



## **Terms of Reference**

# **Independent Terminal Evaluation Of Joint Programme on Youth Employment Somalia (JPYES)**

**Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA) and**

**Participating UN Organizations: ILO, FAO, UNDP, UN-Habitat and UNIDO**

Mogadishu, Somalia

May 2019

## **ACRONYMS**

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| BDS   | Business Development Services               |
| C4W   | Cash for Work                               |
| Eoi   | Expression of Interest                      |
| ESC   | Evaluation Steering Committee               |
| FGS   | Federal Government of Somalia               |
| FMS   | Federal Member States                       |
| IA    | Implementing Agencies (service delivery)    |
| JPYES | Joint Programme on Youth Employment Somalia |
| MoLSA | Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs       |
| MPTF  | Multi Partner Trust Fund                    |
| MTE   | Mid Term Evaluation                         |
| M&E   | Monitoring and Evaluation                   |
| NCE   | No Cost Extension                           |
| NES   | National Employment Strategy                |
| NEP   | National Employment Policy                  |
| NGO   | Non-Governmental Organisation               |
| PSC   | Programme (JPYES) Steering Committee        |
| PSG   | Peace and State-Building Goals              |
| PUNO  | Participating United Nations Organisations  |
| ToR   | Terms of Reference                          |
| ToT   | Training of Trainers                        |
| UNEG  | United Nations Evaluation Group             |
| VC    | Value Chain                                 |

## BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>PROGRAMME TITLE</b>    | Federal Government of Somalia-United Nations Joint Programme on Youth Employment Somalia (JPYES) |
| <b>DONORS</b>             | Denmark, Italy, Sweden and Switzerland   |
| <b>PUNO</b>               | FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNHABITAT AND UNIDO  |
| <b>LEAD MINISTRY</b>      | Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MoLSA)  |
| <b>GEOGRAPHIC AREAS</b>   | Mogadishu, Kismayo, Bosaso, Berbera, Baidoa, and Beletweyne                                      |
| <b>PROGRAMME DURATION</b> | September 2015 to December 2019 (51 months)  |
| <b>OVERALL BUDGET</b>     | \$54,000,000   |
| <b>ACTUAL BUDGET</b>      | \$34,713,811   |

The Joint FGS-UN Programme aims at capitalising on security, governance and reconciliation achievements by expanding employment opportunities for young men and women in Somalia. As highlighted in the Economic Recovery Plan for Somalia, youth unemployment is one of the greatest obstacles to the country's economic recovery. Somalia is a young nation with population estimates of over 70% Youth, who are receiving substandard commercialised education and nominal access to participate in the labour market. The plan of the government for this Joint Programme is to provide youth with employment opportunities to avoid the latter joining militia groups or risking their lives in the oceans while attempting dangerous migration. This was supposed to be achieved through vocational training, enterprise development as well as creation and rehabilitation of infrastructure through labour intensive employment method. The programme recognizes the centrality of youth in fostering stability in the country and outlines specific interventions that can be taken to begin to generate decent work opportunities for young people that will serve as positive alternatives to participation in violence and conflict. The programme generally contributes to the revitalization of the local economy. The employment generating interventions from this programme also aim at augmenting the credibility of the FGS and build trust and confidence in local governance and security sector institutions while providing immediate peace dividends to vulnerable sub-sections of the population.

The overall outcome of JPYES that supports PSG 4: Economic Foundations, is *Somali economy revitalized and expanded with a focus on livelihood enhancement, employment generation, and broad-based inclusive growth*, with the following 3 Sub-Outcomes:

**Sub-Outcome 1:** Improved long-term potential for growth, productivity and inclusive employment through six Value-Chain in various sectors, including agriculture, fisheries and livestock, leading to 5,000 sustainable jobs;

**Sub-Outcome 2:** Enhanced the longer-term employability of 20,000 youth (13,000 urban and 7,000 rural) through basic literacy, numeracy and life-skills and vocational and business training in sectors with high growth and employment potential; and

**Sub-Outcome 3:** Productive infrastructure rehabilitated through labour-intensive method creating short term jobs for 30,000 youth (16,000 rural and 14,000 urban)

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

the proposed programme was designed to contribute to several targets, as mentioned in the JPYES project document:

