offeror or call for new Proposals.

### 26. Vendor protest



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
Unity *in* Diversity

Our vendor protest procedure is intended to afford an opportunity to appeal to persons or firms not awarded a purchase order or contract in a competitive procurement process. **It is not available to non-responsive or non-timely proposers/bidders or when all proposals/bids are rejected. In the event that you believe you have not been fairly treated, you can find detailed information about vendor protest procedures in the following link: <http://www.undp.org/procurement/protest.shtml>.**

## Annex II

### General Terms and Conditions

#### 1. ACCEPTANCE OF THE PURCHASE ORDER

This Purchase Order may only be accepted by the Supplier's signing and returning an acknowledgement copy of it or by timely delivery of the goods in accordance with the terms of this Purchase Order, as herein specified. Acceptance of this Purchase Order shall effect a contract between the Parties under which the rights and obligations of the Parties shall be governed solely by the terms and conditions of this Purchase Order, including these General Conditions. No additional or inconsistent provisions proposed by the Supplier shall bind UNDP unless agreed to in writing by a duly authorized official of UNDP.

#### 2. PAYMENT

2.1.1 UNDP shall, on fulfilment of the Delivery Terms, unless otherwise provided in this Purchase Order, make payment within 30 days of receipt of the Supplier's invoice for the goods and copies of the shipping documents specified in this Purchase Order.

2.1.2 Payment against the invoice referred to above will reflect any discount shown under the payment terms of this Purchase Order, provided payment is made within the period required by such payment terms.

2.1.3 Unless authorized by UNDP, the Supplier shall submit one invoice in respect of this Purchase Order, and such invoice must indicate the Purchase Order's identification number.

2.1.4 The prices shown in this Purchase Order may not be increased except by express written agreement of UNDP.

#### 3. TAX EXEMPTION

3.1 Section 7 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations provides, inter alia, that the United Nations, including its subsidiary organs, is exempt from all direct taxes, except charges for utilities services, and is exempt from customs duties and charges of a similar nature in respect of articles imported or exported for its official use. In the event any governmental authority refuses to recognize UNDP's exemption from such taxes, duties or charges, the Supplier shall immediately consult with UNDP to determine a mutually acceptable procedure.

3.2 Accordingly, the Supplier authorizes UNDP to deduct from the Supplier's invoice any amount representing such taxes, duties or charges, unless the Supplier has consulted with UNDP before the payment thereof and UNDP has, in each instance, specifically authorized the Supplier to pay such taxes, duties or charges under protest. In that event, the Supplier shall provide UNDP with written evidence that payment of such taxes, duties or charges has been made and appropriately authorized.

#### 4. RISK OF LOSS

Risk of loss, damage to or destruction of the goods shall be governed in accordance with DDU Incoterms 2000, unless otherwise agreed upon by the Parties on the front side of this Purchase Order.

#### 5. EXPORT LICENCES

Notwithstanding any INCOTERM 2000 used in this Purchase Order, the Supplier shall obtain any export licences required for the goods.

**6. FITNESS OF GOODS/PACKAGING**

The Supplier warrants that the goods, including packaging, conform to the specifications for the goods ordered under this Purchase Order and are fit for the purposes for which such goods are ordinarily used and for purposes expressly made known to the Supplier by UNDP, and are free from defects in workmanship and materials. The Supplier also warrants that the goods are contained or packaged adequately to protect the goods.

**7. INSPECTION**

1. UNDP shall have a reasonable time after delivery of the goods to inspect them and to reject and refuse acceptance of goods not conforming to this Purchase Order; payment for goods pursuant to this Purchase Order shall not be deemed an acceptance of the goods.

2. Inspection prior to shipment does not relieve the Supplier from any of its contractual obligations.

**8. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY INFRINGEMENT**

The Supplier warrants that the use or supply by UNDP of the goods sold under this Purchase Order does not infringe any patent, design, trade-name or trade-mark. In addition, the Supplier shall, pursuant to this warranty, indemnify, defend and hold UNDP and the United Nations harmless from any actions or claims brought against UNDP or the United Nations pertaining to the alleged infringement of a patent, design, trade-name or trade-mark arising in connection with the goods sold under this Purchase Order.

**9. RIGHTS OF UNDP**

In case of failure by the Supplier to fulfil its obligations under the terms and conditions of this Purchase Order, including but not limited to failure to obtain necessary export licences, or to make delivery of all or part of the goods by the agreed delivery date or dates, UNDP may, after giving the Supplier reasonable notice to perform and without prejudice to any other rights or remedies, exercise one or more of the following rights:

- a) Procure all or part of the goods from other sources, in which event UNDP may hold the Supplier responsible for any excess cost occasioned thereby.
- b) Refuse to accept delivery of all or part of the goods.
- c) Cancel this Purchase Order without any liability for termination charges or any other liability of any kind of UNDP.

