**Terms of Reference**

**Mid-term Review of Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP) – June 2017 – December 2021**

**1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

The government of Ethiopia has over the last two decades shown great commitment to implement policies and programmes aimed at stimulating rapid development transformation largely by prioritizing investments to build and operate social and economic infrastructure, improving capacities within government to broaden access to basic social services such as education, health and water and sanitation, and prioritizing public investments in pro-poor economic sectors such as agriculture and food security. On top of the economic and social transformation, stride has been made in the governance side like ratifying largely progressive constitution, efforts to address inequalities, policies that promote gender equality, establishment of democratic institutions, etc.

The policy orientation and commitment has resulted in significant improvements in Ethiopia’s human development indicators. In view of the county’s context and bold development transformation vision, it has been found important to make deliberate efforts to further broaden space for citizen engagement and participation in the development process to create a sense of shared prosperity, strengthen social cohesion and sustain peace and stability.

Despite these positive developments, the country still faced several setbacks. Two years back from the current political and governance reforms, the country had been characterized with instability and growing dissatisfaction of large groups of the population, primarily the youth segment. 2018 has been a pivotal year in the current transformation and resulted in inherent changes in the Ethiopian political landscape. Widespread and protracted public protests and growing street and youth dissatisfaction forced the way for a series of reforms to be launched under PM Haliemariam Desalegn. Growing dissatisfaction and popular demands for change and reform ultimately resulted in a change in government in February 2018.

With the election of Dr. Abiy Ahmed as the new PM, a raft of proclamations followed including promising announcements to open the political space, free political dissidents and engage in comprehensive institutional reforms of the public sector, including announcements to privatize public enterprises. In his inaugural speech, the new PM highlighted the need for what he termed as ‘an inclusive political process’ with the opposition playing a more active role. The PM urged all Ethiopians to put their differences aside as they worked to forge together a solid democratization process. He identified civil rights and freedom of movement and organization, the right to political participation and representation and the right to freedom of expression as key in this process. He also reaffirmed his government’s commitment to ensure the full participation of women in public life’ and his personal commitment to advancing the equality agenda forward.

The GoE-UNDP Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP), a five-year multi-stakeholders programme (June 2017 to December 2021), has as main objective to support the country sustain efforts towards enhancing institutional capacities and frameworks for strengthening good governance and deepening democratic participation in accordance with the Constitution and International Human Rights Conventions to which Ethiopia is a signatory. Progress in these areas are critical and believed to enable the country to deliver on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II).

The programme on governance and democratic participation was designed based on progress made and lessons learned from the former Democratic Participation Programme (DIP) and other interventions to support initiatives aimed at addressing governance bottlenecks, issues of inclusivity, transparency and accountability, and to nurture the development of a more responsive system of governance and peaceful coexistence. More specifically, the program would deliver on the following five inter-related and complementary outputs:

1. Political processes of federal and regional state legislative bodies are more inclusive and effectively delivering on their constitutional mandates;
2. Federal and regional state systems of governance are more accountable, transparent and are delivering public services in more inclusive and responsive ways;
3. Citizens are more empowered to voice their concern and actively participate in decision-making processes at all levels of the development, governance and political processes and systems;
4. Systems and mechanisms for promoting social cohesion, managing diversity, preventing and managing conflicts, fostering dialogues and building peace are further strengthened at national and sub-national levels; and
5. Access to justice enhanced and human rights promoted and protected across Ethiopia.

The implementation of the GDPP commenced in July 2017 based on the initial visioning and workplan of the programme. The monitoring of implementation of the programme has so far depicted that the programme is relevant with value addition to enhance democratic transformation and political participation. GDPP has reconfirmed as a strong enabling platform for the transformation through the various achievements recorded by the participating Democratic Institutions. Moreover, the new governance arrangements and policy priorities have been instated, emphasizing Human Rights, Rule of Law, accountability, peace and stability. The relevance and value added of the GDPP has reconfirmed as a strong enabling platform for the transformation through the various achievements recorded by the participating Democratic Institutions.

GDPP has also enabled the democratic and accountability institutions to strengthen their mandate through a direct and clear investment in institutional and human capacity development. Building on these positive developments, the dramatic shifts witnessed in the political and governance space and the resulting policy priorities expressed by the political leadership have prompted the Government of Ethiopia and UNDP to ‘refocus’ the GDPP and ‘reposition’ it to more effectively address transformational and transitional needs.

