**TOR for OUTCOME Evaluation**

**UNDP Country programme (2013-2017)**

1. **background**

UNDP and the Government of Sri Lanka signed the 2013-2017 Country Programme Document (CPD) which outlines UNDP’s contribution towards national development priorities. The country programme was developed within the overall framework of the then government’s policy document outlining national and sectoral development strategies, the Millennium Declaration and the Framework of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The aim of the programme is to improve the lives of people in Sri Lanka giving specific focus to the areas of sustainable livelihood, local governance, and delivery of quality service, rule of law/ access to justices, human rights and reconciliation as well as environmental sustainability and disaster resilience.

According to UNDP’s evaluation plan, an outcome evaluation is to be conducted to assess outcomes 1, 2 and 3 of the country programme.

They are as follows:

**Outcome 1**: An enabled environment for equal opportunities to sustainable livelihoods, decent work and employability

**Outcome 2**: Strengthened provision of access to and demand for equitable and quality social services delivery and enhanced capacity of national institutions for evidence based policy development

**Outcome 3**: Communities empowered and institutions strengthened to support local governance, access to justice,

This summative outcome evaluation should assess the status of UNDP Sri Lanka’s Governance for Empowerment and Social Inclusion (GESI) programme in relation to achievement of the defined outcomes. This outcome evaluation should also help to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership building, and generate lessons learned.

The outcome evaluation must be conducted between August – November 2016 with a view to contributing to the development of the new UNDP country programme (2018-2022).

1. **CONTEXT**

Sri Lanka, a lower middle-income country, has been achieving post-war economic growth at 6.3% for 2015 – a decrease from 7.5% in 2014. The economy is shifting towards the services sector, with an increase in the industry sector and a slight decrease in the agricultural sector. Unemployment was a reasonable 4.3% in 2014, although youth unemployment (15-29 years) is alarmingly high at 20.3%. The country remains in the high human development category – ranked higher than some East Asian Countries. Strong economic growth has led to a dramatic reduction in the national poverty headcount ratio, which was 6.7% in 2012/2013. However, over 20% of the country’s 20 million population earn less than US$2 per day, indicating a large number of near-poor who are vulnerable to shocks that could push them back into poverty. Greater prosperity has not reached the estate sector, conflict-affected regions and some rural areas. Latest estimates show that in 2013, the poorest 10% received 1.4% of total household income, while the wealthiest 10% enjoyed 38.7%.

Along with the Presidential election in January 2015, a number of steps were taken under a national interim government, including a critical amendment to the Constitution which scaled back presidential powers; establishment of 9 independent oversight bodies; and recognized the right to information. Following parliamentary elections in August 2015, a national unity government was formed, bringing together the two largest political parties - United National Party (UNP) and the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP) - for the first time since independence under a 2-year consensus framework. The government’s efforts in highly charged political areas such as transitional justice, electoral reforms, power sharing and adoption of a new constitution and advancing reconciliation are key undertakings.

The present government took initiatives to advance reconciliation by taking immediate actions to address the core grievances of minorities and IDPs. Civilian Governors were appointed for the North and the East with a view to changing the dynamics with the provincial administration moving towards enhancing its cooperation and engagement with the central government. As a long-term strategy, the government has established the new Ministry of National Integration and Reconciliation under the President, and within it, the Office of National Unity and Reconciliation (ONUR) to coordinate and facilitate initiatives by government and civil society actors promoting social cohesion, peace education, psychosocial support, livelihoods and implementation of the trilingual language policy.

1. **EVALUATION purpose**

The purpose of this combined outcome evaluation is to assess the extent to which the country programme outcomes 1, 2 and 3 have achieved its results over the five years of the country programme (2013-2017). The evaluation provides an opportunity to ensure accountability to stakeholders in managing for results, and is also a useful learning exercise, especially in relation to informing the formulation of the new Country Programme Document for UNDP, which will begin in October 2016 onwards. The main users of the evaluation will be UNDP, both implementing and development partners and the government of Sri Lanka.