**10. LATE DELIVERY**

Without limiting any other rights or obligations of the parties hereunder, if the Supplier will be unable to deliver the goods by the delivery date(s) stipulated in this Purchase Order, the Supplier shall (i) immediately consult with UNDP to determine the most expeditious means for delivering the goods and (ii) use an expedited means of delivery, at the Supplier's cost (unless the delay is due to Force Majeure), if reasonably so requested by UNDP.

**11. ASSIGNMENT AND INSOLVENCY**



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
Unity in Diversity

- 11.1. The Supplier shall not, except after obtaining the written consent of UNDP, assign, transfer, pledge or make other disposition of this Purchase Order, or any part thereof, or any of the Supplier's rights or obligations under this Purchase Order.
- 11.2. Should the Supplier become insolvent or should control of the Supplier change by virtue of insolvency, UNDP may, without prejudice to any other rights or remedies, immediately terminate this Purchase Order by giving the Supplier written notice of termination.

## **12. USE OF UNDP OR UNITED NATIONS NAME OR EMBLEM**

The Supplier shall not use the name, emblem or official seal of UNDP or the United Nations for any purpose.

## **13. PROHIBITION ON ADVERTISING**

The Supplier shall not advertise or otherwise make public that it is furnishing goods or services to UNDP without specific permission of UNDP in each instance.

## **14. CHILD LABOUR**

The Supplier represents and warrants that neither it nor any of its affiliates is engaged in any practice inconsistent with the rights set forth in the Convention on the Rights of the Child, including Article 32 thereof, which, inter alia, requires that a child shall be protected from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the child's education, or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development.

Any breach of this representation and warranty shall entitle UNDP to terminate this Purchase Order immediately upon notice to the Supplier, without any liability for termination charges or any other liability of any kind of UNDP.

## **15. MINES**

The Supplier represents and warrants that neither it nor any of its affiliates is actively and directly engaged in patent activities, development, assembly, production, trade or manufacture of mines or in such activities in respect of components primarily utilized in the manufacture of Mines. The term "Mines" means those devices defined in Article 2, Paragraphs 1, 4 and 5 of Protocol II annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions and Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects of 1980.

Any breach of this representation and warranty shall entitle UNDP to terminate this Purchase Order immediately upon notice to the Supplier, without any liability for termination charges or any other liability of any kind of UNDP.

## **16. SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES**

### **16.1 Amicable Settlement**

The Parties shall use their best efforts to settle amicably any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of, or relating to this Purchase Order or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof. Where the Parties wish to seek such an amicable settlement through conciliation, the conciliation shall take place in accordance with the UNCITRAL Conciliation Rules then obtaining, or according to such other procedure as may be agreed between the Parties.

### **16.2 Arbitration**

Unless, any such dispute, controversy or claim between the Parties arising out of or relating to this Purchase Order or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof is settled amicably under the preceding



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
*Unity in Diversity*

paragraph of this Section within sixty (60) days after receipt by one Party of the other Party's request for such amicable settlement, such dispute, controversy or claim shall be referred by either Party to arbitration in accordance with the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules then obtaining, including its provisions on applicable law. The arbitral tribunal shall have no authority to award punitive damages. The Parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of any such controversy, claim or dispute.

**17. PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES**

Nothing in or related to these General Terms and Conditions or this Purchase Order shall be deemed a waiver of any of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations, including its subsidiary organs.

## Annex III

### Terms of Reference (TOR) – RFP -34908-2010-005

#### **Request for Proposal for conducting the Country-Led Evaluation of the Delivering as One (DaO) Programme in Rwanda**

## 1. BACKGROUND

### 1.1. United Nations Reform:

In the Outcome document adopted at the 2005 World Summit in New York, global leaders called for stronger system-wide coherence across the various development-related agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations (UN). In addition to supporting ongoing reforms aimed at building a more effective and coherent UN country presence, the document invited the Secretary-General to "... strengthen the management and coordination of the UN operational activities". The UN was also asked to maximize its contribution to achieving internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the need for proposals for "more tightly managed entities" in the field of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment was also stressed.

Consequently, the Secretary-General established a High-level Panel to explore how the UN system could work more coherently and effectively across the world in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment. At country level, the report<sup>1</sup> of the panel noted that:

"To bring about real progress towards the MDGS and other internationally agreed development goals, we believe that the UN system needs to deliver as one at the country level. To focus on outcomes and improve its effectiveness, the UN should accelerate and deepen reforms to establish unified country teams with 'one leader', 'one programme', 'one budgetary framework' and, where appropriate, 'one office'. To deliver as one, the United Nations Country Teams (UNCT) should also have an integrated capacity to provide a coherent approach to cross-cutting issues, including sustainable development, gender equality and human rights".

