



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Consultancy Information

Consultancy title: Support to Public Administration Project –IGAD Regional Initiative for Capacity Enhancement in South Sudan- Phase II

Duration: 30 days

Duty Station: Juba, South Sudan, with possible travel to states

2. Background and Context

The Support to Public Administration Project – IGAD Regional Initiative for Capacity Enhancement in South Sudan-Phase II was designed in line with the 2012-2016 South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP) and the annexed Medium-Term Capacity Development Strategy (MTCDS), the Support Public Administration Project aims to support South Sudan in building its civil service capacity for equitable, responsive, and accountable service delivery. It aims to address the three levels of capacity: enabling environment (policy, legal, regulatory and institutional); organizational level (work procedures and operational arrangements); and individual (skills development) levels. The project is funded by the Government of Norway. Three IGAD countries; Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda contributes experience civil servants who spend two years in South Sudan government institutions.

The SSDP provided a framework for achieving critical development outcomes related to Governance, Economic Development, Social and Human Development and Conflict Prevention and Security. Recognizing that the human and institutional gaps are major obstacles to rapid progress, the MTCDS provides a basis for capacitating the new state to deliver on the national development objectives. Essentially, the SSDP and the annexed MTCDS reaffirm the commitment of the government to create a professional, accountable, transparent and responsive civil service. The Support Public Administration Project was, therefore, designed to directly support SSDP priorities related to an improved civil service.

The Support Public Administration Project was, until December 2015 aligned with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) *outcome "Core governance and civil service functions are established and operational"*, and now to the Interim Cooperation Framework (ICF) outcome "Peace and Governance Strengthened". The implementation of this outcome is further elaborated in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD), Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) – until June 2016, and Annual Work Plans (AWP).

This initiative also resonates with UN General Assembly Resolution on Civilian Capacity in the Aftermath of Conflict¹; which advocates for civilian capacity reform through regional capacity initiatives by Member States. It notes the importance of drawing on relevant expertise in the development of initiatives to support national capacities when supporting countries emerging from conflict. In his report, after the resolution, the UN Secretary General stressed the urgent need for timely and effective civilian capacities in situations of violence and upheaval². He highlighted the importance of South-South and triangular cooperation in developing national capacities and mobilizing resources for institution building³. The Secretary-General noted the Support Public Administration Project as a model partnership in the global South complemented by triangular funding from donor countries⁴ (Norway). The RSS/IGAD Initiative promotes the use of regional expertise through the deployment of CSSOs from member countries to support capacity building and reform in South Sudan.

The Support Public Administration Project is in line with the 'New Deal' advocated by the Group of 7+, championing national ownership for sustainable peace and development in fragile states. It supports inclusive, country-owned and

¹. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, 66/255, Civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict

². Report of the Secretary-General on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict, A/67/312 – S/2012/645, p. 4

³. Ibid

⁴. Ibid., pp. 10 - 11

country-led transitions, while recognizing that 'transitioning out of fragility was a lengthy political process that required country leadership and ownership.'⁵South Sudan government institutions are expected to perform core governance functions to foster sustainable peace and facilitate recovery out of fragility. State-building experiences from post conflict countries attest that this cannot be done without a capable and accountable civil service. In this regard, the Support Public Administration Project echoes the 'New Deal' by supporting South Sudan's transition from fragility through civil service capacity building.

3. Purpose of the Evaluation

The Support Public Administration Project ends in December 2018. This mid-term evaluation is being conducted at the request of the national government and UNDP to assess the project's contribution towards "*support South Sudan in building its civil service capacity for equitable, responsive, and accountable service delivery*". The evaluation is formative in nature, forward looking and utilisation focussed, and will elaborate lessons and best practices to inform the remaining project implementation period (until December 2018). As per the OECD/DAC criteria, this evaluation will assess relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, potential sustainability and impact of the project. The evaluation will assess the intended and unintended outcomes of the Support Public Administration Project and recommend strategies to enhance operational and programmatic effectiveness until project end.

The evaluation serves as an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in South Sudan with an impartial assessment of the results generated to date, including gender equality results of this project. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation who are the relevant ministries and institutions of the Government of the Republic of South Sudan, Government of Norway, Ethiopia, Kenya & Uganda and potential donors, UNDP and other UN agencies.

4. Evaluation scope and objectives

a. Scope

The mid-term evaluation will cover the period of 1 October 2013-31 March 2017, in the following geographic locations - Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Western Equatoria, Northern Bahr el-Ghazal and Western Bahr el-Ghazal. The evaluation will cover programme conceptualisation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of results. The evaluation will also focus performance of indicators agreed with Norway. In addition to assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the RSS/IGAD Regional Initiative, the mid-term evaluation will

- a) explore the key factors that have contributed to the achieving or not achieving of the intended results;
- b) determine the extent to which the Support Public Administration Project is contributing to
 - building capacities,
 - addressing crosscutting issues of gender and human rights,
 - forging partnership at different levels, including with government, donors, UN agencies, and communities; potential sustainability of the Support Public Administration Project for continued realisation of results;
- c) draw lessons learned and best practices and make recommendations for future programming of projects of similar nature.

