Programme Background information:
Based on the success of the TASAF I and TASAF II in a short period of time, in 2013 the Government of Tanzania decided to design and implement the Tanzania Productive Safety Net programme (TASAF III – PSSN). Direct beneficiaries of TASAF –PSSN Programme are poor and vulnerable households living in Project Area Authorities (PAAs) and villages identified as chronic poverty; and it targets people living below the food poverty line which is currently 9.8 percent of the population. The households benefit from a combination of basic conditional transfers, cash transfer through participation in labour intensive public works; advice and support concerning savings and investments. The programme was initially expected to support 275,000 households in five years (2013-2017) and has been scaled up to reach about 920,000 households living below the food poverty line by end of 2015 to substantially contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) particularly the first MDG on eradicating extreme poverty and hunger which is off-track. Currently TASAF III is reaching about 134,000 extreme poor households with cash transfers conditioned on family’s participation in education and health related services.

The implementation of the first two phases of TASAF achieved impressive results in facilitating community access to social services through infrastructure projects such as schools, health facilities and water points reaching 7.3 million people in TASAF I and 16.1 million in TASAF II. Moreover, in TASAF II community based conditional cash transfers (CB-CCT) were piloted in the three districts of Bagamoyo, Kibaha and Chamwino targeting extremely poor households (below the food poverty line) to encourage targeted households to invest in nutrition, education and health. Although the level of cash transfer is a modest $5 per household
per month or $10 if the household has children and/or pregnant woman, given every two months, six times a year, the results of the randomized trial of the pilot showed CCT led to improved outcomes in both health and education and investment in livestock, school shoes, health insurance and for the poorest households increased savings. To improve enrolment and attendance to secondary school an additional $5 maximum has recently been agreed to be added ($2 for lower secondary and $3 for upper secondary) bringing the maximum total amount a household can receive to $15 per month in TASAF III.

Phase III (PSSN - TASAF-III) so far has achieved additional substantial results. The Program has managed to target and enrol total number of 5,037,632 direct beneficiaries in 161 PAAs which reflects 84.0 percent of the target of about 6 million direct beneficiaries. Majority 39.0 per cent of beneficiaries are of school age, between 6 and 18 years while 17.3 per cent are children between 0 and 5 years who are supposed to attend clinic.

By January 2017, a total of 161 PAAs have made enhanced payment of a total of TZS 391,239,435,000 has so far been transferred to 161 PAAs and paid as grant to 1,055,095 beneficiary households in 9,824 villages.

The PSSN is seen as a major component of TASAF that seeks to put in place the building blocks of a permanent national social safety net system in Tanzania in the context of a National Social Policy which is currently being revised for government approval. TASAF will play a pivotal role in the NSPF or Social Protection Policy as a lead Agency in coordinating the Social Assistance Pillar. The Policy will lead to a review of the National Social Protection Framework, which aims to improve coordination and the implementation of various policies and strategies relating to social protection, thus putting the PSSN under a coordinated national framework. Coordination is also one of the major challenges facing the PSSN programme. The NSPF will help synthesize current social protection efforts as well as to develop an optimal mechanism of social protection measures, in collaboration with key ministries and other stakeholders. It is envisaged that the NSPF will adapt a hybrid of both universal and targeted approaches in addressing chronic poverty initially scaling up cash transfers and public works with a view to include livelihood approaches that promote graduation from extreme poverty. The NSPF will benefit from the current interventions, approaches and lessons of the PSSN programme.

The Joint Programme to Support Productive Social Safety Nets: An Overview
The UN Country Team (UNCT) in Tanzania is supporting the Government of Tanzania to scale-up of the Tanzania Productive Social Safety Nets (PSSN) programme and strengthen coordination of social protection interventions across sectors through a Joint Programme Implemented by UNDP, UNICEF, ILO and UNFPA. The 2 year programme started on 22nd May and comes to an end in September 2017.

The JP, which was designed in consultation with the Ministry of Finance and the Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF), focuses at strengthening linkage between policy level and downstream community interventions; filling the existing gaps in the PSSN; and complementing ongoing efforts being implemented through TASAF, to ensure programme sustainability.

The JP is consistent with the UN Development Assistance Programme (UNDAP I) Social Protection Outcome to ensure the Government of Tanzania coordinates a multi-sectoral social protection response to the needs of the economically deprived and vulnerable groups and the UNDAP II Social Protection

1 The programme starts when the first tranche is received. All programmes are given 28 months to implement (an additional four months is given to all programmes as an inception period. The PSSN programme should operationally close, by 21 September 2017 http://proposals.sdgfund.org/sites/default/files/SDG-F-ToRs.pdf).
Outcome to ensure *Increased coverage of comprehensive and integrated social protection for all, especially the poor, and the vulnerable*. Furthermore, the UN support offers PSSN ways to connect international norms and standards on human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability in its implementation.