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

| CHRONOLOGY | MILESTONE  |
|------------|--|
| JUNE 2015  | JPYES – 3 years programme signed by MoLSA and Four UN Agencies (FAO, HABITAT, ILO and UNDP)  |
| SEPT 2015  | Actual start date of JPYES – Funds transferred to Agencies                                   |
| APRIL 2017 | UNIDO joined JPYES as part of the Daldhis Programme (Peace Building Fund)                    |
| NOV 2017   | Commissioning of Mid Term Evaluation   |
| APRIL 2018 | Mid Term Evaluation report   |
| APRIL 2018 | Management response to the recommendations of the Mid Term Evaluation                        |
| JUNE 2018  | 6 months NCE (No Cost Extension) approved – JPYES terminates on 31 <sup>st</sup> of Dec 2018 |
| DEC 2018   | 6 months NCE approved – JPYES terminates on 30 <sup>th</sup> of June 2019                    |
| MAY 2019   | 6 months NCE approved – JPYES terminates on 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2019                   |

The planned activities of JPYES are being implemented in Mogadishu, Kismayo, Bosaso, Berbera, Baidoa, and Beletweyne by 5 Participating United Nations Organizations (PUNOs), these are: FAO, ILO, UNDP, UN-Habitat and UNIDO, through directly by PUNOs or Federal and local government authorities, local NGOs and private sectors. The PUNOs have been implementing their respective activities in close collaboration with the relevant line ministries, local authorities, civil societies and private sector at federal, regional and local levels; whereas the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA) provides overall coordination and oversight to JPYES.

#### **Major Achievements against main areas of intervention:**

To date, the JPYES has the following major achievements:

**Sub-Outcome 1:** Improved long-term potential for growth, productivity and inclusive employment through six Value-Chain in various sectors, including agriculture, fisheries and livestock

Output 1.1: Capacities of public private and academic institutions built to undertake value chain analysis and key interventions identified

Output 1.2: Key interventions implemented to improve their long-term potential for growth, productivity and employment

Achievements:

- Out of 5 value chain development analysis completed in key sectors, the fishery, renewable energy and construction value chains have been approved to be implemented

- 150 young people (100) improved their skills in fishery sector and entrepreneurship and were applying their skills in their fishery businesses in Bossaso, Kismayo and Berbera
- Out of ten constructed fish processing facilities, three were functional and used by the trained youth in Bossaso
- By providing access to revolving funds and business development service, the selected youth (120) have set up their fishery enterprises in Bossaso, Kismayo and Berbera
- Standard Operating Procedures (SOP)/guidelines on sea food safety, under the HACCP, were developed and around 150 beneficiaries were trained
- National Employment Policy for Somalia has been developed and waiting to be ratified by parliament. The programme also commissioned the first Labour Force Survey in Somalia that will be implemented in partnership with the government

**Sub-Outcome 2:** Enhanced the longer-term employability of 20,000 youth (13,000 urban and 7,000 rural) through basic literacy, numeracy and life-skills and vocational and business training in sectors with high growth and employment potential

Output 2.1: Curricula developed for occupations identified by value chain analysis and prioritized by Federal Government and Regional States

Output 2.2: Programmes of vocational, business and life skills training provided

Output 2.3: Capacity of ministries and institutions for the collections, analysis and storage of labour market data and youth employment programming developed

Output 2.4: One stop youth centre developed in Mogadishu and 2 satellite centres in other urban areas

Achievements:

- Over 9,376 young people (over 30% women) trained in different vocational and entrepreneurship skills, literacy and numeracy, after developing 7 related curricula
- 23 officials (2 women) were trained in labour market analysis
- 27 civil servants from government (ministries and local authorities) improved their skills by receiving training in M&E, reporting, coordination and oversight roles
- One Stop Youth Centre in Mogadishu completed

**Sub-Outcome 3:** Productive infrastructure rehabilitated through labour intensive method - creating short-term jobs for 30,000 youth (16,000 rural and 14,000 urban)

Output 3.1: Rural productive infrastructure projects implemented

Output 3.2 Urban infrastructure projects implemented

Achievements:

- A total of 19,293 short-term job opportunities (11,763 in urban and 7,530 in rural areas) created for the young people and 77 public infrastructures were rehabilitated
- In February 2018, a Mid-Term Evaluation of JPYES completed and an evaluation report developed with management responses for implementation
- Over USD 2.9m has been injected into the local economy mainly as cash transfers to beneficiaries

Based on the decision of the JPYES Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings, held in October 2018 and then subsequently another meeting on May 2019, it was agreed that a Terminal Evaluation of JPYES would be commissioned during the implementation period. It was agreed that the recommendations of the

evaluation would inform to the extent of contribution to the Outcomes of the UN Strategic Plan and the Goal of the National Development Plan as well as inform the design of the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation intervention of JPYES and learning for improving decision-making and planning.

## **PURPOSE**

The overall purpose is to assess the extent of the results at outcome and impact levels of programme interventions for which the project had a direct contribution attributed to the target audience (beneficiaries, institutions, communities) across all programme locations.

In relation to the Mid-Term evaluation that was conducted during November 2017-February 2018, the terminal project evaluation is supposed to examine JPYES activities that are producing the outputs and related outcome that have an impact on the ground by identifying:

- a) The extent to which the programme has achieved its main objectives
- b) The long-term effect or impact of the programme on beneficiary institutions and individuals (change in lives)
- c) Direct and indirect effects of programme deliverables

The programme has been running for over three years and is currently on its last segment prior to closure. An impact oriented terminal report will highlight the Joint Programme's key achievements and challenges in addressing the employability potential of beneficiaries. How well has the programme performed in supporting young men and women to enter/get-closer to the labour market or gain sustainable employment. Most importantly, how are the beneficiaries (both women and men) changing their lives as a result of JPYES interventions. This report will also inform the design of the next phase of the programme. For the purpose of this assignment, impact will be understood as the wider effects (social, economic, technical, environmental) of the programme on individuals, institutions and communities. The impact can be direct or indirect, intended or unintended, positive or negative, macro (within a sector or value chain) or micro (individual/household).

In the context of developing the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation of YES Programme and other similar interventions, the evaluation will provide adequate feedback, good practices, and lessons learned that could be considered for learning and improving the decision-making in programme/project planning and overall management.

Findings will be shared with FGG-MoLSA and its line ministries at regional level level, Donor agencies from Denmark, Italy, Sweden and Switzerland, FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNHABITAT, UNIDO and other relevant stakeholders.

## **OBJECTIVES**

The overall objective of the terminal evaluation is to assess the "how" and "why" JPYES objectives are being achieved fully or partially or not accomplished. That is to measure the extent of contribution of outputs to the outcome and impact on the lives of the Somali people, especially, young women and men. It will also help to clarify the underlying factors that explain the achievement or lack thereof of outcome and impacts, highlighting intended and unintended consequences (both positive and negative) of

interventions. This terminal evaluation should set out clear recommendations to improve performance in future programming cycle and generate lessons learned.

The specific objectives of the terminal evaluation are to assess:

1. Extent of intended and unintended changes in development (condition/outcome) between the completion of outputs and achievement of impacts
2. Extent of intended and unintended changes in the lives of people (impacts) - both women and men separately that are result of the changes in development condition/outcome
3. Learned lessons from the good practices and failures of the interventions
4. Improving decision-making in policy and programming as well as organizational accountability

## **SCOPE**

1. Conduct an overall assessment of the JPYES activities undertaken, and the achievements made for the duration of the programme – using random sampling method [Sept-2015 to current date]
2. Quantify the category and number of beneficiaries in each location and examine the quality of support provided in addressing long term unemployment/underemployment
3. Assess the extent to which the programme has achieved its main objectives and specifically the level of support experienced by beneficiaries
4. Review the degree of change by institutions and individuals who benefited from the programme implementation and assess if this was indeed best approach and value for money
5. Assess the sustainability of the interventions, having taken into consideration of economic, socio-cultural, environmental and capacities of the individual and institution aspects.
6. While analyzing the data and relevant information, in all the above areas, the cross-cutting issues, such as gender, capacity development and conflict-sensitivity are to be considered

The terminal evaluation should review the programme achievements against objectives as set out in the programme document and subsequent variations and make an overall performance assessment.