The report outlined a set of recommendations based on five strategic directions:

- Ensure coherence and consolidation of UN activities, in line with the principle of country ownership, at all levels (country, regional, headquarters).
- Establish appropriate governance, managerial and funding mechanisms to empower and support consolidation, and link the performance and results of UN organizations to their funding.
- Overhaul business practices of the UN system to ensure a focus on outcomes, responsiveness to needs and the delivery of results as measured in advancing the MDGs.
- Ensure significant further opportunities for consolidation and effective delivery of "One UN" through an in-depth review.
- Undertake urgent but well-planned implementation for permanent and effective change.

It was also recommended that "the UN should deliver as one by establishing, by 2007, five One Country Programmes as pilots. Subject to continuous assessment, demonstrated effectiveness and

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, **Delivering as One**, Report of the High-level Panel on United Nations System-wide Coherence in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment, General Assembly, A/61/583, 20 November 2006



United Nations  
**RWANDA**

Unity in Diversity

proven results, these should be expanded to 20 One Country Programmes by 2009, 40 by 2010 and all other appropriate country programmes by 2012”. By February 2007, 8 countries had volunteered to participate in the pilot. The key objective of piloting the programme was to improve its impact, coherence and efficiency as well as generate lessons for the future.

## **1.2. UN Reform in Rwanda**

The Government of Rwanda (GoR) was among the first to request to be included in the pilot countries<sup>2</sup> for Delivering as One (DaO) where the ‘One UN’ models (‘One Office’, ‘One Programme’, ‘One Leader’, ‘One Budgetary Framework’) would be tried. The pilot helped to position the UN System in Rwanda to support the country meet the MDGs and guide it towards the fulfillment of the Vision 2020. Instead of being “funding-driven”, the UN is now “results-driven”.

A ‘One UN’ consultation workshop was held in February 2007 involving the UNCT, the GoR and other development partners. The meeting agreed to push for better alignment of UN programmes with national priorities. Thus, the second UNDAF 2008-2012 is based on and aligned with the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS).

A Steering Committee chaired by the Minister of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN) was set up to guide the implementation of the ‘One UN’ in Rwanda. The committee is comprised of the EC, Germany Cooperation, UNICEF, WFP, FAO, UNDP, WHO, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Local Government, the Ministry of Education and MINECOFIN. The Common Operational Document (COD), signed on 20 November 2007, provides the full details on the implementation of the UNDAF Results, covering the Code of Conduct, management mechanisms as well as the monitoring and evaluation system.

## **1.3. Delivering as One implementation in Rwanda**

The implementation of the One UN Programme began in January 2008. All agencies defined activities jointly and in close collaboration with the GoR. The One UN Programme is organized around five strategic results, identified by the UN Country Team the Government and other development Partners, as areas where the UN in Rwanda has the comparative advantage and the capacity to deliver in an effective and efficient manner. The programming period (2008-2012) was established to coincide with the duration of the EDPRS.

The five UNDAF Results are outlined in the COD as follows:

- Good governance enhanced and sustained
- The mortality due to child and maternal morbidity; the incidence and impact of HIV and AIDS and other major epidemics are reduced, and the growth of the population slowed down
- All children in Rwanda acquire a quality basic education and skills for a knowledge-based economy
- Management of the environment, natural resources and land is improved in a sustainable way
- The Rwanda population benefits from economic growth and is less vulnerable to social and economic shocks.

Each UNDAF Result is expected to be produced by targeting specific outcomes. Thus, the following outcomes were identified:

### **UNDAF Result 1 – Good Governance**

1. Rule of law
2. Decentralization, accountability and transparency

---

<sup>2</sup> Other pilot countries are: Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Tanzania, Uruguay and Viet Nam.



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
Unity in Diversity

3. Participation in democratic governance
4. Gender equality
5. Evidence-based policy making

### **UNDAF Result 2 – Health, Population, HIV/AIDS and Nutrition**

This result was divided into two to enable a focused UN-system response:

<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	<b>Health</b>
1. Coordination, planning, M&E and partnership	1. Effective health system
2. Prevention of HIV	2. Health practices
3. Mitigation against AIDS	3. Disease control & epidemic prevention