1. **EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND questions**

* To assess the extent to which the planned outputs have been or will be achieved by 2017 and extent to which these output results have contributed to the planned outcomes To identify unintended positive or negative results of the three outcomes
* To assess the three outcomes and related outputs against Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability.
* To assess the level of integration of gender equality, conflict sensitivity, environment concerns and Results-based management in the programme implementation

Identify Major factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving these outcomes, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including: weaknesses in design, management, implementation (including implementation modalities), human resource skills, and resources

Identify lessons learnt, recommendations, good practices and related innovative approaches in relation to the management and implementation of activities and achieving results.

The following evaluations questions will guide the evaluation.

**Relevance**

* The extent to which the outcomes are in line with national, provincial and district priorities and the peoples’ development expectations
* Has UNDP been able to adapt its programming to the changing context to address priority needs in the country?
* To what extent is this aligned with UNDP’s mandate as envisioned in the Strategic Plan (2014-2017)?
* Have UNDP interventions been relevant to women and other marginalized and disadvantageous groups and their needs?
* To what extent are the outputs relevant to the planned outcomes?
* What are potential areas of engagement for UNDP’s next Country Programme within UNDP’s mandate?

**Effectiveness**

* To what extent have the planned outcomes been achieved?
* To what extent have programme outputs been achieved or are likely to be achieved by 2017?
* Have there been any unintended or unplanned achievements or impacts of UNDP’s interventions?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outcomes?
* Have the modes of implementation proven to be effective?
* What are the key gaps that UNDP interventions could address within its comparative advantage that would significantly contribute to the achievement of the outcome?
* Has UNDP’s partnership strategy been appropriate and effective in contributing to the outcome?
* To what extent did the results, both at the outcome and output levels, benefit women and men equally?
* To what extent has UNDP contributed to capacity development of local partners and civil society organizations?

**Efficiency**

* How appropriate are national Implementation (NIM) and direct implementation (DIM) modalities in delivering results within these outcome areas? (strengths and weaknesses)
* Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proven to be more cost-efficient?
* Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered?
* Are there sufficient resources (financial, time, people) allocated to integrate human rights and gender equality in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of these outcomes?

**Sustainability**

* How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?
* How has UNDP contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners (as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions)?
* Is there a clear exit strategy at project level, factoring in environmental, operational and financial sustainability?
* What recommendations could be given to strengthen sustainability?

5. **EVALUATION SCOPE**

The evaluation will cover UNDP Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 under the current Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)/ Country programme Document (CPD) for the period 2013 up until the time of the evaluation. This evaluation should cover outcomes and the extent to which programmes, project, soft assistance, advocacy initiatives, partners’ initiatives and synergies among partners contributed to its achievement.

Two key programmes which contribute to these three outcomes are Governance for Local Economic Development (GLED) and Strengthening Enforcement of Law, Access to justice and Social Integration (SELAJSI). Details of other UNDP projects will be provided to the evaluation team upon signing the contract.

**Governance for Local Economic Development (GLED)**

GLED is UNDP Sri Lanka’s flagship programme for strengthening local governance capacities and improving socio-economic opportunities in vulnerable regions in the country. Broadly, GLED focuses on increasing the capacity of sub-national level governance institutions, civil society, the private sector and communities in order to foster access to enhanced public sector service delivery, socio-economic development, and social cohesion across the whole country, with a focus on the lagging regions of Sri Lanka including the former conflict-affected regions of the country. The programme will help communities increase their production and “value-added” capacities and make use of productive infrastructure, new technologies and knowledge. Strengthened engagement with the private sector will increase the sustainability of livelihoods initiatives. Given the sub-national variations in Sri Lanka’s human development index, GLED focuses primarily on lagging areas and vulnerable communities.