UNDP in close coordination with the GoE engaged in a ‘repositioning’ exercise of the programme following the changes in the political landscape and the shift of policy priorities of the Government. The Repositioning Paper, which was launched in December 2018 allowed all Institutions contributing to the programme and UNDP to reconfirm relevance of the programme to the current policy priorities and to ensure identified activities are addressing transformational issues. The results framework of the programme had undergone a review and expansion with new sub-outputs included.

With the programme reaching its mid-cycle implementation, and as per corporate requirements, UNDP is engaging in a ‘formative’ mid-term review that aims at enabling the Government and UNDP to draw lessons learned and secure the Programme remains relevant and responsive to the needs of the country. This mid-term review/evaluation will also inform programme revisions and any necessary adjustments in the remaining period of the programme so as to ensure that the programme is more relevant, effective and efficient to achieve its intended results (outputs and outcomes).

**2. EVALUATION PURPOSE**

This mid-term review will be a formative evaluation exercise, with a dual purpose of learning and accountability. The review/evaluation is expected to provide concrete evidences on the relevance, adaptability, results/impact, efficiency of processes and operationalization of the programme. This mid-term evaluation is being conducted at a critical time when the country is in dramatic change processes with several reforms in the political, justice and government structures, as well as in the middle of the implementation of the programme to enable to draw lessons for making necessary adjustments to revisit the programme for making it relevant in the country’s changing political and governance environment and also effectively and efficiently achieve its expected results.

Evidence and lessons from the evaluation will therefore feed into the revisiting/revamping of the programme to meet the timely needs of the direct and indirect beneficiaries of the programme and also other key stakeholders. UNDP and the Democratic Institutions/Executive Organs which are implementing partners of the programme will benefit by large from the evidences and results of the mid-term review for informed decision making to improve the programme implementation for achieving results, remaining relevant and adaptive to the country and policy changes/context, as well as demonstrating accountability and transparency. Based on the review/evaluation findings and recommendations, UNDP jointly with Implementing Partners will develop management responses to act upon the review/evaluation recommendations.

**3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

This mid-term evaluation will cover the implementation period of the programme extending from July 2017 to August 2019. The evaluation will cover all the eleven Implementing Partners with field visits to the selected IPs (40% – 50%) prioritizing IPs that have regional branches or regional counterparts. For selecting the sample IPs that will be visited during field data collection, the complexity of operations, level of achievements of targets, criticality of the role/mandate of the IP towards the reform process and volume of interventions are considered as criteria for stratification.

Assessment on all the five outputs, and corresponding sub-outputs as well as indications/contributions towards achievement of intended outcomes of the programme will be in the scope of the mid-term review/evaluation. This mid-term review will give emphasis on the operational/implementation mechanisms and arrangements practiced in the respective Implementing Partners (IPs) and their effectiveness & efficiency, perceptions towards the programme/how UNDP operates, the ownership/commitment level by the IPs, etc. The analysis in the review/evaluation needs to be gender focused/sensitive with sex disaggregation of results to clearly reflect on different factors affecting or affected by gender dynamics.

The mid-term review/evaluation will have the specific objectives of:

* Review and reconstruct the theory of change of the programme to map the results pathways and also assess cause - effect relationships.
* Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme interventions;
* Identify implementation issues and challenges/bottlenecks which constrain programme and financial delivery;
* Provide evidence whether the programme implementation is on track or off-track during the mid-years period and propose measures to rectify;
* Identify lessons learned and recommendations, based on evidence, so as to improve relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of programme results, and also document knowledge basis from the programme design and implementation;
* Identify strengths and weaknesses of the programme in the application of right-based approach and gender mainstreaming and possible recommendations to apply in the remaining period of the programme;

**4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS**

The evaluation is expected to apply the internationally accepted evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. It will also look into adaptability, responsiveness, coherence and women equality and gender mainstreaming. Aligning to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation may need to include and address the following key evaluation questions, among others:

**Relevance:**

* To what extent the operations and objectives of the GDPP programme are consistent with the need of beneficiaries of the partner democratic intuitions, need of implementing partners, current country need, and donors’ policies and expectations?
* To what extent were/are the interventions aligned with the needs of other key stakeholders particularly government and other actors in the sectors relevant to governance, democratic participation and transparency?
* Were the approaches and strategies used relevant to achieve intended sub-outputs, outputs and outcomes of the programme/intervention?
* To what extent were the interventions respond to the needs of vulnerable groups and women?
* To what extent the programme is aligned to SDG, GTP II and UNDAF?