### **UNDAF Result 3 – Education**

1. Increased enrolment
2. Increased retention
3. Life-long learning achieved
4. Effective education management system

### **UNDAF Result 4 – Environment**

1. Effective enabling policy framework
2. Restoration and protection
3. Utilization of natural resources

### **UNDAF Result 5 – Sustainable Growth and Social Protection**

Cross cutting issues were identified as specific drivers within the UN Country Team development work. These were to be mainstreamed into all planning processes or actions undertaken by any UN Agency. Based on the EDPRS cross cutting issues; Gender, environment, social inclusion and HIV /AIDS, UN programming has integrated the issues either as UNDAF results or as country programme outcomes. A Human Rights based approach to programming was recognized and adopted by the UN at all levels. The cross-cutting issues are addressed through targeted operational support through the Task Forces: Gender, Human Rights, Disaster Management and Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

The One UN Programme ensures that UN Agencies in Rwanda are better aligned and more coherent in their support to the Government of Rwanda in the achievement of the EDPRS, Vision 2020 and the MDGs. The preparatory processes of the UNDAF and development of the COD supported the development of strong partnerships, increased networking among stakeholders and increased collaboration among UN Agencies, Government and Development Partners.

During the first year of implementation, the UNCT disbursed close to US\$80 million, of which US\$8.2 million was provided by donors at country level through the One UN Fund (DFID, Sida, Norway and Spain via the MDG Achievement Fund). The rest was provided through the core resources from the UN Headquarters and other Vertical Funds (thematic trust funds, UNICEF National Committee, Friends of UNFPA, etc.)<sup>3</sup>. In 2009, the programme planned to disburse US\$ 4.46 million, with additional funding from the Expanded Delivering As One Funding Window amounting to US\$ 17.219 million, bringing the total to US\$ 21.679 million.

An “evaluability assessment” conducted in February 2008 suggested that country level evaluations be conducted regularly to: assess progress made against the planned strategic results; record

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Rwanda, **End of Year Report One UN Programme**, 2008



United Nations  
**RWANDA**

*Unity in Diversity*

achievements; identify areas for improvement and remaining challenges; and distil lessons to inform decision-making at the national and inter-governmental levels.

#### **1.4. Evaluation Process for Delivering as One**

The UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) outlined a three-stage process for evaluating the DaO pilots as follows:

1. Assessment of the “evaluability” of DaO, to provide the basis for the second and third stages. This was conducted by the UN Development Group and completed in March 2008;
2. A country self evaluation of the DaO;
3. An independent evaluation of the results and impacts of the pilots.

The current country-led evaluation is the second stage of the evaluation process.

## **2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation intends to inform decision makers on how to enhance the role and contribution of the UN system in support of national policies and strategies to achieve national development results, specifically towards the achievement of EDPRS targets and Vision 2020 goals. Within this context, the evaluation will also assess the progress made against the strategic intent of the DaO and identify areas for improvements and remaining challenges. The evaluation will provide evidence on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the DaO in Rwanda. The evaluation criteria are defined as follows;

- a) **Relevance:** responsiveness to the needs and priorities of the countries
- b) **Effectiveness:** progress towards the achievement of development results and implementation of better processes to achieve those results
- c) **Efficiency:** reduction of transaction cost for countries and the UN in comparison to previous arrangements
- d) **Sustainability:** the probability of benefits to continue over time

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- i. Assess overall progress in alignment of the DaO to Rwanda’s development agenda specifically the EDPRS and the Vision 2020, as well as cross-cutting issues including gender equality and human rights.
- ii. Determine progress made against achieving the strategic intent of DaO, and assess to what extent the UN work under the DaO is perceived as relevant, coherent and effective.
- iii. Assess overall implementation of the “One Programme”, “One Budgetary Framework”, “One Leader”, “One Office”, “One Voice” and document best practices as well as challenges.
- iv. Assess the effectiveness of other DaO managing bodies (Steering Committee, Thematic Groups, UNCT, etc.) and identify key lessons learnt and recommendations.
- v. Assess harmonization and alignment of the One UN programme with the Paris Declaration principles, which forms the basis of national aid coordination and management and aims at improving the overall effectiveness of development cooperation in Rwanda.
- vi. Assess DaO partnerships with other key stakeholders including; the Civil Society Organizations and the private sector



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
Unity in Diversity

- vii. Assess the predictability and effectiveness of financial resources mobilized through the One UN budget framework and their alignment to GoR systems

### 3. SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will focus on the three key areas of the DaO programme:

- response to the national development objectives;
- creating a coherent and results-oriented strategy; and
- facilitating joint programmes.