The evaluation will examine the JPYES programme from inception to date and take an independent stock of how programmed interventions have attained their objectives.

The evaluation will essentially focus on the geographical locations of JPYES implemented projects across Somalia, such as Mogadishu, Baidoa, Kismayo, Bossaso, Berbera and Beletweyne. The results from this study will inform decision makers in the government, donors and Implementing Agencies as well as extend an opportunity for understanding the performance of the programme delivery mechanism and identify specific areas for improvement.

This evaluation will use a systematic process to examine the influence or the effect the programme had at grassroot level or the point of delivery. It is envisaged that the evaluator will formulate the success criteria in the spirit of programme deliverables [reference to the 3 sub-outcomes] and complete a holistic evaluation within 12 weeks. Random samplings will be collected for data and information analysis and triangulation method will be used for data verification. The scope of the terminal evaluation will take into consideration the following:

- The quantity and quality of long-term/sustainable jobs that was created as a result of the interventions inclusive of self-employment opportunities created
- The extent to which the lives of the women and men have changed due to creation of job opportunities – sustainable/short-term jobs – intended/unintended, negative/positive, direct/indirect
- Impact of the social policy interventions of the programme, such as the creation of safe-space/youth-centres and unconditional money transfers to vulnerable individuals
- Overall assessment of short-term job creation and comparative analysis of different activities related to the labor-intensive/Cash for Work initiatives
- The intended and unintended outcome and impact of technical or vocational and entrepreneurial trainings
- Any benefits or drawbacks associated with urban or rural infrastructure constructed or rehabilitated by the programme
- Documentation of the lessons to be learnt from the initiatives that worked well and not worked well

#### **Gender Mainstreaming in Evaluation:**

In each stage of the evaluation, especially in data collection and analysis, gender equality will be taken into consideration. Sex disaggregated data will be collected for the analysis. During the data collection and analysis, different needs and aspirations of women, girls, boys and men are to be considered. Evaluation needs to explicitly explain on how the intervention has addressed the men's and women's needs differently.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

The following methods, but not necessarily limited to, will be considered during the evaluation.

##### **Desk Review:**

During this stage, key documents, listed below, will be reviewed:

- JPYES Programme document
- Annual Work Plans (AWP)
- Annual Progress and Back to Office Reports
- Success stories, case studies, good practices and lessons learnt
- Beneficiary profiles
- Mid-term Evaluation Report
- Partners' contact list
- National Employment Strategy/Policy
- National Development Plan
- UN Strategic Plan

The Team will be given access and review project documents: data, reports, agreements, evaluations, policies, strategies, promotional material, case studies, curriculums, ToTs, training documents, beneficiary



information in each location, Institutional capacity building, engagement procedures, beneficiary selection guidelines and any other relevant documents.

This desk review should build a good understanding of the available information on JPYES in the wider context of employment programmes and economic development in general before conducting an in-depth study of this intervention. This review will aid in describing the long-term trends of programme implementation and outputs since its inception, giving specific attention to geographical coverage, target audience and the true depth of support that was extended to beneficiaries in their journey to sustainable employment.

#### **Case Studies:**

The terminal evaluation team will sample and assess at least 5% of individual cases (random sampling) who completed their intervention for each activity/project implemented by JPYES. The team will also review some of the institutions and communities that took part in this process, giving due regard to the disparity between Ministries, Regional Administrations, civil society and NGOs. The case studies will include as a minimal; geographical coverage, thematic (e.g. training, C4W, BDS, VC etc.) and target group. The aim of the case studies is to scrutinize the impact of the interventions on specific target audiences or subset of the beneficiaries of JPYES such as women, IDPs, ethnic groups, etc. The team may select few government staff at FGS and FMS level who are direct beneficiaries of capacity building efforts and measure their improvements and aptitude to be effective practitioners. The case studies will also provide a platform to assess the programme impact through inspection of programme inputs, processes, activities and outputs and the way they interact with each other.