**Effectiveness:**

* To what extent has this programme achieved its planned sub-outputs, outputs, immediate outcomes, and objectives?
* What are the main expected and unexpected results of the programme?
* To what extent does the strategic revision for reposition the programme lead to achievement (or lack of achievement) of the sub-outputs, outputs, and objectives of the programme?
* Do the assumptions and the Theory of Change hold true? If not, why?
* What are the major factors influencing implementation and operations of the programme for achievement or non-achievement of results?
* What are the unintended results of the changes in political landscape and the reforms underway in the country to the programme implementation and achievement of results?
* What are lessons learned and good practices to take for future effective and efficient implementation of the programme?

**Efficiency:**

* Do the Project’s implementation mechanisms including institutional arrangements, partnership, support services, etc., permit utilization of resources in efficient way, and also delivery of services and achievement of results in timely manner?
* Does the programme cost efficient? Do the cost per output/sub-output the most cost effective or are there areas where savings should be made to reduce costs?
* To what extent are project management practices and tools adequate to timely and effectively implement the programme?
* Are project resources adequate and available on time to implement the activities as planed?

**Sustainability:**

* To what extent are the results and positive changes from the programme implementation up to this point in time likely to continue during remaining period of programme implementation and there after?
* To what extent do the shift in the governance landscape and political arena of the country would affect continuity of programme’s implementation and sustainability of results achieved?
* To what extent do the implementing partners show ownership of the programme, results, and lessons learned and their ability to continue with the programme with limited or without intervention from UNDP?
* To what extent the programme established and maintained effective partnership with development partners, government, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), etc.?

The above listed evaluation questions are not to be considered as exhaustive to address the evaluation purpose and objectives in comprehensive manner. So, the evaluation questions will be further discussed and elaborated in collaboration with the evaluation team, stakeholders (implementing partners) and UNDP during the inception phase to refine and accept.

**5. METHODOLOGY**

The methodology for this mid-term review/evaluation will be designed by the selected evaluation team/consultant in consultation with UNDP during the inception phase. The methodology to be designed by the Evaluation Team will include but not limited to the following:

* Participatory mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) of data gathering and analysis.
* The Evaluation Team may also need to triangulate information from different sources and methods so as to ensure reliability and validity of data and findings.
* In the inception phase, the selected Evaluation Team will develop an elaborated evaluation matrix that clearly links the evaluation questions with data sources and collection methods. The proposed methods for data collection and analysis should be discussed and agreed by UNDP and other stakeholders before their application throughout the evaluation processes.

The mixed methods that will be employed should ensure that women, girls, men and boys from different stakeholders’ groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used. Furthermore, the proposed methods should also clearly outline how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) principles have been integrated and addressed in the design, planning and implementation, as well as what results have been achieved so far.

The identified evaluation team also needs to expand clearly and in detail the criteria and approach to be used to select representative sample Implementing Partners and stakeholders that will be visited for data collection.

Generally, the quantitative and qualitative data to be used for this mid-term review/evaluation will be collected from both secondary and primary sources. The desk level review of available relevant documents at different levels will be main source of secondary data and information for the evaluation.

The primary data from representative sample institutions and individuals will be collected through qualitative and quantitative interviews. The data generating through qualitative and quantitative interviews with the help of customized qualitative interview tools and structured quantitative survey questionnaires will be the sources of primary data. The focus group discussions and key informant interviews/individual in-depth interviews that will be conducted with knowledgeable informants from the selected Implementing Institutions, UNDP and other stakeholders are the prime qualitative methods to be employed for primary qualitative data collection. The structured quantitative survey that will be carried out with randomly sampled individuals from the Implementing Institutions and/or beneficiaries is the quantitative tool to be used for primary quantitative data gathering.