**Strengthening Enforcement of Law, Access to justice and Social Integration in Sri Lanka (SELAJSI)**

Following Phases 1 and 2 of UNDP Sri Lanka’s Equal Access to Justice (A2J) Project spanning the period 2004-2012, a broader and more ambitious programme was launched for the period 2013-2017, building on the achievements and lessons of the previous two projects. This Programme aims to consolidate the previous A2J initiatives as well as systematize and institutionalize these initiatives under a broader framework of coordinated enforcement of law, access to justice and social integration. The objective of the programme is to ensure sustainability, increased quality in capacity development and strategic planning at national as well as sub national level, to reach a sector-wide approach to justice sector development and increased social integration. This Programme is currently implemented through the national implementation modality by the Ministry of National Coexistence, Dialogue and Official Languages (MNCEDOL), the Ministry of Justice (MOJ), and the Ministry of Women and Child Affairs (MWCA).

**Geographical coverage:** Almost all the programmes and projects address issues nationally while specifically working in certain districts.

**Target:** Each of the programme and projects have specific targets groups.

Due to the numerous players involved in UNDP development projects and the fact that outcomes are set at a very high level in a complex social development context, “**attribution”** of development change to UNDP may be extremely difficult in this outcome evaluation. The evaluation will therefore consider “**contribution”** of UNDP to change in the stated CPD/CPAP outcome. The evaluator will need to explain how the UNDP country programme contributed to the observed results. To make the assessment, first the evaluator must examine the stated CPD/CPAP outcomes; identify the change over the period being evaluated on the basis of available baseline information; and observe the national strategy/strategies and actions in support of that change. Second, the evaluator must examine the implementation of UNDP strategy and actions in support of national efforts.

1. **methdology**

An appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative methods will be used to gather and analyze data/information, in order to offer diverse perspectives to the evaluation, and to promote participation of different groups of stakeholders.

The final decisions about the specific design and method for the evaluation should be developed in consultation with the evaluation management team and UNDP programme staff on the basis of what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose, objectives and answers to evaluation questions.

The outcome evaluation should use available data/information to the greatest extent possible. This will encompass administrative data as well as various studies and surveys, including those conducted by UNDP and implementing partners. This approach will help address the possible shortage of data and reveal gaps that should be corrected as a result of the evaluation.

The Outcome Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all including primary stakeholders and UNDP, governmental institutions, CSOs as well as members of donor community, private-sector representatives, multilateral and bilateral donors. Field visits to selected project sites and briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP, as well as with donors and partners are envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by gender, age and location) where possible.

Based on the objectives mentioned above, the evaluation team must propose a methodology and plan for this assignment, which will be approved by the evaluation management team. An approach relating objectives and/or outcomes to indicators, study questions, data required to measure indicators, data sources and collection methods that allow triangulation of data and information often ensure adequate attention is given to all study objectives.

1. **DElIVERABLES**

Expected deliverables from the evaluation team are;

**Inception report:** Evaluation Inception Report detailing the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered (which methodologies will be used), a proposed schedule of tasks. The evaluation team shall submit an electronic copy of the draft inception report to the Evaluation manager as stated in the agreement. Before preparing the inception report, the evaluation team should consult with relevant UNDP staff to come to a consensus on the evaluation methodology, field visit plans, sampling and so on. The inception report should include a detailed evaluation methodology and evaluation framework along with the tools to be used to gather data, sampling approaches and key milestones. The inception report needs to be approved by UNDP before starting the data collection. The evaluator **may** be asked to make an oral presentation of the inception report.

The inception report should include, *inter alia*:

**Evaluation purpose and scope**—A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.

**Evaluation criteria and questions**—The criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale.

**Evaluation methodology**—A description of data collection methods and data sources to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data collection tools, instruments and protocols and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation; and the sampling plan.

**Evaluation matrix**—This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered by the methods selected (see Annex 4).

A revised **schedule of key milestones**, deliverables and responsibilities.

Detailed **resource requirements** tied to evaluation activities and deliverables

detailed in the work plan.

**Presentation 1:** the preliminary evaluation findings to be shared for validation with the evaluation management team just after completion of data analysis

**Draft Evaluation Report**: The report’s findings and results should follow logically from the analysis, be credible and clearly presented together with analyses of achievements and deficiencies. All recommendations should (a) be supported by data analyses (evidence), findings and conclusions, (b) be clearly stated, and (c) specify who is recommended to do what by when. The draft evaluation should be submitted on the date agreed in the inception report. Feedback for the report will be provided by the evaluation management team.

**Final Evaluation Report:** The final report may be prepared after a few iterations of the report if the quality standards are not met within the first round. The review and revision process from the draft report stage to the final report should not exceed 6 weeks.

**Final Presentation:** This would include evaluation findings to be shared amongst a wider stakeholder group within four weeks of submitting the final evaluation report.

The template for the evaluation report is provided in Anne 5

1. **EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

The evaluation team should comprise of national experts with high levels of technical, sectoral and policy expertise; rigorous research and drafting skills; and the capacity to conduct an independent and quality evaluation. The number of evaluators must be determined by the lead evaluator who submits the proposal depending on the requirements of the assignment. Either a team of consultants or a research company could submit proposals in response to this call for proposals.

The following requirements must be fulfilled by the team leader and the evaluation team.

Team Leader should have

* A minimum of 10 years’ experience as lead evaluator in programme/ policy evaluations
* Experience and subject knowledge in democratic governance, rule of law and access to justice, human rights, reconciliation, gender would be an added advantage
* Team leader and evaluation team should have Prior hands-on experiences in conducting programme/ policy level evaluations
* Proven experience with quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches
* Experiences in using results-based management principles, theory of change /logical framework analysis for programming;
* Excellent understanding of the local context, and in particular the new and emerging policy directions
* Possess strong analytical skills and the ability to conceptualize, articulate and debate about local governance and human rights issues, access to justice, livelihood, with a positive and forward-looking attitude
* Proven ability to produce analytical reports and high quality academic publications in English
* Ability to bring gender dimensions into the evaluation, including data collection, analysis and writing
* Strong interpersonal skills and ability to work with people from different backgrounds to deliver quality products within a short timeframe
* Team members should have a minimum of 5 or more years of relevant professional experience, including previous substantive evaluation experience and involvement in monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, result-based management (preferably in democratic governance, rule of law and access to justice, Human rights, sustainable livelihoods, reconciliation and social cohesion, gender empowerment, and youth empowerment)
* Be flexible and responsive to changes and demands;
* Be client-oriented and open to feedback.

**Required corporate competencies for evaluation team members:**

* Knowledge on UNDP programming principles and procedures; the UN evaluation framework, norms and standards; human rights based approach (HRBA);
* Demonstrate integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promote the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Display cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Fulfill all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

**Description of tasks**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lead Evaluator** | **Other evaluators** |
| Lead the entire evaluation process, including communicating all required information with the evaluation manager | *Assists the Evaluation Team Leader in the collation and desk review of programme document* |
| *Finalize the research design and questions based on the feedback and complete inception report* | *Based on the approved inception report, assists in the coordination of data‐gathering activities, including focused group discussions with clusters of respondents* |
| *Leads the coordination and conduct of data gathering activities: desk review, focus group discussions* | *Assist in data gathering: Field interviews and focus group discussions;* |
| *Data analysis, final report consolidation and submission* | *Data analysis and drafting of report* |
| *Deliver and Present the draft final report to the Reference Group* | *Co‐present the final report and document comments* |

1. **management arrangment of the evaluation**

The following diagram and description explain the composition and structure of the Evaluation Management Team

