

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR FINAL EVALUATION OF SDG-F JOINT PROGRAMME PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABLE CULTURAL TOURISM FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INCLUSIVE ON LENCA ROUTE

General Context: the SDG-F

The Sustainable Development Goals Fund is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional Joint Programmes. It builds on the experience, knowledge, lessons learnt, and best practices of the MDG Fund and the MDG experience, while focusing on the fostering of sustainable development, public-private partnerships and gender and women's empowerment as cross-cutting priorities in all our areas of work. The SDG Fund aims to act as a bridge in the transition from MDGs to SDGs providing concrete experiences on how to achieve a sustainable and inclusive world as part of 'Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development.'

Since 2014, UNDP and UNWOMEN in Honduras are implementing the Joint Programme "Promotion of sustainable cultural tourism for economic development inclusive in Lenca route". The main objective of the joint program is to contribute to the reduction of levels of poverty and extreme poverty of Lenca population in the municipalities of Intibucá, Jesús de Otoro, La Esperanza, San Miguelito and Yamaranguila through the promotion of social cohesion and inclusive economic development and sustainable.

The Joint Programm outcomes are aligned to the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012-2016 and Joint Programm is expected to contribute to achieve the following:

Outcome 1. Improved capacities of participating municipalities for formulation Participatory strategies for revitalization and cultural preservation aimed at the development of Initiatives of sustainable cultural tourism.

Outcome 2: Employability and entrepreneurship conditions for Lenca population improved with emphasis on women and youth from the municipalities of Intibucá, Jesús de Otoro, La Esperanza, San Miguelito and Yamaranguila, through the enhancement of sustainable touristic and cultural products and certification of gender equity stamps and green companies.

Outcome 3: Municipalities involved are projected as a benchmark in the country of the enhancement and revitalization of Lenca culture as well as the inclusion of women and young people in Local economy.

The municipalities selected have as a main value the Lenca culture located in the department of Intibucá where high levels of poverty and inequality converge (the average NHDl is the lowest in the country), a sharp contrast to the enormous wealth of heritage, culture, tourism and the environment. Indigenous women and young people are identified as the population groups that face the greatest challenges to take advantage of the opportunities offered by development.

In this regard, the joint programme will commission an independent final evaluation in the last months of implementation of the Joint Programme.

I. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

To promote accountability, organizational learning, stocktaking of achievements, performance, impacts, good practices and lessons learnt from implementation towards SDGs.

2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. To measure joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained the results originally foreseen in their project document, M&E frameworks, etc.
4. To measure the impact of the joint programme on the achievement of the SDGs.
5. To identify and document substantive lessons learnt and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic areas and crosscutting issues: gender, youth participation, sustainability and public private partnerships.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will apply the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of the joint programme are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and achieving the SDGs

- a) How has the joint programme contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase, in particular with reference to the baseline situation?
- b) To what extent was the joint programme aligned with national development strategies and the UNDAF/UNDAP?
- c) To what extent was joint programming the best option to respond to development challenges described in the programme document?
- d) To what extent are the objectives of the joint programme still valid in the context of national policy objectives and SDGs?
- e) To what extent have the implementing partners participating in the joint programme contributed added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?

Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved

- a) To what extent did the joint programme attain the development outputs and outcomes described in the programme document or has progress been made towards their achievement?
- b) How have corresponding outputs delivered by the joint programme affected the outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective?
- c) What good practices, success stories, lessons learnt and replicable experiences have been identified? Please describe and document them.
- d) What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have the joint programme's partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
- e) What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the joint programme's work?

- f) To what extent did the results achieved benefit women and men equally?
- g) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)
- h) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results

- a) To what extent was the joint programme's management model (governance and decisionmaking structure, i.e. lead agency, Joint Programme Coordinator, Programme Management Committee and National Steering Committee, financial management and allocation of resources, i.e. one work plan, one budget) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- b) To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to achieve better results when compared to single-agency interventions? What efficiency gains/losses were there as a result?
- c) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, business practices did the implementing partners use to promote/improve efficiency?
- d) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have these affected its efficiency?
- e) To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- f) To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- g) How did the joint programme promote gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?