It is critical to include respondent end-users in order to ensure effective triangulation of data and receive feedback from citizens/users of the services on their quality, adaptability, responsiveness and on how they are advancing a normative agenda in the country. The evaluation team’s own observation with the help of observation checklists will also complement the data that will be collected through focus group discussions and key informant interviews/individual in-depth interviews, and also be used for data triangulation. In fact, the evaluation team is expected to propose, during the inception phase, how many qualitative interviews of each type will be conducted by considering the reliability and validity of findings, and also cost and time requirements.

The evaluators should also follow participatory and consultative approaches throughout the evaluation processes so as to ensure active engagement of the Evaluation Manager, Governance and Capacity Development (GCD) Unit, Implementing Partners, Programme’s beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

**6. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)**

The evaluation team will be accountable for producing and delivering the following products/deliverables. The key deliverables for this mid-term evaluation are as indicated below; with the milestones to be specified in the timeframe for the evaluation section.

* **Evaluation Inception Report—**Evaluators are responsible for preparing an Inception Report (10 – 15 pages - not counting annexes) with guidance from the Evaluation Focal Person and Programme Management and Support Unit (PMSU).Aninception report will be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. An inception report should detail how the team intends to conduct the evaluation with an emphasis on methodological and planning aspects. The clear and detail **evaluation matrix** is one of the deliverables as part of the inception report. An inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designated team members with the lead responsibility for each task or product. An inception phase, which concludes with an inception report, is believed to give an opportunity to Governance Unit/UNDP and the Evaluators for verification and shared understanding of the evaluation and also clarifying any misunderstanding about the evaluation approach, methodology and processes. **An inception report,** with details evaluation approach, methodology including **evaluation matrix**, and action-plan for undertaking the evaluation, is the product to be delivered by the evaluators.
* **Debriefing on preliminary findings or Aide-memoire –** once the inception phase is completed, the evaluators will embark on data collection and analysis exercise **-** this covers data collection and analysis activities, including field work. The evaluation team will conclude the data collection and preliminary analysis phase with a presentation of the early findings of the evaluation to Governance Unit, PMSU, and other stakeholders during the data collection exit debriefing session. The debriefing session will be conducted immediately upon completion of the data collection; and the **preliminary report/raw data** is the product that the Evaluation Team should deliver to UNDP.
* **Validation Workshop –** a validation workshop with UNDP, Implementing Partners and other stakeholders will be conducted for discussing and verifying the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. In the session, inputs will be solicited to fill data gaps, capture perspectives, and also refine findings and recommendations. The Evaluation Team Leader will be responsible to lead the session; while UNDP be responsible for all logistical arrangements. The proceedings of the validation workshop will be the product to be delivered.
* **Draft evaluation report—** the evaluation team will analyse the data collected during the desk review and field work, conduct additional consultations with stakeholders as required to eventually draft an evaluation report. The draft evaluation report will present the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations of the evaluation. Findings should be evidence-based and relevant to the evaluation objectives. Data will need to be disaggregated by sex & other relevant characteristics, and also the evaluation findings and conclusions will require to highlight differences in results by Implementing Partners. There should be a logical flow from findings to conclusions and from conclusions to recommendations. Recommendations will be limited in number, actionable and targeted to the relevant users. The proposed specific recommendations will form the basis of the management response to the evaluation. The draft evaluation report will be reviewed by Governance team/UNDP, Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), Independent Evaluation Quality Assurance Team, and other stakeholders (as deem necessary) to provide comments to address factual errors as well as improve the quality of the evaluation so as to ensure credibility and usability. The evaluation team will incorporate inputs into a final evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The draft evaluation report is the product that the evaluation team submits to Governance Unit/UNDP just following the data analysis and reporting of the evaluation.
* **Final evaluation report –** the evaluation team should properly and adequately address the comments provided on the draft evaluation report to produce the final evaluation report. The final evaluation report that the evaluation team submits to Governance Unit/UNDP should meet the required quality criteria for ensuring credibility and usability.
* **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products –** A three to five pagers brief of the evaluation will summarize the evaluation report and serve to knowledge sharing and disseminate evaluation main findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. It should also briefly highlight the evaluation design. The evaluation brief will be a final product that the evaluators deliver; and it should be written in a language easy to understand by non-evaluators and with appropriate graphics and tables.