Its scope will cover the period 2006-2009, focusing on implementation of the Common Operational Document from January 2008 to December 2009 as compared to UN programmes implementation from 2006 to 2007. To achieve this, the evaluation will try to respond to the following critical questions:

1. Is the DaO effectively responding to the development priorities of Rwanda outlined in the national programming frameworks?
2. Are the five main areas of creating coherent and results-oriented programmes: “One Programme”; “One Budgetary Framework”; “One Leader”; “One Office” and “One voice” being achieved? Each of these areas will be assessed for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency using the detailed Evaluation Framework given in Annex 1:
  - ❖ One Programme: progress made in establishing joint programming and a single, common programme instead of a collection of the individual UN agency-specific programmes.
  - ❖ One Budgetary Framework: the extent to which the administrative systems in place have been able to achieve a common financial management system.
  - ❖ One Leader: the extent to which the position of Resident Coordinator has enabled a more coherent UN approach to address national development challenges.
  - ❖ One Office: the extent to which common support services and shared business units have increased efficiency.
  - ❖ One voice: the extent to which one communication strategy has supported a more effective role and contribution of the UN system in Rwanda.
3. To what extent has the DaO mechanism facilitated: (i) joint programming across the participating agencies? (ii) Effective programme implementation? (iii) Productive partnerships and synergies? (iv) Capacity building among implementing partners and GoR institutions;
  - ❖ Is the DaO enabling the UN in Rwanda operate in accordance with the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness’s commitments: ownership, harmonization, alignment; and results and mutual accountability?
  - ❖ Have cross cutting sectors (gender and human rights) been fully integrated into the programming framework and are they being taken care of in the implementation?
  - ❖ Is the Steering Committee playing its role of guiding the implementation of ‘One UN’?
4. Other evaluation questions to be addressed include:
  - ❖ What were the national political drivers for the country to become a DaO pilot?
  - ❖ What was the UNCT environment and experience of joint work at the time of launching the process?
  - ❖ To what extent have the findings and recommendations from the “evaluability assessment” been accepted and implemented?
  - ❖ What is the progress made towards mainstreaming the RBM approach in the joint programming?

- ❖ Is there an M&E system that supports effectively the planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the One Plan?
- ❖ Have there been missed opportunities for the DaO process so far and if so, which?

## 4. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE EVALUATION

### **4.1. Evaluation Management Group**

The overall guidance for this evaluation will be provided by the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) with the membership of the government, the UN and donors. It will be chaired by a respected academician to be appointed by the National University of Rwanda (NUR). The EMG will comprise 8 members in addition to the Chair; the other members will be drawn from a cross section of stakeholders in consultation with the EMG Chair. This will assure the independence and credibility of the EMG.

The EMG will design, oversee and manage the evaluation process including the selection of the evaluation team (local or international firm), recruitment of the facilitator of logistics, assuring independence of the evaluation and that the evaluation meets the highest quality standards. The EMG will provide regular feedback to United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) which will be providing quality assurance throughout the evaluation process.

The EMG will submit the evaluation report to the Steering Committee for them to approve the proposed management response.

### **4.2. Reference Group**

The EMG will identify a larger reference group which will be a consultative body. The EMG will keep the reference group informed throughout the evaluation. The group should consist of stakeholders and interested parties; Government of Rwanda, civil society organisations, private sector, media, academia, international development partners working in the Rwanda and donors. The Group will also comment on the validity of the results.

### **4.3 One UN Steering Committee**

The Steering Committee as an oversight institution of the DaO will approve the terms of reference for the evaluation and receive regular updates throughout the key phases of the evaluation process. The committee will also prepare the management response from the three key stakeholder groups; GoR, the UN system and the Development Partners. The Committee will furthermore monitor implementation of approved key recommendations.

### **4.4 UNCT**

The UNCT will designate two members to the EMG and appoint a focal point for logistical support from the UN side. The UNCT will also execute payment requests made by the EMG after agreement on the overall evaluation budget.

### **4.5 UNEG**

The UNEG will provide quality assurance throughout the evaluation and propose a list of potential international evaluators/ consultants with experience in conducting complex evaluations at international level, in addition to those who may express interest.

## 5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNEG norms and standards and on the basis of OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines, to ensure full compliance with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2006).

The evaluation team will consult with a stakeholder group who include GoR, civil society, and private sector, donors, the UNCT and DOCO among others. The group consists of those who are engaged in the implementation of the DaO approach. They will be asked to provide support to the work of the evaluation team by making available information regarding the UN programmes, projects and activities in Rwanda.

In particular, the UNCT will support the work of the evaluation team in liaising with key partners and other stakeholders, making all necessary information available to the team regarding UN programmes, projects and activities in the country. The UNCT will also be requested to provide additional logistical support to the evaluation team as required in addition to providing a facilitator for the process that will be based in MINECOFIN. The direct cost of the evaluation will be budgeted and managed under the EMG.