#### **Field Visits:**

The evaluation team will holistically analyze JPYES activities in all target regions across Somalia (including Somaliland) and will carry out selected field visits in programme target locations. The team will collect data, interview beneficiaries, conduct focus groups, assess host community perception and survey target population. The idea is to tease out any lasting impact that the programme may have had on people and build a good picture of target beneficiaries, geographical coverage disparities and barriers to implementation. The evaluators ought to be able to identify a 'reference group' to engage in deeper analysis to compare and contrast with the 'target group' and highlight the implications of services and benefits they received.

#### **Surveys and Questionnaires:**

The evaluation team will formulate a targeted survey questionnaire to gather data from relevant stakeholders using an effective platform such as paper-based for beneficiaries and email interchange or web-based survey with Implementing Partners. Survey analysis ought to be used to supplement other forms of data collection such as interviews and focus group discussions.

#### **Interviews:**

The evaluation team will interview a good sample of stakeholders namely: members of the PUNOs, PSC, Technical Working Group, donors, Regional Technical Focal Group, participants from government agencies, programme administrator, coordination body, national and international staff attached to the programme, beneficiaries, community committees and institutions that received infrastructure and

others as relevant. The purpose is to understand the impact of JPYES from the perspective of those involved and how they may have been affected by the interventions. The study will aim to identify effective use of resources in line with aid effectiveness principles and value for money. It is expected that the Impact evaluation report will include an adequate Cost-Benefit analysis from beneficiary's perspective.

## **QUESTIONS AND TASKS**

The terminal evaluation will mainly aim at quantifying the number of beneficiaries in each location and identify any changes experienced by beneficiaries as a result of JPYES intervention. The evaluation Team will establish the causal connections between the changes experienced by beneficiaries and the programme inputs and effectively measure the magnitude of that change. The assessment will particularly focus on a broad range of performance indicators in accordance with the guidance from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) with an emphasis on **impact, performance, sustainability and coverage**. It is envisaged that assessment will incorporate a financial appraisal of JPYES projects in order to measure value for money, and specifically any welfare/support that trickled down to the target groups.

The terminal evaluation should address the following questions:

### **Strategic:**

- Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the options from 1-3 which best reflects this project)?
- Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)?
- Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme's theory of change during implementation.

### **Relevant:**

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the UN Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

**Effective:**

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outputs and outcomes, UN Strategic Framework, the SDGs, and the national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs and outcomes achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended project outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UN partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
- Were the intended targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

**Efficient:**

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?

**Sustainability and National Ownership:**

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are the stakeholders and partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Identify and appraise any products that has been handed over to government institutions or community representatives?

- Are there any social, political or security risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent did UN actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UN interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

#### **Other Suggested Questions:**

1. What is the total number and profile of JPYES beneficiaries in Somalia (including Somaliland)? All JPYES beneficiary data should be collected, collated, categorized, analysed and presented as a separate entity? Attention ought to be given to the geographical location of activities and both 'people' and 'institutions' that benefited from JPYES.
2. What was the logic of selection of JPYES activity locations? Were there consultations with the relevant stakeholders?
3. How well does the JPYES modality manage beneficiary data?
4. To what extent have JPYES interventions achieved their objectives (or will do so in the future)?
5. Is there a strategic and coherent master plan for the interventions by the PUNO, Implementing Agencies and the Government?
6. Are there any concrete plans by Implementing Agencies for beneficiary selection? Did the benefits reach the target groups as intended? Are there any secondary and/or unintended population that benefited from JPYES? Are there general unintended or indirect benefits?
7. Are the monitoring indicators (if any) relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?
8. Were benefits distributed fairly between gender, age groups, ethnic groups, locations and between social and cultural lines? Is there any strategy to drafting/engaging beneficiaries or ensuring 'Equality & Diversity' standards are adhered to?
9. What measures are in place to ensure that beneficiaries are safeguarded from any undue pressure, humiliation, abuse or quid pro quo from service providers or stakeholders in a position of authority?
10. Does the Joint Programme consider the particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention?
11. What measurements are in place or 'actions taken' to ensure that marginalized communities (women, rural communities, orphans etc.) are positively encouraged to 'engage with' and 'benefit from' JPYES activities?
12. What are the direct and indirect, positive and negative, intended and unintended impacts of JPYES intervention on people and institutions? What would be the impact without JPYES intervention?