**7. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

Three highly qualified and experienced evaluators will be hired to undertake the mid-term evaluation. The members of the evaluation team will be one international and two nationals’ evaluators. One of the three evaluators will be the team leader of the evaluation. The members of the evaluation team should also not have been involved in the design or implementation of the subject of evaluation or have any other conflict of interest. Further, they will act impartially and respect the code of conduct for the evaluation profession. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its team leader and guidance from the Evaluation Focal Person, PMSU and Governance Unit/UNDP.

The evaluation team is expected to include three members, including the team leader and 2 evaluators. It is recommended that the team leader be an international expert and the two evaluators be seasoned national experts. The team should include women and men of mixed cultural backgrounds and very good knowledge of the Ethiopian’s socio-cultural context. The estimated number of days is expected to be 45 days, spreading over a period of three months.

The team competencies need to be multi-disciplinary - including members who together have an appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge in: designing evaluation, statistical analysis, governance and political analysis, capacity development and gender analysis, among others. Experience with evaluating governance and political participation projects is a must. The following specific competencies are expected from the evaluation team:

* All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills; evaluation experience and familiarity with the country.
* The Team leader will have technical expertise in one of the technical areas specified above and demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations. She/he will also have expertise in designing methodology, data collection tools and undertaking systematic qualitative and quantitative analyses. She/he will also have leadership and communication skills, including a track record of excellent writing and presentation skills.
* The primary responsibilities of the team leader incudes: defining the evaluation approach and methodology; guiding and managing the team during the evaluation process; leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team in meetings with implementing partners and other stakeholders; drafting and revising, as required, the inception package, and evaluation report in line with comments from the evaluation focal person, PMSU, Governance Unit/UNDP, and Evaluation Quality Assessment Support Service (EQAS).
* The team members will bring together a complementary combination of the technical expertise required and have a track record of written work on similar assignments.
* Team members will contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; conduct field work; participate in team meetings and meetings with implementing partners and other stakeholders; and contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in her/his technical area(s).

For evaluating the qualification and competencies of the candidates for this mid-term review/evaluation, the applicants are supposed to present evidences (like resumes, work samples, references) that will be expected to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience.

**8. EVALUATION ETHICS**

This mid-term review/evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[1]](#footnote-1); and the Evaluation Team is expected to be abided with the ethical considerations in the guidelines. Moreover, while conducting the evaluation, the Evaluation Team should carefully consider any harm that may result from an evaluation and take steps to reduce it. Everyone who participates in the evaluation should do so willingly (informed consent). Attention should also be made in order to keep the confidentiality and safety of the participants.

The evaluation ethical considerations and critical issues must be addressed both during the design and implementation of the evaluation. The evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers may include: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

**9. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The organization and management structure for the evaluation and also lines of authority of all parties involved in the evaluation process are as outlined below:

**9.1 UNDP Ethiopia**

The **Management of UNDP Ethiopia, PMSU or Governance Unit** will take responsibility to:

* Assign an Evaluation Manager/Evaluation Focal Person who coordinates the evaluation, safeguards independence, provides routine support throughout the evaluation process, and so on;
* Approve the final TOR, inception and evaluation reports;
* Ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation at all stages;
* Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and the evaluation subject, its performance and results with the Evaluation Manager and the evaluation team;
* Organise and participate in debriefings;
* Oversee dissemination and follow-up processes - including the preparation of management response to the evaluation recommendations;

**9.2 Evaluation Focal Person and PMSU**

The Evaluation Focal Person and PMSU to coordinate and lead quality assurance process of the evaluation will be responsible to:

* Manage the evaluation process through all phases including drafting this TOR;
* Ensure quality assurance mechanisms are operational;
* Consolidate and share comments on draft TOR, Inception and Evaluation Reports with the Evaluation Team;
* Ensure the expected use of quality assurance mechanisms (checklists, quality support, etc.);
* Ensure that the team has access to all documentation and information necessary to the evaluation;
* Facilitate the team’s contacts with Implementing Partners and other stakeholders;
* Set-up meetings, and field visits;
* Provide logistic support during the fieldwork;
* Organise security briefings for the evaluation team and provide any materials as required;