The Common Operational Document (COD) will be the document of reference, given that it contains the logical results chain of the One Programme. Progress in implementation will be measured against the indicators contained in the COD, while primary data will be collected through interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, field visits, direct observation. Key methods proposed include:

- Review of key strategic documents and texts including the EDPRS and the COD.
- Interviews with individuals to capture the perspectives of both the GoR and UNCT, but also Donors and other stakeholders associated with One UN reform. The Evaluation team will use a mix of structured and in-depth interviews. Key informants will include: GoR officials (Ministers, Permanent Secretaries, local government authorities); Project coordinators; Heads of UN Agencies, as well as relevant implementing partners.
- Focus Group interviews with stakeholders will also be held and used for analysis of the UN effectiveness, and to identify perceptions and attitudes;
- Information Systems available at the UN agencies will be used for data collection on procurement, human resource and financial management and disbursement processes;
- Formal Survey through oral interviews or written questionnaires in a representative sample of respondents;
- Interviews with key stakeholders to assess effects of the reform on government and donor transaction costs.

The Evaluation team will develop a data collection work plan with a finalised methodological design.

Secondary data will be collected from the existing information sources through a desk review and triangulation of different existing documents. This phase will be comprised of: (i) review and analysis of relevant documents including the GoR programmatic documents & reports, the UN Rwanda programmatic documents & reports, recent studies and research reports, relevant developmental and social reports, and (ii) critical analysis of available data with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended UN inputs to the GoR.

The Evaluation team should acknowledge relevant existing data from the UN agencies; the Resident Coordinator, Office, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, programme/project managers of implement agencies, development partners, NGOs, web-based information, NISR and other sources.



The evaluation team will be responsible for the content, including findings and recommendations in the final report. All reports including the inception, draft and final, will be produced in the English language.

## 6. DELIVERABLES

The consulting team will deliver the following products:

- An inception report outlining the methodological approach, including types of data and information to be collected, tools and strategy for data collection and analysis, definition of key informants and time frame for completing the Evaluation prepared based on these TOR;
- Presentation of preliminary findings at stakeholder workshop
- Draft Report to be submitted to the EMG for review and comments;
- Final Report.

## 7. DISSEMINATION

---

The draft and final reports will be shared with all key stakeholders. The report will be disseminated to users to distil lessons to inform the decision making process at the national level. Some of the key importance of the report to the key users include;

**One UN Steering Committee:** the evaluation of the DaO will highlight weaknesses and strengths in the management of the DaO process and enable the steering committee, as an overseer of the implementation of the DaO to take corrective measures and to reinforce best practices.

**GoR:** the evaluation findings will provide evidence on whether the UN has been more effective and efficient in response to GoR priorities and needs since the DaO. The results from the evaluation will enable the GoR jointly with the UN to improve the DaO to ensure a more sustainable contribution to poverty reduction and development

**UNCT:** the findings of the evaluation will be useful for UNCT in understanding how best to reform the UN system in Rwanda, through the DaO to be more responsive to national needs.

**Civil Society Organizations (CSOs):** the report findings will furthermore provide insight into how the DaO has enabled partnerships with CSOs. In addition, the evaluation will provide lessons learnt for strengthening the effectiveness of the DaO in areas of cross intervention with CSOs including the cross cutting issues of gender and human rights.

## 8. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Key steps for the Evaluation are comprised as follows:

Timeframe (deadline)	Activities / phase
27 January 2010	ToR shared with Steering Committee
2 February 2010	ToR validation
9 February 2010	Contracting process launched
2 March 2010	Contracting process completed
15 March 2010	Inception Report (workshop with key stakeholders)
16 March 2010	Data collection and analysis

16 April 2010	Preliminary findings workshop (same stakeholders as previously)
28 April 2010	First draft (to be discussed for amendments)
12 May, 2010	Final report

## 9. EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATION TEAM

### *i) General considerations*

- The selected firm and/or consultants should have experience in conducting international development/humanitarian agency evaluations and will be recruited through an international tendering process. The selected firm, if international should demonstrate how they will work with local consultants in conducting the evaluation.
- The members of the evaluation team will be independent from the UN agencies and organisations that participated in the design and implementation of the evaluated intervention. The evaluation team should be independent of the One UN process and should not have any conflicting interests. The team will be a multi-disciplinary team and will be expected to bring different types of expertise and experience to the team with one member having substantial experience in UN reform and substantial knowledge and understanding of the development context in Rwanda.
- The team should include national experts as they have a better understanding of the Rwanda development context and can enhance national ownership of the evaluation findings. This will also build professional capacities in the country and increase the potential for recommendations to be implemented.
- The Evaluation team must commit itself to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation to promote trust and confidence in evaluation. The team should produce high quality evaluations guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles.
- The evaluation team will be responsible for data collection and analyses and for the evaluation report, including the formulation of value judgements and the drafting of conclusions and recommendations. The Evaluation team will interact with the Evaluation Management Group and provide the EMG with the evaluation services as stipulated in the contract.