Key intervention carried out by JP is as follows:

**UN Agencies interventions within PSSN**

(i) **Adolescence and Youth:** UNICEF and TASAF have decided to pilot ‘Cash Plus’ a model for safe transition to a healthy and productive adulthood. Cash Plus intervention focuses on an out of school youths 15-24. The Plus: Identify out of school youth 15-24 years in PSSN households & provide: Livelihoods intervention (economic empowerment) to 1,250 youth; Sexual & reproductive health (SRH), HIV prevention, gender information & messaging to 2,500 youth; Linkages to SRH, HIV and other health services in the communities.

(ii) **Community Engagement Toolkit:** UNICEF and TASAF are implementing Community Engagement Toolkit known as Stawisha Maisha as SBCC communication tool to enhance PSSN sessions by engaging women beneficiaries with grandchildren on Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) issues through Stawisha Maisha club activities conducted on bi-monthly cash transfer days (6 sessions per year). The Stawisha Maisha Groups will stimulate senior women to act to ensure nutritious Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) in their households and family networks. It will do this by (1) enhancing their collaboration, (2) building their agency, (3) strengthening their leadership role and capacity to identify and solve problems in relation to the topic, and (4) increasing their knowledge of new practices.

(iii) **Enhancing gender mainstreming into the PSSN Programme:** As part of the effort to strengthen the implementation and gender responsiveness of the PSSN programme, UNDP and TASAF have conducted a gender assessment of the PSSN programme assessing the gendered impacts and gender responsiveness of the PSSN programme as well as the institutional framework and capacity for gender mainstreaming. The assessment provides recommendations on how to strengthen the integration of gender into the Programme through revision of frameworks and guidelines; capacity development and structures to support gender mainstreaming. In addition, a training package for TASAF staff is being developed and piloted.

(iv) **Strengthening MIS and M&E systems and capacities:** As part of the effort to strengthen the institutional capacity of TASAF for the effective implementation of the PSSN programme, UNDP has provided support to enhance data capturing at the local level by setting up data capture centres and conducting trainings of front line staff. Furthermore, trainings have been carried out to strengthen the M&E capacities of TASAF staff.

(v) **Towards a coherent social protection system in Tanzania:** UNDP, UNICEF and ILO have supported the development of a draft National Social Protection Framework through support to the government led taskforce spearheaded by the Prime Minister’s Office. UNDP and UNICEF have also supported the integration of social protection objectives and indicators into the Five-Year Development Plan and UNDP is currently supporting the integration of social protection indicators into the Poverty Monitoring Master Plan.

(vi) **ILO support brings up linkages among the youth (15-35 years) from PSSN beneficiary households with livelihood and economic empowerment initiatives by providing relief from poverty vulnerability and social exclusion among the youth through earnings from income generating activities.** The support plays a preventive role by averting deprivation (e.g. through economic empowerment clubs); promotive role by enhancing real incomes and capabilities through engagement of feasible economic activities; and finally transformative role by empowering and
protecting the rights of the vulnerable youth and addressing concerns of social equity and exclusion which often underpin their experiences.

**The Sustainable Development Goal Fund (SDG-F):**
The Sustainable Development Goals Fund (SDG-F) is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multi-dimensional 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.’

Tanzania was among countries selected to participate in the new development cooperation mechanism created by the **Government of Spain** and UNDP, on behalf of the UN system, to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional joint programmes. The support received from the SDG-F, amounts to US$ 1,500,000 (with additional matching funds of USD 2,180,000 by UN agencies), has been combined with the UN agencies’ technical and financial contributions to strengthen implementation of the PSSN Joint Programme at both policy and sub-national levels.

As per the SDG-F monitoring and evaluation strategy, all joint programmes will commission an independent final evaluation in the last three months of implementation. The SDG Fund Secretariat assumes the role of guidance and oversight in this evaluation.

1. **EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE:**
   This first draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the PSSN JP Evaluation outlines the overall goal of the evaluation, objectives and methodology to be used (including the evaluation criteria and related questions), the composition of the evaluation team, the planned deliverables and timeframe, as well as the intended use of the evaluation.
   The overall goal of the evaluation is 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 of the PSSN Joint Programme 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, sustainability and public private partnerships.

3. **SCOPE AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**
   The evaluation will apply the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Specific evaluations may include but are not limited to the following:
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 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 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?
   b) What good practices, success stories, lessons learnt and replicable experiences have been identified? Please describe and document them
   c) 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.)
   d) 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 decision-making 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?

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 cross-cutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment, 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?

**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?

4. **METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

This final evaluation will make use of:

I. **All relevant secondary information sources**, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, evaluations and

II. **Primary information sources** including: interviews, surveys, etc. to ensure participatory approach and appropriate consultation and engagement of stakeholders

III. **Triangulating of information** to allow for validation and discern discrepancies

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation will 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.

5. **EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The Evaluator (evaluation consultant) 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.