**9.3 Evaluation Team**

The Evaluation Team will have responsibilities to:

* Carry out desk review and field data collection and also triangulation and analysis of data collected through desk review and field visit;
* Draft inception report (containing the methodology and detail action-plan for the evaluation) and share it with the Governance Unit/UNDP for comments;
* Finalize inception report with incorporation of relevant comments from Governance Unit/UNDP and Independent Quality Assurance Support Service;
* Conduct field visit/research (interviews, observation, etc.);
* Ensure that all aspects of the TOR are fulfilled;
* After approval from Evaluation Manager to submit/present preliminary findings to the Governance Unit/UNDP;
* Draft evaluation reports (using template for reporting, typographic styles and UN spelling);
* Finalize evaluation report on the basis of comments received from different levels;
  1. **Implementing Partners and other Stakeholders**

The Implementing Partners and other stakeholders will avail themselves to meet with the evaluation team and provide data and information that are required and relevant to achieve the purpose and objectives of this mid-term evaluation.

**10. TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will come across through the following phases: preparation, inception, data collection and analysis, report writing, dissemination and follow-up. The main tasks with responsible body/ies, and tentative milestones are as detailed below:

* + Identification of Evaluation Team members – 15 – 31 August 2019 – UNDP;
  + Pre-contract meetings (virtual through Skype) - 26 – 29 August 2019 – UNDP and Evaluation Team;
  + Signing of contract – 29 – 31 August 2019 – Evaluators;
  + Desk review of available documents in preparation for inception meeting – 1 – 5 September 2018 – Evaluation Team;
  + Inception Phase (inception meetings; designing evaluation (methodology, evaluation matrix, data collection instruments); preparation of inception report; and also review and endorsement of inception report/package) – 6 – 20 September 2019 – Evaluation Team and UNDP;
  + Conducting the review/evaluation (data collection, analysis, draft report preparation) – 21 September – 15 October 2019 – Evaluation Team
  + Aide-memoire or debriefing on evaluation process, methodology, preliminary/initial findings, conclusions and recommendations- 11 October 2019 – Evaluation Team;
  + Submission of draft Evaluation Report – 20 October 2019 – Evaluation Team;
  + Review of draft report and provide comments – 21– 31 October 2019 - UNDP;
  + Validation workshop – 24th October 2019 – Evaluation Team and UNDP;
  + Addressing comments and producing final Draft Evaluation Report – 1 – 8 November 2019 – Evaluation Team;
  + Submitting final draft report which incorporates feedback provided by client/UNDP – 9 November 2019 – Evaluation Team;
  + Review and endorse final draft report (making sure that the final draft report meets required evaluation quality criteria) – 10 – 15 November 2019 – UNDP;
  + Prepare and submit Evaluation Brief – 16 – 18 November 2019;
  + Dissemination and follow-up (including organizing learning events, preparing and endorsing management responses on evaluation recommendations, etc) – 20 November – 15 December 2019;

**The graphic illustration of the main phases/tasks and milestones of the planned mid-term review/evaluation are as outlined in the below Gantt Chart**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase/Task** | **September** | | | | **October** | | | | **November** | | | | **December** | | | |
| **Week1** | **Week2** | **Week3** | **Week4** | **Week1** | **Week2** | **Week3** | **Week4** | **Week1** | **Week2** | **Week3** | **Week4** | **Week1** | **Week2** | **Week3** | **Week4** |
| Inception Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conducting the review/evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Submission and review of draft report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Validation workshop |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Addressing comments and submission of final report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review and endorsement of final report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparation and submission of Evaluation brief |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dissemination and follow-up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**11. ANNEXES**

In this section additional information which provide details about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators will be annexed (such as Programme document, Intervention Results Framework and Theory of Change, Intervention Results Framework and Theory of Change, Sample Evaluation Matrix, and so on).

**12 Evaluation matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant** |  | **Key** |  | **Specific sub** | **Data** |  | **Data-collection** | **Indicators/** |  | **Methods for** |
| **evaluation** |  | **questions** |  | **questions** | **sources** |  | **methods/tools** | **success** |  | **data** |
| **criteria** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **standard** |  | **analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/ search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)