13. To what extent can the changes observed be attributed solely to JPYES interventions rather than external factors?
14. Are there any success stories, good practice and transferrable examples of effective interventions?
15. How has the interventions affected the overall situation of the target beneficiaries, stakeholders and institutions?
16. Evidence number of curriculums developed by JPYES. Review curriculums and assess their design, usage (during and after intervention), fitness for purpose and value for money. How were the curriculums developed and what measures are in place to identify duplication and synergise with curriculums developed by other programmes?
17. What measures have been taken during planning, contracting and implementation to ensure that JPYES resources are efficiently used?
18. Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that ensures project deliverables are achieved and that beneficiaries are receiving adequate services?
19. In what ways has the JPYES contributed to the agenda of upskilling, employment and business start-ups? Are there any linkages to ensure that beneficiaries receive an integrated and seamless service?
20. Are the interventions consistent with the needs and aspirations of the target groups? What measures are in place to consult with beneficiaries, civil society or other stakeholders and collate a 'Needs Assessment' that informs activities?
21. What is the engagement of public agencies with the capacity building strand of JPYES?
22. In which way are JPYES projects consistent with the 'capacity building needs' and priorities of the government? Specific focus needs to be given to Ministries and Administrations that have benefited or contributed to JPYES interventions?
23. Is there any discernable change in the institutional, Organisational and individual capacity to acquire programme management tools, coordination, oversight and M&E?
24. What are the key developmental changes by the Ministries as a result of JPYES intervention?
25. To what extent have the interventions contributed to capacity development and system strengthening of government and community-based institutions?
26. Do government counterparts and local communities participate in the planning and implementation of JPYES activities? If so how, and to what extent do they take the lead on decision making?
27. How do JPYES interventions ensure local ownership?
28. What is the agency presence in project locations and their capacity to resolve challenges on the ground and ensure that activities are delivered efficiently and effectively?
29. What could have been done to make the interventions more effective?
30. In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving?
31. What is the general perception of beneficiaries and other stakeholders affected by JPYES activities?
32. What mechanisms are in place to support beneficiaries after the interventions have ended? Are any activities providing aftercare services and how?
33. Are there any activities that have been integrated into local systems as an exit strategy? What mechanisms are in place to sustain activities?
34. Will the benefits realized through JPYES interventions be maintained (and to what extent) after the termination of external support?
35. Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure that beneficiaries are not penalised or fast tracked before attaining concrete results to transition into sustainable self/employment?
36. Do agencies collaborate and share beneficiary information in order to align similar activities, leverage their comparative advantage or eliminate duplications?

37. How could an all-together different type of programme interventions have solved the same problems with less resourcing and management structures?
38. Are JPYES interventions producing the most appropriate impact, given the context and resources available? To what extent can this be justified by results?
39. Are there any other cost-effective ways of achieving JPYES results, outputs and outcomes?
40. Have networks been created or government institutions strengthened to adequately carry out the roles that the JPYES programme team are performing?
41. In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future?

## APPROACH

The methodology and technique for delivering the Evaluation should be sufficiently articulated in the tender documents or E.o.I (Expression of Interest). It will be assessed against this ToR's scope of required inquisition, its ability to comprehensively address terminal evaluation of JPYES and provide conclusions and recommendations. Tenderers should propose the precise combination of methods to be mobilized in carrying out the terminal evaluation of JPYES.