6. **ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION:**

i. **Evaluation Reference Group**

The main actors in the evaluation process are the SDG-F Secretariat, the programme team of the joint programme (UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, ILO), including the Joint Programme Coordinators from the Resident Coordinators’ Office, M&E Officer from one of the UN agencies, in addition to the Social Protection Outcome Group which involves national partners. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the **evaluation reference group.** Its role will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

i. Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design
ii. Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation

iii. Providing input on the evaluation planning

iv. **Prepare communication and dissemination plan**

v. Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference

vi. Facilitating the Evaluator’s access to all information and relevant documentation, as well as to key actors, stakeholders and informants

vii. Monitoring the quality of the process and deliverables generated

viii. **Prepare improvement/action plan** following the submission of the final evaluation report

ix. Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

(see detailed ToR attached)

**ii. Evaluation Consultant/s**

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

IV. Well-qualified, selected based on competence, by means of a transparent process

V. Impartial, i.e. not have been (and not expected to be) involved in the design or implementation of the joint programme

VI. Suitably experienced, possess methodological expertise and at least five years of recognized experience in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programmes, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.

In the case of hiring more than one evaluator, one consultant should be experienced in the sector or technical areas addressed by the evaluation, or have a sound knowledge of the subject to be evaluated. The other should be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using the specific evaluation methodologies that will be employed for that evaluation.

The evaluator/s are expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of IT/office equipment, stationary, communication, office space, accommodation, transport and other logistics.

(see detailed ToR attached)

**7. EVALUATION BUDGET**

PSSN JP evaluation costs will be borne by the JP evaluation budget under UNDP budget line.

Schedule of payment will be as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
<th>Payment schedule/amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Inception Report                                  | *(2 weeks)*
| Includes detailed Evaluation Work Plan Evaluation    | 20% of total value of contract (upon approval of report)      |
| Matrix & Tools                                        | *                                                             |
| 2. Draft Evaluation Report                           | *(4 weeks)*                                                   |
| To be assessed using UNEG Quality Checklist Draft    | 40% of total value of contract (upon approval of report)      |
| presentation for the Developing Partners for their   | *                                                             |
| inputs.                                              | *                                                             |
| 3. Final Evaluation Report with findings as per the  | *(2 weeks)*                                                   |
| template (30-40 pages)                               | 40% of total value of contract (upon approval of report)      |

---

Max. 30,000 words plus essential annexes and 2,500 word Executive Summary (submitted in hard and soft copy). To be assessed using UNEG Quality Checklist. Final presentation to the respective Developing partners for their inputs.

8. TENTATIVE TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Main activities and deliverables</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Official notification from the Secretariat to the RC advising the start date of the evaluation, the process and generic TOR</td>
<td>SDGF Secretariat</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing of evaluation reference group (ERG) and adaptation of TOR by the evaluation reference group and compilation of all relevant documents under Annex I</td>
<td>Drafted by Coordinators from the Resident Coordinators’ Office in collaboration Evaluation Reference Group</td>
<td>21st July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and dissemination plan prepared and submitted to Secretariat</td>
<td>Joint Programme Coordinators from the Resident Coordinators’ Office in collaboration with UNDP</td>
<td>Oct/ Nov 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Evaluation Consultant: ERG prepares contract with consultant per the TOR. Contract will outline responsibilities, duration, fees, travel etc.</td>
<td>Evaluation Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Briefing with the Evaluator and sharing of all documents to be reviewed (Annex I) Preparation of Desk Study. Submission of the inception report including the findings from the desk review and evaluation methodology (see Annex II)</td>
<td>ERG and SDG-F Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation of mission itinerary</td>
<td>Evaluation Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field visit conducted by Evaluator based on the planned agenda</td>
<td>Evaluation Consultant</td>
<td>15th – 20th December (Five days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of draft final report (Annex III) to the Secretariat Review of report Finalization of the report and submission to the Secretariat</td>
<td>Evaluation Consultant and SDG-F Secretariat</td>
<td>10th January (15 days) 20th January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Improvement/action plan submitted by the evaluation reference group based on the recommendations of the evaluation report Implementation of communication and dissemination plan</td>
<td>Evaluation Consultant and Evaluation reference group</td>
<td>5th February</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION
The evaluation reference group will 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** 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. ANNEXES

#### I. Check List: Documents to be Reviewed
The documents below will be timely provided to the evaluation consultant/s by the evaluation reference group:

**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)
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

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Under the supervision and coordination of the Evaluation Reference Group and SDGF Secretariat, the evaluation consultant will conduct the following duties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Working Days</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review programme documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key assessment instruments (questionnaires, logic models, surveys, samples...) to collect these data through surveys and interviews during and prior to the field mission; Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project’s activities and analyse other background info.</td>
<td>• Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; • Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country’s legislative and regulatory framework.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Briefing with the Evaluation Reference Group and other key stakeholders at UN offices. Preparation of the Inception Report.</td>
<td>Inputs to the ERG on: • Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Inception Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conduct field visits</td>
<td>• In liaison with ERG and counterparts set up interview and field visit schedules. Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation’s initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN DUTIES</td>
<td>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</td>
<td>Working Days</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepare the evaluation report, according to the TOR;</td>
<td>• Draft evaluation report.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the evaluation report with ERG and SDG-F Secretariat and stakeholders for feedback and comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Revise the draft project evaluation report, based on comments from ERG, SDG Secretariat and stakeholders</td>
<td>• Final evaluation report.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Absence of conflict of interest:**

The consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract.