



Terms of Reference for Outcome Evaluation of Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio

1. BACKGROUND

In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Turkey Country Office, an outcome evaluation will be conducted to assess the impact of UNDP's development assistance in the Practice Area of Inclusive and Democratic Governance (IDG).

The proposed evaluation will evaluate the ISG Portfolio against the relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Country Development Strategy (UNDCS) and the following country programme outcomes and outputs as stated in the Country Programme Document (CPD) for Turkey both covering the period 2016-2020.

IDG and UNDCS/CPD Outcomes

UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 2.1 By 2020 central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems with the full participation of civil society including the most vulnerable.

UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 3.1 Improved legislation, policies, implementation and accountability mechanisms to enable equal and effective social, economic and political participation of women and girls by 2020.

RELATED COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTPUTS

2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities

2.1.2. Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute and Ombudsman enhanced and human rights awareness promoted

2.1.3. Enhanced capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring

2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services

2.1.5. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors

2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management

3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women's rights and gender sensitive policies including local level

3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making



projects of the Portfolio has been cooperating with the following key partners in achieving development results:

- Presidency Office of Strategy and Budget (former Ministry of Development)
- Turkish Grand National Assembly
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Ministry of Interior
- Ministry of Defense
- Turkish Land Forces Command
- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Environment and Urbanization
- Ministry of Labour, Social Services and Family
- Court of Cassation
- Union of Turkish Bar Associations
- Ombudsman Institution
- National Human Rights and Equality Institution
- Union of Provinces
- Union of Municipalities of Turkey
- Development Agencies
- Municipalities
- Private Sector
- Other UN Agencies (UNFPA, OHCHR, UNWomen, UNHCR)

The subject of this outcome evaluation will be the programs and projects implemented within the framework of Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio, through the approaches mentioned previously, which can be summarized as below:

Projects and initiatives to be included in the Evaluation	Budget of the Relevant Project	Partners / Donors	Relevant Country Programme Output
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• USD 1,797,120	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Union of Turkish Bar Associations, Ministry of Justice	2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthening Transparency and Code of Ethics for Enhanced Public Confidence in Court of Cassation in Turkey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 1,000,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Court of Cassation 	<p>2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities</p> <p>2.1.5. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 26,400,000,00 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of National Defense TURMAC, Ministry of Interior General Directorate of Provincial Administrations Department of Border Management 	<p>2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of Ombudsman Institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 750,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ombudsman Institution 	<p>2.1.2. Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute and Ombudsman enhanced, and human rights awareness promoted</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrity Assessment of Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 12,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality 	<p>2.1.5 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender Mainstreaming in Çukurova Development Agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 30,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Çukurova Development Agency 	<p>2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services</p> <p>3.1.4: National policies in support of women's economic empowerment improved</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 13,476,697,50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of National Defense TURMAC, Ministry of Interior General Directorate of Provincial Administrations Department of Border Management 	<p>2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and Greece Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EUR 1,820,995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Interior Directorate General for Provincial Administrations, Land Forces Command 	2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing Institutionalization and Broader use of the e-consulate system for increased efficiency in the service delivery of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Phase II Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 5,800,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Foreign Affairs 	2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing access to justice and legal aid for refugees (Syrian and other nationalities) in Turkey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USD 300,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Justice, Union of Turkish Bar Associations 	2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities

In addition to assessing the overall result and development impact of the above-mentioned projects, this evaluation will also take into consideration the impact of these programs on gender equality.

2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The scope of the projects and programs that are held in the scope of this evaluation can be summarized as:

- All Projects of Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio

The evaluator will visit selected project sites in 7 provinces to meet the local stakeholders and beneficiaries including central administrations/ministries, local administrations, local NGOs, women and youth, local authorities etc.

The evaluation shall assess the following for each outcome in the 2016-2020 programming cycle in this portfolio:

- Relevance: Are the outcomes relevant to UNDP's mandate, to national priorities and to beneficiaries' needs? (Relevance to UNDP's country programme)
- Effectiveness: Have the intended impacts been achieved or are they expected to be achieved? Do different outcome definitions feed into each other and is there a synergy in between? Is the outcome achieved or has progress been made to achieve? Has UNDP made significant contributions in terms of strategic outputs?
- Efficiency: To what extent do the outcomes derive from efficient use of resources? And to what extent UNDP has contributed to the outcomes versus that of its partners?
- Degree of Change: What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended changes brought about by UNDP's intervention in these outcomes?
- Sustainability: Will benefits/activities continue after the programme cycle?