## DELIVERABLES

| DELIVERABLE             | DESCRIPTION  | TIMEFRAME                                       |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| <b>INCEPTION REPORT</b> | <p>Must contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logic of terminal evaluation proceedings based on desk review</li> <li>• Findings from the desk review</li> <li>• Plan, methods, sources, procedures and templates for data collection, interrogation, analysis, sampling of key indicators. This should be comprehensive enough to address all questions stipulated in the ToR</li> <li>• Template for data analysis and data presentation</li> <li>• Proposed timeline of activities, schedule of tasks and submission of deliverables</li> <li>• The report will be shared with relevant stakeholders for feedback and approval</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities of assessment team</li> </ul> | Within two weeks from the start of the contract |
| <b>DRAFT REPORT</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evaluation team will hold a workshop with relevant JPYES staff (or reference group) to showcase and defend preliminary findings and conclusions</li> <li>• This report should structurally mimic the final report, address most of assessment questions and work towards presenting a meaningful findings, conclusions and recommendations</li> <li>• The draft report will separately present the tools used and findings (figures and graphs) of beneficiary data</li> <li>• Draft report will be shared with relevant stakeholders for feedback and approval</li> </ul>  | At the end of 10 weeks of assignment            |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>FINAL REPORT</b>                            | <p>Final report will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address the feedback comments of the draft report</li> <li>• Systematically assess the programme’s impact on beneficiary individuals and institutions</li> <li>• Provide factual evidence of direct and indirect results of interventions</li> <li>• Synthesise information received for purposes of conclusion and recommendation</li> <li>• Need to focus on honest representation of observations from desk review, case studies, interviews and field research</li> </ul> <p>The final report will consist of the following sections as a minimal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Table of contents</li> <li>2. Executive summary</li> <li>3. Intervention description</li> <li>4. Purpose</li> <li>5. Methodology</li> <li>6. Findings</li> <li>7. Data analysis</li> <li>8. Lessons learnt</li> <li>9. Conclusion and</li> <li>10. Recommendations</li> </ol> | <p>Within one to two weeks of receiving feedback and approval of draft report</p> |
| <b>Evaluation Brief and Knowledge Products</b> | <p>The consultant team are required to develop and submit high quality evaluation brief and at least 3 knowledge products that could be used for communication/promotional purposes. Therefore, lessons and knowledge from the evaluation can be ‘packaged’ in the form of a <b>knowledge product</b> to meet the needs of a wider audience.</p>  | <p>In the last week of the evaluation period.</p>                                 |

## TIMELINE

| ACTIVITY                    | DESCRIPTION   | LOCATION                   | TIMELINE      |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---------------|
| <b>BRIEF</b>                | <p>Terminal Evaluation Focal Point (UNDP) will brief evaluator and share Terminal Evaluation folder. The evaluation Team should prepare all their questions and requests at this point. There will be a documented agreement of a list of activities to be covered. Signing of the JPYES Terminal Evaluation contract with chief evaluator.</p> <p>Desk review.</p> | <p>Nairobi / Mogadishu</p> | <p>Week 1</p> |
| <b>STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS</b> | <p>Meeting with key stakeholders (Government, PUNO and Donors). Planning of milestones, field missions and work programmes for national/local team.</p>   | <p>Mogadishu</p>           | <p>Week 2</p> |

|                         |   |  |           |
|-------------------------|---|--|-----------|
| <b>INCEPTION REPORT</b> | Inception report based on desk review, initial meetings and plans to implement the terminal evaluation  | Mogadishu  | Week 3    |
| <b>FIELD VISITS</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draw a comprehensive field visit plan</li> <li>• Fair coverage of all interventions, locations, sectors, agencies and different types of beneficiary groups</li> <li>• Beneficiary interviews (telephone/face-to-face)</li> <li>• Case study and survey analysis</li> <li>• Focus group discussions</li> </ul> | Various project sites:<br>Kismayo, Baidoa, Mogadishu, Berbera, Bosaso etc. | Week 3-5  |
| <b>DRAFT REPORT</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of findings</li> <li>• Submission of draft report</li> <li>• Presentation of findings</li> <li>• Approval of draft report</li> </ul>  | Mogadishu  | Week 6-7  |
| <b>FINAL REPORT</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate feedback</li> <li>• Submission of final report</li> </ul>  | Mogadishu / Home   | Week 8-10 |
|                         |   |  |           |

## EVALUATOR REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The evaluation Team should be led by an international Team Leader with high standard technical and overall management/leadership skills, knowledge and experience to successfully complete this task. S/He should be supported by 2 national experienced-evaluators who can ultimately engage the beneficiaries and must command in-depth understanding of the Somalian culture and language. All members of the assessment team should be independent from any organization that has been involved in the design, execution or advising any aspects of the JPYES. The evaluation team should include:

- One team leader (experienced in evaluating similar caliber of programming)
- Two national consultants (socio-economic background), with data collection and analysis experience

## INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT/TEAM LEADER

### Qualifications

- Post graduate degree in economics, Project Management, International development, Social Sciences, or any other relevant fields