### *ii) Competencies for the Evaluation Team*

#### ■ **Technical and Analytical Skills**

- Experience in planning and managing complex development/humanitarian agency evaluations
- Experience in management of technical programmes especially those covered by the MDGs
- Design, data collection and analysis, reporting follow up and dissemination
- Ability to address the cross-cutting thematic issues of gender and human rights
- Adequate understanding of Rwanda's social, political and economic context and environment
- Knowledge of the UN system and of results-based management

**Interpersonal skills:** Communication, cultural sensitivity, negotiation and facilitation skills

#### ■ **Education background**

- An advanced university degree or equivalent in social sciences, project/programme management or other relevant disciplines, with specialized training in areas such as evaluation, social statistics, advanced statistical research and analysis.



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
*Unity in Diversity*

- Relevant professional experience in the design and management of evaluation processes, including multiple stakeholders, survey design and implementation;
- The Evaluation team should have evaluation skills particularly the ability to formulate value judgements, to draw up conclusions and recommendations and to draft synthesis.
- The evaluation team should have mastery of data collection and analysis tools

■ **Core Competencies of the Team Leader**

- The Evaluation Team Leader must have proven competencies in the management of an evaluation function and in the conduct of development evaluation studies.
- Very strong organisation, dialogue and coordination skills particularly at the policy level.
- Must be well versed in evaluation quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis tools, techniques and approaches.
- Must be able to produce credible and compelling evaluation reports, with evidence-based findings and recommendations
- Must possess proven managerial skills for management of the evaluation process, planning, setting standards and monitoring, team management and providing leadership.
- Ability for strategic and global thinking;
- Ability to bring together diverse stakeholders;
- Language proficiency in English and French

## 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

The assignment is expected to be completed within a period of 3 to 4 months. The selected consulting firm and/or consultants will be paid an all-inclusive lump sum fee which includes the honoraria for local consultants, fees for data collection and data processing, fees for administrative support and products). The consultancy firm and/or consultants will also be responsible for all travel costs (if necessary, these may include flights to and from Kigali, DSA, local transportation) will be expected to provide working equipment for the evaluation team. A comprehensive detailed budget will be submitted by the Consulting firm.

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Contract Payment</b>
Inception report	30%
Launch of data collection	30%
Presentation of approved final report	40%

The UN Rwanda will provide support in engaging a facilitator for the evaluation team and the EMG. MINECOFIN will provide the working space, access to internet and facilitate contacts with key stakeholders as appropriate.

## 11. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Suggested key documents include the following:

1. Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Vision 2020
2. Republic of Rwanda, Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy (2008 – 2012), September 2007
3. Republic of Rwanda, Annual Report on the implementation of the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) – 2008
4. Republic of Rwanda, Education Sector Strategic Plan (2006-2010), Ministry of Education, 2006
5. Republic of Rwanda, Health Sector Strategic Plan (July 2009 – June 2012), July 2009
6. Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Aid Policy, 2006
7. United Nations Rwanda, One UN 'Delivering As One' in Rwanda Concept Paper, April 2007
8. United Nations Rwanda, UNDAF 2008-2012
9. United Nations Rwanda, One UN Programme Rwanda, Common Operational Document (2008-2012)
10. United Nations Rwanda, Communication Strategy (2007-2008), 2007
11. Consolidated Annual Work Plan (CAP) 2008
12. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Evaluability Assessment of Delivering as One Pilots Draft Evaluability Assessment Report on Rwanda, March 2008
13. United Nations Rwanda, End of Year Report of the One UN Programme 2008,
14. United Nations Rwanda, Stocktaking report 2008 for Delivering as One in Rwanda
15. Consolidated Annual Work Plan (CAP) 2009

## 12. LIST OF UN AGENCIES IN RWANDA

### Resident Agencies

<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNAIDS</b>	United Nations Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>UNFPA</b>	United Nations Populations Fund
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organisation
<b>UNIFEM</b>	United Nations Development Fund for Women
<b>WFP</b>	World Food Programme
<b>UNHCR</b>	United Nations High Commissioner for the Refugees

### Non-Resident Agencies

<b>UNESCO</b>	United Nations
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organisation
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environmental Programme
<b>IFAD</b>	International Fund for Agricultural Development
<b>UNECA</b>	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
<b>OHCHR</b>	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
<b>UN-HABITAT</b>	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
<b>UNIDO</b>	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
<b>UNCDF</b>	United Nations Capital Development Fund
<b>UNCTAD</b>	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
<b>UNV</b>	United Nations Volunteers