For each of the selected outcomes on Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio, the outcome evaluation shall respond to the questions below:

Outcome analysis

- Whether the selected outcomes were relevant given the country context and needs, and UNDP's niche? (relevance)
- Whether the outcome indicators chosen are sufficient to measure the outcomes? What other SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) indicators can be suggested to measure these outcomes?
- Whether sufficient progress has been achieved vis-à-vis the outcomes as measured by the outcome indicators? (effectiveness)
- What are the main factors (positive and negative) that have/are affecting the achievement of the outcomes? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?
- To what extent did UNDP contribute to gender empowerment/ gender equality?
- What are the factors that influenced the differences in participation, benefits and results between women and men?
- In this programme period, how did UNDP position itself strategically or did UNDP have a comparative advantage? If yes, how were these reflected in achieving the results? Any recommendations for future programming?
- What does the evaluation reveal in terms of UNDP's role in an Upper Middle-Income Country (UMIC) environment? Did UNDP add value in such an environment, could it build a niche?
- How has the UNDP's support for the inclusive sustainable growth positively contributed to the attainment/understanding of the SDGs?

Output analysis

- Are the UNDP outputs with the project corresponding projects under each outcome relevant to the outcome?
- Has sufficient progress been made in relation to the UNDP outputs?
- Were the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link outputs to outcomes or is there a need to establish or improve these indicators? If so, what are the suggestions?
- What are the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs?
- What are the recommendations for the existing portfolio?
- What are the lessons, especially pertaining to gender equality and social inclusion, and directions for future programming?

Output-outcome link

- Whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective? (UNDP's capacity with regard to management of partnerships; UNDP's ability to bring together various partners across sectoral lines)
- What are the key contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome? (e.g. piloting new systems and practices, support for policy study and research, support for innovation)
- UNDP's ability to develop national capacity in a sustainable manner (through holistic, participatory and gender-sensitive approach, building and strengthening institutional linkages, transparency and accountability, exposure to best practices in other countries, south-south cooperation); UNDP's



- ability to respond to changing circumstances and requirements in capacity development;
- What is the prospect of the sustainability and replicability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome (what would be a good exit strategy for UNDP)?

All the above evaluation questions should include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

- Human rights
- Gender Equality
- Capacity development
- Institutional strengthening
- Innovation or added value to national development
- South-South Cooperation

Purpose of Evaluation:

At the country office level, UNDP uses and applies learning from monitoring and evaluation to improve the overall performance and quality of results of ongoing and future projects, programmes and strategies. Learning is particularly significant for UNDP support to the policy reform process, which is often innovative and contains uncertainties.

Evaluations are not seen as a one-time event but as part of an exercise whereby different stakeholders are able to participate in the continuous process of generating and applying evaluative knowledge. A monitoring and evaluation framework that generates knowledge, promotes learning and guides action is, in its own right, an important means of capacity development and sustainability of national results.

The outcome evaluation seeks to:

- Review the programmes and projects of UNDP contributing to the Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio with a view to understand their relevance and contribution to national priorities for stock taking and lesson learning, and recommending mid-course corrections that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of UNDP's development assistance;
- Review the status of the outcome and the key factors that have affected (both positively and negatively, contributing and constraining) the outcome;
- Assess the extent to which UNDP outputs and implementation arrangements have been effective for strengthened linkages between the outcomes (the nature and extent of the contribution of key partners and the role and effectiveness of partnership strategies in the outcome);
- Provide recommendations for future country programme in the outcomes of the Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio and particularly for better linkages between them.
- Evaluate current actions and propose alternative action which can increase the impact for development results.

This interim evaluation will help the country office to understand whether the intended outcomes are still relevant or need an update (to be incorporated in the next programme period), as well as the actual development change created by UNDP's development assistance throughout the programme period for the selected outcomes. UNDP will use this information for designing its activities as well as communicating to



interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; protocols to ensure anonymity/confidentiality.)

3. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP will provide the IC all relevant background documents. UNDP is not required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending to the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection etc.) and at the discretion of the UNDP and relevant stakeholders such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC.

The Consultant will report to IDG Portfolio Manager. The Portfolio Manager will establish the first contacts with the government partners and project staff. The expert will then set up his/her own meetings and conduct his/her own methodology upon approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report.

4. DELIVERABLES

The key evaluation deliverables include: a work plan with timeframe, documented records of all interviews and observations after the inception report. First draft with PPT to present the findings. Final evaluation report after reflecting UNDP and relevant stakeholders' comments.