### Experience:

- At least 10 years of professional experience in areas such as: Programme Evaluation and Quality Assurance. A strong record in designing and leading assessments/evaluations
- Knowledge of programmes that work in the field of value chain development, labour market analysis, enterprise support and Tvet provision
- Experience of evaluating or assessing employment programmes or other relevant programmes within the remit of Economic Development/Growth



- Prior evaluation experience of programmes of similar magnitude
- Technical competence in undertaking complex assessments which involve use of mixed methods
- Extensive conceptual and methodological skills and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research evaluation methods
- Experience in gender analysis and mainstreaming in evaluation or research activities
- Excellent communication skills for building rapport with stakeholders, facilitating participation and effective presentation of results
- Prior experience in fragile countries or conflict zones
- Excellent analytical skills, IT literate, especially in Microsoft Package
- Prior experience in Somalia and knowledge of the local language are asset
- Experience in Organizational management, setting up systems and structures, leading operations, capacity development, managing M&E and reporting
- knowledge of UN programmes in Somalia and experience of UNEG (UN Evaluation Group) norms and standards are advantage

**Languages:**

- Proficiency, both written and spoken, in English

Knowledge in Somali or Arabic is an advantage

**NATIONAL CONSULTANTS/Data collection and analysis (2):**

**Qualification:**

Masters' degree in economics, social studies, statistics, and other social studies

**Experience:**

- At least 5 years of working experience in socio-economic and other relevant projects
- Proven skill-set and experience in data collection, data processing, field interviews, data presentation and facilitating focus groups
- Experience of working on evaluations, auditing, impact assessment, quality control etc.
- Knowledge and experience of UN programmes is an asset
- Familiarity in Somali political and socio-economic contexts

**Language:**

- Proficiency, both written and spoken, in English and Somali

**MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT**

The overall coordination of the evaluation, including monitoring of progress and administration, will be undertaken by a Government-UN Evaluation Taskforce. The Evaluation Taskforce (ET) will in turn appoint a Focal Point to deal directly with the evaluators. The main stakeholders of this assessment are

UNDP/programme administrator, Participating UN Organizations, MoLSA at FGS and FMS levels, Evaluation Taskforce, Donors, Beneficiaries and the RC Office. The ET is responsible for:

- Drafting the ToR for the Assessment
- Leading on the recruitment of the assessment team
- Providing programme documents (beneficiary data, reports, policy, evaluation, site visits, minutes etc.) to the Assessment Team
- Participating in the design and planning of the Terminal Evaluation
- Providing administrative and secretariat support
- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the programme in all levels
- Review/share with stakeholders and collate feedback on all reports produced by the Evaluation Team
- Approving or seeking approval of deliverables
- Providing an oversight role to ensure quality of the process and product
- Disseminate, utilize and establish the process for management response to the findings

UNDP Somalia shall manage the terminal evaluation in its role as Administrator of JPYES, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the process from the programme resources. UNDP Somalia will be responsible for ensuring that the process is conducted as stipulated, promoting and leading the assessment design, coordinating and monitoring progress, development and the quality of the process. It shall also disseminate the findings and recommendations.

### **BUDGET & PAYMENT TRANCHES**

The consultants will be paid on deliverable-based in 3 tranches, as follows:

| # | Deliverables  | Amount to be paid | % of payment | Timeline |
|---|---|-------------------|--------------|----------|
| 1 | Inception report and its endorsement  |                   | 20%          | 2 weeks  |
| 2 | Draft Report and presentation   |                   | 30%          | 8 weeks  |
| 3 | Final Report, presentation and its endorsement. Evaluation Brief and Knowledge Products and their endorsement |                   | 50%          | 2 weeks  |

### **ETHICAL PRINCIPLES**

The Assessment will be guided by the UNEG code of conduct (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>) and the following ethical considerations:

### **EXPRESSION OF INTEREST**

Expressions of interest should be emailed to:

Deadline for submissions: 17<sup>th</sup> of May 2019

Selection of candidate: 31<sup>st</sup> of May 2019

Applications should be in PDF form and comprise of:

- CVs of lead evaluator
- A detailed technical proposal and budget
- At least one example of recently completed evaluation of a similar programme and one example of terminal evaluation
- References