Impact – Positive and negative effects of the intervention on development outcomes, SDGs

- a) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the SDGs?
- b) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the targeted crosscutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, multiculturalism (indigenous peoples), youth participation, public private partnerships (PPPs) and sustainability at the local and national levels?
- c) What impact did the matching funds have in the design, implementation and results of the joint programme?
- d) To what extent did the joint programme have an impact on the targeted beneficiaries? Were all targeted beneficiaries reached? Which were left out?
- e) What unexpected/unintended effects did the joint programme have, if any?
- f) Have there been complementarities, articulations or synergies with other national projects or programs or other donors developed in the same geographical area and sector?

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term

- a) Which mechanisms already existed and which have been put in place by the joint programme to ensure results and impact, i.e. policy, policy coordination mechanisms, partnerships, networks?

- b) To what extent has the capacity of beneficiaries (institutional and/or individual) been strengthened such that they are resilient to external shocks and/or do not need support in the long term?
- c) To what extent will the joint programme be replicated or scaled up at local or national levels?
- d) What indications are there that the results achieved will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
- e) To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- f) To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
- g) How will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by primary stakeholders?

4. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The evaluation methodology will be developed by the evaluator and presented for approval to the Evaluation Reference Group. The methodology should use a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods that are suitable to address the main evaluation questions. These methods should be applied with respect of human rights and gender equality principles and facilitate the engagement of key stakeholders.

This final evaluation will make use of:

- **All relevant secondary information sources**, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, evaluations and
- **Primary information sources** including: interviews, surveys, etc. to ensure participatory approach and appropriate consultation and engagement of stakeholders
- **Triangulating of information** to allow for validation and discern discrepancies

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in the inception report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory approaches.

The evaluation will be carried following UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards¹, UNDP Evaluation Policy as well as the Ethical Guidelines for evaluations in the UN system.

5. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The main actors in the evaluation process are the SDG-F Secretariat, the management team of the joint programme, including the Joint Programme Coordinator, M&E Officer, in addition to the Programme Management Committee. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the **evaluation reference group**. Its role will extend to all phases of the evaluation. The SDG Fund Secretariat shall assume the role of guidance and oversight in the final evaluation.

The evaluation reference group will serve as the primary contact with the evaluator and will help to:

¹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation - Providing input on the evaluation planning
- Prepare **communication and dissemination plan**
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference
- Facilitating the Evaluator's access to all information and relevant documentation, as well as to key actors, stakeholders and informants
- Monitoring the quality of the process and deliverables generated
- Prepare **improvement/action plan** following the submission of the final evaluation report
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group

The evaluation reference group will give approval for the final evaluation report. The evaluation coordinating agency, UNDP in consultation with the RC will provide the necessary guidance on the process and in reviewing the draft report.

UNDP and UNWOMEN will organize field-visits, focus groups, meetings with stakeholders in coordination with joint programme team.

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Evaluator will provide the following deliverables:

Inception Report

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme this report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluator and the evaluation reference group. The report will follow this outline in Annex II:

Draft Final Report

The draft final report will follow the same format as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 30-40 pages in length. See Annex III for the template.

Final Evaluation Report

The final report will be 30-40 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than five pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will follow the template and follow the outline as given in Annex III.

For this evaluation, it is expected that the evaluator will have 25 calendar days from the signing of the contract. It is estimated that the evaluation will take place between April 18th and May 12, 2017.

8. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

	Scheduled date	Main activities
Phase A: Preparation for the evaluation	Three months before programme closure	<p>Official notification from the Secretariat to the RC advising the start date of the evaluation, the process and generic TOR</p> <p>Establishing of evaluation reference group and adaptation of TOR by the evaluation reference group and compilation of all relevant documents under Annex I</p> <p>Communication and dissemination plan prepared and submitted to Secretariat</p>
Phase B: Execution phase of the evaluation study	Desk study (Five days)	<p>Briefing with the Evaluator and sharing of all documents to be reviewed (Annex I)</p> <p>Submission of the inception report including the findings from the desk review and evaluation methodology (see Annex II)</p> <p>Preparation of mission itinerary by evaluation reference group</p>
	Field visit (Five days)	Field visit conducted by Evaluator based on the planned agenda (Intibucá, La Esperanza, Jesús de Otoro, San Miguelito, Yamaranguila)
	Final Report (15 days)	<p>Submission of draft final report by Evaluator (Annex III) to the Secretariat</p> <p>Review of report by the evaluation reference group</p>
		<p>Review of report by Secretariat</p> <p>Finalization of the report by Evaluator and submission to the Secretariat</p>
Phase C: Action Plan	One month before closure	<p>Improvement/action plan submitted by the evaluation reference group based on the recommendations of the evaluation report</p> <p>Implementation of communication and dissemination plan by evaluation reference group</p>

9. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation reference group and any other stakeholders relevant for the joint programme will jointly design and implement a complete **communication and dissemination plan** to share the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim to advocate for sustainability, replicability, scaling up or to share good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

The **communication and dissemination plan** should at least aim to target all relevant stakeholders as necessary.

10. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality** - the evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality
- **Responsibility** - the report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen between the Evaluator and the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted
- **Integrity** - the Evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention
- **Independence** - the Evaluator should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof
- **Incidents** - if problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the SDG Fund Secretariat. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat in these terms of reference
- **Validation of information** - the Evaluator will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report
- **Intellectual property** - in handling information sources, the Evaluator shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review
- **Delivery of reports** - if delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable

11. COMPETENCIES OF THE EVALUATOR(S)

The evaluator should have verifiable evidence of extensive international experience in evaluating programs and projects related to economic rights, employment and sustainable productive development, as well as programmatic frameworks for cooperation. He/She must meet the following requirements:

Education and experience:

- Master's degree studies in social sciences, political sciences or other related specialties related to international cooperation and development.

- Suitably experienced, possess methodological expertise and at least five (5) years of recognized experience in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programmes, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.
- Experience in the design, formulation and implementation of development programs and projects in the areas of economic rights, employment and sustainable productive development.
- Experience in public policy analysis and sustainable development, including field experience.
- Extensive experience in strategic planning, management by results (special domain of formulation of the theory of change).
- Experience in gender mainstreaming, human rights, and intercultural approach in programs and projects.
- Fluency in Spanish and English.

In observing UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016),¹ the evaluation should be conducted by evaluator who have:

- Knowledge of the United Nations Systems;
- Knowledge of United Nations principles, values, goals and approaches, including human rights, gender equality, cultural values, the Sustainable Development Goals and results-based management;
- Professional foundations (evaluation norms, standards and ethical guidelines and the relevant organizational evaluation policy); and
- Technical evaluation skills; and
- Communications and interpersonal skills

¹ UNEG (2016) Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016:
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

12. ANNEXES

I. Check List: Documents to be Reviewed

The documents will be provided by the evaluation reference group who will be responsible for compiling the complete list and collecting all the documents for timely submission to the Evaluator.

SDG-F Context

- [SDG Fund TORs and Guidance for Joint Programme Formulation](#)
- SDG Fund M&E strategy
- Communications and Advocacy Strategy
- Knowledge Management Strategy

Programme-Specific Documents

- Joint programme document and its annexes (annual work plan and budget, theory of change, integrated M&E research framework, performance monitoring framework, risk analysis matrix)
- Baseline and end line study (if any)
- Mid-term review report (if any)
- NSC and PMC minutes
- Exit strategy
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Financial information (MPTF)

Other in-country documents or information

- All assessments, reports and/or evaluations directly conducted/commissioned by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the SDGs at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country

II. Inception Report - Outline

0. Introduction
1. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach
2. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research
3. Main substantive interventions of the joint programme
4. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information
5. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including field visit

III. Draft/Final Evaluation Report - Outline

1. Cover Page
2. Executive Summary – a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations.
3. Introduction
 - a. Background, goal and methodological approach
 - b. Purpose of the evaluation
 - c. Evaluation methodology
 - d. Constraints and limitations of the study conducted
4. Description of the development interventions carried out
 - a. Detailed description of the development intervention undertaken: description and judgement on implementation of outputs delivered (or not) and outcomes attained as well as how the programme worked in comparison to the theory of change developed for the programme.
5. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered)
6. Conclusions and Lessons Learnt
7. Recommendations
8. Annexes