**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SOMALIA (YES)**

1. **BACKGROUND**

The Joint FGS-UN Programme aims to capitalise on security, governance and reconciliation achievements by expanding employment opportunities for young men and women in Somalia. As highlighted in the Economic Recovery Plan for Somalia, youth unemployment is one of the greatest obstacles to the country’s economic recovery. The plan states the aim of the government is to provide youth with employment opportunities so as to avoid the latter joining militia groups. This is to be achieved through vocational training, enterprise training and creation and rehabilitation of infrastructure through labour intensive employment methods. The programme recognizes the centrality of youth in fostering stability in the country and outlines specific interventions that can be taken within the next 18 months to begin to generate decent work opportunities for young people that will serve as positive alternatives to participation in violence and conflict. This will also contribute to the revitalization of the local economy. The employment generating interventions from this programme also aim to augment the credibility of the FGS and build trust and confidence in local governance and security sector institutions while providing immediate peace dividends to vulnerable sub-sections of the population.

As encouraged in the New Deal Compact, this joint youth employment programme is a frontline intervention of the FGS to achieve rapid results under Peace and State-building Goal (PSG) 4 (Economic Foundations), which identifies youth employment through job creation and skills development as one of the most important priority projects over the next two years. The idea of a high-visibility, government-led campaign to mobilize young people in an effort to rebuild (or build anew) critical economic infrastructure remains highly attractive from the perspectives of economic recovery and state building.

The programme aims at creating sustainable job opportunities for youth by addressing the below challenges affecting the labour supply and demand factors.

* The employment situation is bleak for Somali youth, as young people (15-24) struggle to find work, especially in the formal sector. Young Somalis cannot afford unemployment because of the absence of social protection and therefore face underemployed and are occupied in survival activities such as self-employment or as unpaid family workers. They often engage in low-productive and poor quality jobs mostly in the informal economy.
* Somalia's private sector has a serious competitiveness problem, which translates among others into important youth unemployment and a weak export performance. In fact, the main cause of youth unemployment in Somalia appears to be a result of “demand side” factors, i.e. low demand for jobs by companies.

The joint programme was signed on 17 June 2015 for an overall period of three years (mid 2015 – mid 2018) and funded period of 18 months. Actuals funds transferred to the participating UN Organizations (FAO, HABITAT, ILO and UNDP) was on 29 September 2015. The programme was amended until 31 December 2017 upon availability of additional funds. In terms of funding, the overall project is $54m, and current approved budget until end 2017 is $22.9m ($8.9m + $14m).

The overall outcome of the project that supports PSG 4: Economic Foundations is Somali economy revitalized and expanded with a focus on livelihood enhancement, employment generation, and broad-based inclusive growth with the following sub outcomes:

**Sub-Outcome 1:** Improved long-term potential for growth, productivity and inclusive employment through six value chains implementation plans.

**Sub-Outcome 2**: Enhanced longer-term employability of youth in sectors with high growth and employment potential.

**Sub-Outcome 3:** Productive infrastructure rehabilitated through labour-intensive methods.

**Relationship to Somalia’s Peace-building and State-building Goals (PSG) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)/Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**

The Youth Employment Programme is in line with the New Deal processes culminating in the Somali Compact, which puts youth at the forefront of the agenda for employment creation. The Compact aims to foster confidence between people, communities, the state and international partners through: transparency; risk sharing; use and strengthening of country systems; strengthening government capacity; and timely and predictable aid.

The plan assumes that improving the conditions for youth –e.g. access to employment and to basic services– will significantly contribute to establishing peace and maintaining stability. More specifically, the proposed programme will contribute to several targets:

* PSG 4, Priority 2: “*Expand opportunities for youth employment through job creation and skills development*;”
* PSG 4, Priority 1: “*Enhance the productivity of high priority sectors and related value chains, including through the rehabilitation and expansion of critical infrastructure for transport, market access, trade, and energy*;”
* Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Goal 1: “*Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger*,” in particular Target 1b, “*Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and youth*.”

1. **OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION**

As per the project document, the Joint Programme will be evaluated to inform learning, decision-making and guidance on how to implement the programme. The evaluation aims to determine the **relevance** and fulfilment of objectives as well as the **efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and the impact** of the Joint Programme.

Evaluation of a Joint Programme should be undertaken in accordance with the guidance from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) (e.g., relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) with an emphasis on impact at outcome level, sustainability of the results.

Mid-term evaluations are formative in nature and seek **to generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned and improve implementation of the programmes during their remaining implementation and will guide the design of the next phase of the programme**. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee and the Project Steering Committee.

1. **SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS**

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

**The unit of analysis or object of study for this mid-term evaluation is the joint programme,** understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and amendments made during implementation.

The overall objective of the mid-term evaluation is to find out the **outcome and impact of the programme project and to asses if the programme objectives are being achieved, using its resources and provide recommendations for project modification, further development and improvement.** In addition,examine the changes that resulted from the project implementation and provide inputs to guide the decision making for the upcoming renewal and extension of the project including funding requirements.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. To discover the programme’s **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the NDP and the **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**, and find out the degree of national ownership of the programme.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks as envisaged in the programme.
3. To identify the programme’s **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the Youth Employment in the country including resource mobilization and effective use of resources in line with the aid effectiveness principals, and value for money.
4. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA**

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

**Design level**

* **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Sustainable Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**

1. Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the joint programme?
2. Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention?
3. To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural context?
4. Are the monitoring indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?
5. To what extent has the Resident Coordinator’s Office (RCO) Secretariat for Joint Programmes contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programmes?

* **Ownership in the design: national social actors’ effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**

1. To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national and regional plans?
2. To what extent have the country’s national and local authorities and social stakeholders been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention?

**Process level**

**- Efficiency: The extent to which the resources/inputs (funds, time etc.) have been turned into results**

1. How well does the joint programme’s management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?
   1. How resources are managed i.e. human resources as well as financing (how resources are managed, allocated amongst partners and expended.)
2. To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation?
3. Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded?
4. Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme’s results? How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate? What are the interlinkages between the three components of the programme?
5. Are work methodologies, financial tools etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes?
6. Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural context identified?
7. How conducive are current UN agency procedures to joint programming? How can existing bottlenecks be overcome and procedures further harmonized?
8. Are some of the participating agencies not undertaking similar employment creation activities? How can existing overlaps be minimized and intervention areas are assigned to agencies with comparative advantage which includes presence in project target areas and capacity to deliver.
9. How efficiently are the UN participating organization mitigating the risks?

**- Ownership in the process: National social actors’ effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**

1. To what extent have the target population and the participants taken ownership of the programme, assuming an active role in it?
2. To what extent have national public/private resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s goals and impacts?

**Results level**

**- Efficacy: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been met or are expected to be met, taking into account their relative importance.**

1. Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?
   1. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals (previously Peace-building and State-building Goals – PSGs) at the local and national levels?
2. Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes?
3. Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality?
4. Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?
5. Is the programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned?
6. In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving?
7. Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified?
8. In what ways has the joint programme contributed to the issue of youth employment?
9. What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?

**Sustainability: The probability that the benefits of the intervention will continue in the long term.**

1. Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the joint programme?

At local and national level:

* + 1. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?
    2. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?
    3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national and local partners?
    4. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
    5. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will ensure the sustainability of the interventions?
    6. Have networks or network institutions been created or strengthened to carry out the roles that the joint programme is performing?
    7. Has the geographical coverage of the programme been effective? Were there consultations with the relevant stakeholders?
    8. Is the programme and its activities contributing to the environmental protection and climate change?
    9. How does the programme create solidarity and develop better relations amongst the beneficiaries and communities?

1. To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent with or different from those of the joint programme?
2. In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future?

**Country level**

1. During the analysis of the evaluation, what lessons have been learned, and what best practices can be transferred to other programmes or countries?
2. To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals in the country?
3. To what extent and in which ways are the joint programmes helping make progress towards United Nations reform? One UN
4. How have the principles for aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, managing for development results and mutual accountability) been developed in the joint programmes?
5. To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country’s public policy framework?
6. **METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

The mid-term evaluation will use an international consultant, hired by UNDP, as the Evaluator to conduct the evaluation and a locally hired consultant who will support the Evaluator by providing information about local context such as institutions, protocol, traditions, etc. and assist with translation of key meetings/ interviews during the mission as needed. It is the sole responsibility of the Evaluator to deliver the inception, draft final and final reports.

The Evaluator will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, the Evaluator is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. The Evaluator should also to use interviews, field visits, meetings with stakeholders and focus group discussions as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation and use triangular method for validation and analysis of data and information collected. The stakeholders *inter alia* include donors, UN participating organizations and its project teams, donors, and government counterparts.

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

## Required Qualifications Competencies, Skills and Experience of the Evaluator

Sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation).

Full computer literacy.

*Academic Qualifications for the Evaluator:*

A master degree or equivalent on international development, public policy, social science, business administration or related field is a requirement. Further education or a concentration in monitoring and/or evaluation would be an asset.

*Years of experience:*

A combination of 5 years of recognized expertise in:

Conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas and

Having thematic expertise in youth and employment, international development programmes and or assessing or evaluating one or more of the economic and private sector development; conflict prevention and peace building; cultural diversity and development, economic governance, gender and women’s empowerment).

Having experience in fragile or conflict countries particularly in Africa

Having experience with UN is advantageous

*Language Requirements:*

Knowledge of English is required.