**Evaluation Commissioner**

**Evaluation Team**

**Evaluation Manager**

**Reference Group**

**Quality Assurance Panel**

**The Evaluation commissioner is the Deputy Country Director of the UNDP**.

* Determine which outcomes and projects will be evaluated and when
* Provide clear advice to the evaluation manager at the onset on how the findings will be used
* Respond to the evaluation by preparing a management response and use the findings as appropriate
* Take responsibility for learning across evaluations on various content areas and about evaluation
* Safeguard the independence of the exercise
* Allocate adequate funding and human resources

**The Evaluation Manager is the M&E Analyst, UNDP** and is responsible for overall management of the evaluation process. Following are the specific tasks under her responsibility;

* Lead the development of the evaluation ToR
* Manage the selection and recruitment of the external evaluators
* Manage the contractual arrangements, the budget and the Personnel involved in the evaluation
* Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group
* Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data
* Liaise with and respond to the commissioners and co-commissioners
* Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation
* Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s); ensure the final draft meets quality standards
* Liaise with communication team to share evaluation findings for different target groups appropriately.

**The Reference group** consist with 4-5 key stakeholders representing government, civil society organizations and private sector. Tasks of this group are as follow;

* Participate in the drafting and review of the draft ToR
* Assist in collecting required data
* Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation
* Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets quality standards

**Quality assurance panel** consist of the regional evaluation advisor and an experienced evaluation professional representing the Sri Lanka Evaluation Association. Their tasks are as follow;

* Review documents such as TOR, inception report and draft evaluation report as required and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation and options for improvement, albeit for another evaluation
* Be a critical friend

1. **EVALUATION code and ETHICS**

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation” (annexure 02) and should sign and follow the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the UN System (annexure 03).

1. **TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **May** | **June** | | | | **July** | | | | **August** | | | | **Sep** | | | | **October** | | | | **Nov** | | | |
| **Preparation stage ( Evaluation Management team)** |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prepare and finalize the TOR with evaluation Management team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compiling key documents and existing data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recruitment of external evaluator(s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Inception stage (by evaluators)** |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Briefings of evaluators (by evaluation management team to orient the evaluators) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Desk review of key documents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finalizing the evaluation design and methods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparing and finalizing an inception report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Data collection and analysis stage (by evaluators)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Desk research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data and information collection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Synthesis and reporting stage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First presentation on evaluation findings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Submit draft report by the evaluators** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review of the draft report with key stakeholders for quality assurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incorporating comments and revising the evaluation report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Submission of the final report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dissemination and follow-up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparation of Management response and sharing findings with wider stakeholders |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Dissemination of evaluation findigns**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Purpose** | **Key audience** | **knowledge product and responsible party** | **dissemination event and responsible party** | **Timing and place** |
| Improve transparency and accountability , sharing good practices and lessons learnt | Key stakeholders of the outcomes 1, 2 and 3 | *Presentation (ppt)*  Communication team | Evaluation finding sharing session for stakeholders who take part in outcome 1, 2 and 3  ACD who is responsible for outcome 1,2 and 3 | Within first month of completion of the evaluation report |
| Improve transparency and accountability , sharing good practices and lessons learnt | All staff of UNDP | *Presentation (ppt)*  Communication team | All staff meeting  ACD who is responsible for outcome 1,2 and 3 | Within first month of completion of the evaluation report |
| Sharing good practices | UNCT staff | *Presentation (ppt)*  Communication team | UNCT meeting  DCD | Within first month of completion of the evaluation report |

**12. ANNEXURES**

The following documents are appended to the TOR when provided to the evaluator(s):

1. Results and Resource framework of CPD/CPAP which details three outcomes

2. UNEG ethical guideline for evaluation

3. Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the UN System

4. Sample evaluation matrix

5. Evaluation report template

**Annexure 01:** Result and Resource frame work for outcome 1, 2 and 3 from the CPAP



**Annexure 02:** UNEG Ethical guideline for Evaluation

****

**Annexure 03:** Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the UN System



Annexure 04: Sample Evaluation matrix



Annexure 05 : Evaluation Report template