The evaluation will also assess the synergy between the Support Public Administration Project and other UNDP initiatives contributing towards the same outcome areas; community security and arms control, democracy and participation, public financial management and access to justice and rule of law projects.

b. Objectives

Specific evaluation objectives are:

1. To determine the relevance and strategic positioning of the Support Public Administration Project and whether the initial assumptions are still relevant;
2. To assess the progress to date and what can be derived in terms of lessons learned for ongoing and future UNDP's support towards civil service capacity building for equitable, responsive, and accountable service

⁵. New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile States, endorsed at the Fourth High-Level Forum in Aid Effectiveness, Busan, Republic of Korea, 29 November – 1 December 2011.

delivery;

3. Review the frameworks and strategies that UNDP and partners devised for its support on capacity enhancement of South Sudan institutions and determine whether they are well conceived for achieving planned objectives;
4. Review how the project succeeded to strengthen application of a rights-based approach, gender mainstreaming and participation of other socially vulnerable groups such as children and the disabled
5. Assess the overall contribution of the project to the state of good governance and public administration in the country.

Target Audience

UNDP and UNCT, Norway, contributing IGAD countries (Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda), South Sudan government ministries, agencies and departments and other relevant users of the report.

5. Evaluation questions

The mid-term project evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

Relevance

1. To what extent is UNDP's engagement in the Support to Public Administration Project – IGAD Regional Initiative for Capacity Enhancement in South Sudan a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in the development context in South Sudan and its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners
2. Was the design of the project adequate to properly address the issues envisaged in the formulation of the programme?
3. Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended outcomes and effects?
4. To what extent has UNDP capacity building support contributed to influencing national policies/strategies focusing on human rights protection, gender equality and equitable sustainable development
5. To what extent was UNDP's selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?

Effectiveness

6. To what extent have project results/targets been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement?
7. How have corresponding outputs delivered by the project affected the project/CPD outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective?
8. What has been the contribution of other UNDP projects, partners and other organizations to the project results, and how effective have project partnerships been in contributing to achieving the results?
9. What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the project's work?
10. To what extent did the project benefit women and men equally?
11. To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?
12. Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving institutional capacity in the country?

Efficiency

13. Are the project implementation strategy and approaches, conceptual framework and execution efficient and cost effective? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?
14. Is there an economical use of financial and human resources? Are resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) being allocated strategically to achieve outputs??
15. To what extent are quality outputs being delivered on time? Can a different approach produce better results?

16. To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
17. How is the project management structure operating?
18. To what extent are monitoring systems providing management with a stream of data to allow it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?

Sustainability

19. What indications are there that the project results will be or has been sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
20. To what extent has a sustainability strategy been developed or implemented?
21. To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
22. To what extent are partners committed to providing continuing support?
23. How will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by government institutions?

Partnership strategy

24. To what extent are partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
25. Are there current or potential complementarities or overlaps with existing partners' programmes?
26. How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs?
27. Has UNDP worked effectively with partners to deliver on this current Initiative?
28. How effective has UNDP been in partnering with civil society (where applicable) and the private sector to promote the institutional capacity enhancement initiative in the country?
29. The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration

Gender considerations

30. To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? Is gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?
31. Are gender issues being implemented as a cross-cutting theme. Is the project providing sufficient attention to promote gender equality and gender-sensitivity?
32. To what extent is the project informed by human rights treaties and instruments?

Social inclusion

33. How did the project consider the plight and needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged to promote social equity, for example, women, youth, disabled persons?

Based on the above analysis, the evaluator is expected to provide overarching conclusions on the project results in this area of support, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP South Sudan Country Office could adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities for similar future initiatives.

6. Methodology for the evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation and Ethical Standards as well as OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and fully compliant with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2016). This mid-term evaluation involves qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate project implementation and their performance and to make recommendations for the ongoing project.

The evaluation will be carried out by an independent evaluator, and will engage a broad range of key stakeholders and beneficiaries, including government officials, donors, civil society organizations (where applicable) UNDP staff. This evaluation is expected to take a "theory of change" (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the initiatives that UNDP South Sudan has supported, and observed progress in civil service capacity in the country. Evidence

obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits as applicable

5.1. Data Collection

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UN, the government institutions, CSOs, CSSOs, South Sudan civil servants (twins), development partners and beneficiaries (where applicable). Field visits to selected project sites; and briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the government officials, as well as with development partners, are envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location) where possible.

To use existing sources/information and avoid duplication, data will be mainly collected from various information sources through a comprehensive desk review that will include the analysis of relevant documents, information, data/statistics, triangulation of different studies etc. Data will also be collected from stakeholder key informants through interviews, discussions, consultative processes, and observations in field missions. This phase will comprise:

- i. Review and analysis of relevant documents, including government programmatic documents & reports, UN(DP) strategic documents, project documents & reports, recent studies and research reports, developmental and social reports, (see list attached and relevant links);
- ii. Critical analysis of available data with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended project inputs to the government.

The mid-term evaluation will benefit from and optimally use the data collected through other sources such as the project assessment reports, project monitoring reports, annual reviews, donor reports, audit reports etc to determine project performance.

7. Evaluation products (Deliverables)

Under the guidance and supervision of the Support to Public Administration Project Manager, in consultation with the Partnership and Management Support Unit, and the mid-term evaluation reference group, the consultant shall provide the following deliverables:

- i. **Inception report:** The evaluator will prepare an inception report that details the evaluator's understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, data sources and collection analysis tool for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with partners and UNDP country office before the evaluator proceed with site visits
- ii. **Draft mid-term evaluation report** - The consultant will prepare the draft evaluation report cognisant of the proposed format of the report and checklist used for the assessment of evaluation reports (see annexes). The report will be submitted to the evaluation reference group through the project manager for validation. Comments from the reference group and stakeholders will be provided within 10 days after receiving the draft report. The evaluator will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.
- iii. **Final mid-term evaluation Report.** The final report (30-50 pages) will include comments from the reference group and other stakeholders will be submitted 10 days after receiving all comments.

8. Evaluation team composition and required Competencies

The mid-term evaluation will be conducted by a team of independent consultants. The team will be comprised of one international⁶ evaluation expert (Team Leader) and one national evaluation expert (Associate). Both the international and national consultants must have extensive experience in strategic programming of development assistance in post-conflict countries within the broader areas of democratic governance, public administration, local government and

⁶ *The International Consultant (Team Leader) will be recruited first and s/he will assist in the recruitment of the National Consultant.*

service delivery, and institutional (policies, frameworks, strategies, etc.) sector capacity building at national and sub-national levels. Preferably, the consultants also have substantial knowledge of and experience with the monitoring and evaluation of public administration capacity building projects in volatile environments. The required expertise, qualifications and competencies are listed below:

- Minimum Master's degree in Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development Studies, Law, International Development
- Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the fields of public administration, governance, international relations, regional development, gender equality and social services.
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting evaluations of UN, government and international aid organisations;
- Direct experience with civil service capacity building is an added advantage
- Excellent writing skills with a strong background in report drafting;
- Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views;
- Ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter concisely.

Corporate competencies

- Demonstrated integrity by upholding the United Nations' values and ethical standards;
- Appreciate differences in values and learning from cultural diversities;
- Promotes UNDP vision, mission and strategic goals;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age-based sensitivity and adaptability;
- Demonstrates diplomacy and tact in dealing with sensitive and complex situations.

Professionalism

- Demonstrates professional competence and mastery of subject matter;
- Demonstrated ability to negotiate and apply good judgment;
- Is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results.

Planning & Organizing

- Establishes, builds and maintains effective working relationships with colleagues to achieve the planned results.

5. Evaluation Ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on it data. The consultants must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorisation of UNDP and partners.

6. Implementation arrangements

The UNDP South Sudan Country Office will select the evaluator through an open process in consultation with the partners. UNDP will be responsible for the management of the consultant and will in this regard designate focal persons for the evaluation (who is the Support to Public Administration project manager) and any additional staff to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.) The project manager takes responsibility for the approval of the final mid-term evaluation report in liaison with the partners.

The designated Ministry focal point/national consultant will assist the consultant in arranging introductory meetings with the relevant parties in UNDP, partners and government and civil society. The consultant will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. UNDP will develop a management response to the evaluation within 2 weeks of report finalization.

The project manager will convene an evaluation reference group comprising of technical experts from partners and

UNDP to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This reference group will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The reference group will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards.

The consultant will work full time, based in UNDP South Sudan. Office space and limited administrative and logistical support will be provided. The consultant will use her/his own laptop and cell phone.

7. Timeframe for the evaluation process

The evaluation will be carried out over a period of 30 working days broken down as follows:

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan	Inception report	5 days
Initial briefing		
Documents review and stakeholder consultations	Draft report	20 days
Field Visits		
Data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft evaluation report		
Validation workshop		
Finalization of evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders and submission to UNDP South Sudan.	Final mid-term evaluation report	5 days
Total number of working days		30 days

8. Cost

The budget for the exercise is US\$ 60,000. The budget items are as follows:

- Consultant's fees
- All travel-related costs for consultants to project sites
- Focus group meetings and interviews
- Convening Reference Group and/or stakeholder meeting/consultations

Interested consultants should provide their requested fee rates when they submit their expressions of interest, in USD. Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by UNDP planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

Inception report	10%
Draft Evaluation and Lesson Learned Report	70%
Final Evaluation and lesson learned Report	20%