## ANNEX 1 EVALUATION FRAMEWORK<sup>4</sup>

	ONE PROGRAMME	ONE LEADER	ONE BUDGET	ONE HOUSE	ONE VOICE
<b>Relevance</b>	To what extent did the new Programme respond to national priorities?	Is the leadership of the UN RC the most suitable way to represent the depth and breadth of the UN system?	Is the One Budget proposal the most suitable way to enhance the financial administration of DAO?	Are the common support services and shared business units the most suitable way to enhance the administration of DAO?	Is one communication strategy the most suitable way to explain the UN activities and the DAO approach?
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Has the DAO process led to improved effectiveness and impact of operational initiatives for development?	Is the UN RC leadership perceived as more effective than previous arrangements?	To what extent has the one budget resulted in a more effective allocation and use of funds to the one programme components?	To what extent did common support services and shared business units increase the effectiveness of DAO in terms of achieving programme objectives?	To what extent did one communication strategy support a more effective role and contribution of the UN system in the country?
	Has there been any progress in mainstreaming the UN conventions and resolutions in the joint programming, including human rights, gender, HIV/AIDS, etc, and if so, to what extent?	To what extent has the UN RC, as One Leader, been able to exercise enhanced authority, responsibility and accountability?	Has the configuration of the One Budget/One Fund progressed and how?	What is the progress towards this objective?	Is the UN speaking with One Voice in a coherent way and is that one voice manifest in the one programme"?
	To what extent has the one programme generated positive synergies and value-added beyond the individual interventions to increase effectiveness?	Is the firewall between UN RC and UNDP working?	To what extent have donors provided un-earmarked and multi-year resources to the One Plan Fund in a timely manner?	What are the main constraints, including in terms of resources?	
	Has the DAO process led to improved relationships between the national government and the UN agencies?	Which actions would be required from UN HQ to further enhance the authority and accountability of the One Leader?			
	Has the DAO process progressed in the level of inclusiveness among UN agencies, on one hand, and national institutions, on the other and if so, how?				
<b>Efficiency</b>	Has the DAO process led to improved efficiency and impact of operational initiatives for development?	To what extent has the one leader taken leadership and ensured	To what extent has the Harmonized Approach to Cash	To what extent did common support services and shared	

<sup>4</sup> United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), **Country Level Evaluations of the Delivering as One Programme Country Pilots**, Framework Terms of Reference, 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2009



	ONE PROGRAMME	ONE LEADER	ONE BUDGET	ONE HOUSE	ONE VOICE
		efficiency gains from the harmonization of the programme, budget, office and voice?	Transfers (HACT) been implemented?	business units increased the efficiency of DAO?	
	To what extent has the one programme generated positive synergies and value-added beyond the individual interventions to increase efficiency?		To what extent have the Cost Norms been harmonized among UN Agencies and with Government and donors and has this led to efficiency gains?	Has there been any progress in the definition and calculation of transaction costs of the collaboration through DAO for both the Government and the UN?	
	Has the DAO process led to reduced transaction costs for the national government, the UN and other donors?				
<b>Sustainability</b>	To what extent has the one programme been integrated into government systems to ensure ownership and sustainability of capacities developed/strengthened or results achieved?		To what extent has the UN RC ultimate authority on the allocation of resources from the OPF?		





**Annex V**

**PRICE SCHEDULE**

The Contractor is asked to prepare the Price Schedule as a separate envelope from the rest of the RFP response as indicated in Section D paragraph 14 (b) of the Instruction to Offerors.

All prices/rates quoted must be exclusive of all taxes, since the UNDP is exempt from taxes as detailed in Section II, Clause 18. ’

The Price Schedule must provide a detailed cost breakdown. Provide separate figures for each functional grouping or category.

Estimates for cost-reimbursable items, if any, such as travel, and out of pocket expenses should be listed separately.

In case of an equipment component to the service provided, the Price Schedule should include figures for both purchase and lease/rent options. The UNDP reserves the option to either lease/rent or purchase outright the equipment through the Contractor.

The format shown on the following pages should be used in preparing the price schedule. The format includes specific expenditures, which may or may not be required or applicable but are indicated to serve as examples.

In addition to the hard copy, if possible please also provide the information on diskette (IBM compatible).

<b>Price Schedule:</b>				
<b>Request for Proposals for Services</b>				
Description of Activity/Item		Number of Staff	F. Monthly Rate	Estimated Amount
<b>1.</b>	<b>Remuneration</b>			
1.1	Services in Home office			
1.2	Services in Field			
<b>2.</b>	<b>Out of Pocket Expenses</b>			
2.1	Travel			
2.2	Per Diem Allowances			
2.3	Communications			



United Nations  
**RWANDA**  
*Unity in Diversity*

2.4	Reproduction and Reports			
2.5	Equipment and other items			