Key deliverables: Evaluation Inception Report. An inception report should be prepared by the evaluator before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: a) proposed methods, b) proposed sources of data, and c) data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. [1]
[SEP]

Draft evaluation report. A comprehensive engendered analytical report that should, at least, include the following contents:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcome, the outputs and the outcome-output linkages;
- Analysis of salient opportunities to provide guidance in the upcoming country programme cycle;
- Key findings (including best and worst practices, lessons learned)
- Conclusions and recommendations, including suggestions for future programming.
- Annexes: TOR, field visits, people interviewed particularly women, documents reviewed, etc.

Final Evaluation report. A combination of all previous reports, incorporating the comments and feedbacks from UNDP and key stakeholders. Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in



knowledge sharing events.

The Consultant shall be responsible for preparation and submission of the following deliverables (reports) listed in the table below:

Activities	Deliverables	Estimated duration to complete (working/days)	Target Date for Submission to UNDP for Approval	Review and approvals required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review and list of reviewed documents • Evaluation framework and work plan 	Inception Report and Presentation of the Framework	7	11 January 2019	IDG Portfolio Manager, UNDP Turkey
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with stakeholders • Field visits/data collection • Summary of main findings 	Draft Evaluation Report	16	01 February 2019	IDG Portfolio Manager, UNDP Turkey
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debriefing with UNDP Turkey • Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft) 	Final Evaluation Report	12	28 February 2019	IDG Portfolio Manager, UNDP Turkey
Maximum Total Number of Working/Days		35 days		

Each and every activity to be conducted by the Consultant is subject to UNDP approval. Each step shall be conducted upon approval of the previous step by UNDP.

Number of days to be invested for each deliverable may change but the total number of days worked by the individual contractor cannot exceed 35 days for this assignment (i.e for submission of the deliverables) as defined in the ToR.



Reporting Language: The reporting language should be in English.

Title Rights: The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this ToR will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

Evaluation Expert will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP. S/he will specifically undertake the following tasks:

- Lead and coordinate the evaluation mission,
- Design the detailed evaluations scope, methodology and approach,
- Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of evaluation
- Draft, communicate and finalize the evaluation report as per the comments from UNDP.

5. MINIMUM QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The expected qualifications of the expert are as follows:

General Qualifications	General Professional Experience	Specific Professional Experience
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum master’s degree in economics, business administration, political sciences, law, or any other social sciences • Proficiency in English is required • Advanced degree (doctorate) on relevant field is an asset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum eight (8) years of professional experience in at least four of the following fields: governance, rule of law, human rights, access to justice, local administrations and reform policies, gender empowerment, programme management, programme evaluation is required • More than ten (10) years of general professional experience will be considered as an asset • Previous experience in preparation of programming documents including CPDs will be considered as an asset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least three (3) similar evaluation assignment completed within the last five (5) years experience in conducting evaluations, • Minimum three (3) years of experience on results-based management evaluation and/or participatory M&E methodologies or approaches • Previous experience in working with UNDP, the civil society, government authorities and local administrations will be an asset. • Previous working experience in Turkey and/or Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) countries will be an asset.

Notes:

- . Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.
- . Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.
- . Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.
- . Female candidates are encouraged to apply.



6. TIMING AND DURATION

The Assignment is expected to start in 5 December 2018 and be completed by 28 February 2019. The Individual Consultant is expected to allocate 35 working days throughout the contract duration as per the Deliverable Table in Section 4.

7. PLACE OF WORK

Place of work (duty station) for the assignment is home-based. There will be *missions to Ankara and selected project sites*. All travel related costs (cost items indicated below) of these missions out of the duty station (economy class flight ticket and accommodation in 3 or 4 star hotel) will be borne by UNDP. Approval of UNDP is needed prior to the missions is needed. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
- Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
- covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	



Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

8. PAYMENTS

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of the corresponding deliverable by UNDP on the basis of actual number of days invested in that respective deliverable and the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the consultant and approved by the responsible Portfolio Manager.

The total amount of payment to be affected to the Consultant within the scope of this contract **cannot exceed** 35 days throughout the contract validity. The consultant shall be paid in US\$ if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TL through conversion of the US\$ amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer.

If the deliverables are not produced and delivered by the consultant to the satisfaction of UNDP as approved by the responsible Portfolio Manager, no payment will be made even if the consultant has invested working/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Expected delivery dates of the reports will be finalized by UNDP during the Briefing Meeting that will be conducted upon contract signature.

The amount paid to the consultant shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

9. ATTACHMENTS TO TOR

1. Evaluation Report Outline



Attachment 1 to TOR: Evaluation Report Outline

i. Title and Opening page:

- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time-frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Country of the evaluation intervention
- Names and/or organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents – Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page reference.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

ii. Executive Summary

- Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the projects, programs, policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

iii. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

iv. Description of the intervention

- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.



- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview groups, observation protocols, etc) as appropriate
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of supporting documents reviewed

Thamondokobut