1. **EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The Evaluator is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the UNDP Country Director (on behalf of all participating UN Organizations):

* **Inception Report** (to be submitted within seven days of the submission of all programme documentation to the Evaluator)

This report will be 5 to 10 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 inception report will propose an initial theory of change to the joint programme that will be used for comparative purposes during the evaluation and will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluator and the evaluation managers. The Evaluator will also share the inception report with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

* **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 40 to 50 pages in length. This report will be shared among the key Project Steering Committee (PSC) members – government lead, donors and participating UN organizations). It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes 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. UNDP Somalia will share the draft final report with the PSC members to seek their comments and suggestions.

* **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within seven days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 30 to 40 pages in length. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 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. UNDP Somalia will send the final report to the PSC members. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page

2. Introduction

* + Background, goal and methodological approach
  + Purpose of the evaluation
  + Methodology used in the evaluation
  + Constraints and limitations on the study conducted

3. Description of interventions carried out

* + - Initial concept
  + - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.

4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions

5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)

6. Recommendations

7. Annexes

1. **ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION**

The mid-term 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 among the consultants or between the Evaluator and the reference group of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The Evaluator must corroborate all assertions, and note any disagreement with them.

• **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, the Evaluator must report these immediately to UNDP Somalia. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used by the Evaluator to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by UNDP Somalia 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.

1. **ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION**

The main actors in the mid-term evaluation are the Programme Management Unit of the joint programme, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs –FGS, participating UN organizations and donors of the programme. The Programme Management Unit, PSC Co-Chairs, and the RC Office will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

* 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 documents (Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
* Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
* Facilitating the evaluation team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
* Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
* Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

UNDP Somalia shall manage the mid-term evaluation in its role as proponent of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the mid-term evaluation from the programme resources. As manager of the mid-term evaluation, UNDP Somalia will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated; promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process. It shall also disseminate evaluation findings and recommendations.

1. **TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**
2. **Design phase (15 days total)**
3. UNDP Somalia shall send the generic TOR for independent mid-term evaluation of the programme to the reference group for any inputs and feedback.
4. UNDP will use the TOR as the basis to recruit the Evaluator and share the TOR with the selected Evaluator.
5. From this point on, the UNDP Portfolio Manager is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the Evaluator, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (Evaluator, reference group in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.
6. UNDP will arrange travel, accommodation, security clearance and field visits of the Evaluator.
7. **Execution phase of the evaluation study (55-58 days total)**

**Desk study (15 days total)**

1. The Portfolio Manager will brief the Evaluator **(1 day).** He/she will hand over a checklist of activities and documents to review, and explain the evaluation process. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. The Evaluator will review the documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. The Evaluator will submit the inception report to the Portfolio Manager in UNDP; the report will include the findings from the document review and will specify how the evaluation will be conducted. The Evaluator will share the inception report with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (within **seven days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal points for the evaluation (PSC Co-Chairs) and the Evaluator will prepare an agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (e.g. Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc.) (Within **seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

**Field visit (9-12 days)**

1. In-country, the Evaluator will observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document review. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, UNDP’s Portfolio Manager may need to facilitate the Evaluator’s visit by means of phone calls and emails to the reference group.
2. The Evaluator will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

**Final Report (31 days total)**

1. The Evaluator will deliver a draft final report, which UNDP’s Portfolio Manager shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group **(within 10 days of the completion of the field visit).**
2. The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The Evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the UNDP’s Portfolio Manager can and should intervene so that erroneous data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed **(within 14 days of delivery of the draft final report).**

The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgements contained in the report, but these do not affect the Evaluator’s freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.

1. UNDP’s Portfolio Manager shall assess the quality of the final version of the evaluation report presented, using the criteria stipulated in the annex to this TOR **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report).**
2. Upon receipt of input from the reference group, the Evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit. UNDP’s Portfolio Manager shall review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report by the UNDP Portfolio Manager to the evaluation reference group **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments).**
3. **Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within 21 days of delivery of the final report):**
4. UNDP’s Portfolio Manager, as representative of UNDP Somalia, shall engage in a dialogue with the reference group to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.
5. UNDP’s Portfolio Manager will hold a dialogue with the reference group to develop a simple plan to disseminate and report the results to the various interested parties.
6. **ANNEXES**

**a) Document Review**

New Deal and PSG Context

* The Somali Compact
* Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
* SDRF and PSG Work Group Guidelines/TORs

Specific Documents for Joint Programme

* Joint Programme Document
* Amendment 1 to the Joint Programme
* Progress Reports by the joint programme
* Studies/Knowledge Products
* Assessments conducted by the joint programme
* Relevant documents or reports on the Peace-Building and State-Building Goals
* Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One

**b) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan**

After the mid-term evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 1** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| **Key actions** | **Time frame** | **Person responsible** | **Follow-up** | |
| 1.1 |  |  | **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 2** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| **Key actions** | **Time frame** | **Person responsible** | **Follow-up** | |
| 2.1 |  |  | Comments | Status |
| 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 3** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| **Key actions** | **Time frame** | **Person responsible** | **Follow-up** | |
| 3.1 |  |  | Comments | Status |
| 3.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 |  |  |  |  |