

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. Consultancy Information

Project Title: Support to Public Financial Management

Duty Station: Juba, South Sudan with field travel to the project locations

Duration: 30 days

Type of Consultancy: Summative Evaluation of the Public Financial Management Project

2. Background and Context

The 2011 Transitional Constitution of the Republic of South Sudan specifies a three-tiered system of decentralized government: national, state and local governments. While most high-yielding revenues are collected by the national government, the rest are given to state and local governments. The Constitution, together with the Local Government Act of 2009, devolve responsibility for the provision of primary public service delivery and infrastructure development to states and counties. However, at the states and counties levels; financial resources at disposal and its fiscal space are most limited and public financial management capacity is very low. In addition, the fall in oil revenue receipts caused by the volatilities in the global oil market coupled with the impact of the internal conflict exacerbated poor public service delivery at the subnational levels due to inadequate revenue flowing to the states. This further worsen the capacity of the subnational governments to deliver basic social services to their people.

UNDP believes that building strong institutions is the pathway for developing a progressive society where people can access services when they need them and have confidence living in an area where their welfare is ensured. Recognizing the importance of improved public financial management and accountability, UNDP with financial assistance from the government of Japan and African Development Bank, provides technical assistance to build the capacity for domestic non-oil revenue generation and accountability in Aweil, Bor, Gbudue, Gogrial, Jubek and Torit states.

The project contributes towards the UN Cooperation Framework 2019-2021 Outcome 2: Local economies are recovered, and conditions and coping strategies are improved to end severe food insecurity, and UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2019 – 2021 Output 2.4. National and subnational governments capacities developed for tax and trade policy harmonization, revenue diversification, expansion of fiscal space and more transparent utilization of public resources.

Towards improving the capacity of local government to generate, manage resources in a transparent and equitable manner, the programme supported establishment of regulatory, legal framework, and unified institutional tax structures and system for tax systems in six states; enhanced capacity of state revenue officials from Aweil, Bor, Gbudue, Gogrial, Jubek and Torit, and on non-oil revenue management which has led to increased revenues collection; increased capacity of members of State Legislative Assemblies from the six states on public financial management procedures, gender-sensitive budgeting and oversight.

3. Purpose of the evaluation

The current phase of Support to Public Financial Management Project in South Sudan ends in March 2020. This evaluation is being conducted to assess the project's contributions towards the enhancement of capacity of states in non-oil revenue management and accountability for improved service delivery.

UNDP commissions this summative evaluation to provide UNDP, donors, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results generated by the project. The evaluation will assess the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability contributions towards gender equality and women empowerment; identify and document lessons learned; and provide stakeholders with recommendations to inform the design and implementation of other related ongoing and future projects. The evaluation will also assess linkages and coherence with other initiatives like AfDB's Non-Oil Revenue Management and Accountability (NORMA) project. Key stakeholders are State Revenue Authorities, State

Ministries of Finance, State Legislative Assemblies in Aweil, Bor, Gbudue, Gogrial, Jubek and Torit, funding partners (Japan, AfDB), UNDP and other actors.

4. Evaluation scope and objectives

a. Scope

The summative evaluation will cover the period from March 2016 to date, covering all the project locations; Aweil, Bor, Gbudue, Gogrial, Jubek and Torit. The evaluation will cover programme conceptualisation, design, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of results and will engage all project stakeholders. The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of the project; explore the key factors that have contributed to the achieving or not achieving of the intended results; and determine the extent to which the project is contributing towards strengthening state governments' capacity for resource management and public service delivery; addressing crosscutting issues of gender equality and women's empowerment and human rights; and forging partnership at different levels, including with government, donors, UN agencies, and communities.

Objectives

Specific evaluation objectives are:

- i. To assess the relevance and strategic positioning of the project to South Sudan's public financial management and improved service delivery needs;
- ii. Assess a) the progress made towards project results and whether there were any unintended results and b) what can be captured in terms of lessons learned for ongoing and future UNDP's public financial management and institutional capacity enhancement initiatives in South Sudan.
- iii. Assess whether the project management arrangements, approaches and strategies were well-conceived and efficient in delivering the project.
- iv. Analyse the extent to which the project enhanced application of a rights-based approach, gender equality and women's empowerment, social and environmental standards and participation of other socially vulnerable groups such as children and the disabled.

5. Evaluation Questions

The summative evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

Relevance

1. To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
2. To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
3. To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
4. To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

Effectiveness

5. To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
6. To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
7. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
8. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
9. To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

Efficiency

10. To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?

11. To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
12. 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?
13. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

14. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
15. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
16. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
17. 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?
18. To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?

Human rights

19. To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Gender equality

20. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
21. Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
22. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

Guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with UNDP evaluation stakeholders.

6. Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNDP evaluation guidelines and policies, United Nations Group Evaluation Norms and Ethical Standards; OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The evaluation may employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods including:

1. Document review of all relevant documentation. This would include a review of inter alia; project document (contribution agreement); theory of change and results framework; programme and project quality assurance reports; annual workplans; consolidated quarterly and annual reports; results-oriented monitoring report; highlights of project board meetings; and technical/financial monitoring reports.
2. Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners:
 - Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
 - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
 - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The summative evaluation report will not assign specific comments to individuals.
3. Surveys and questionnaires including participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
4. Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
5. Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
6. Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.

The final methodological approach including interview schedules, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation will be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators

7. Evaluation Products/Deliverables

The evaluators will be expected to deliver the following:

- i) Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages). The inception report will be drafted following and based on preliminary discussions with after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- ii) Evaluation debriefings. Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing
- iii) Draft evaluation report (up to 40 pages including executive summary). UNDP will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluators within an agreed period, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and agreed quality criteria.
- iv) Evaluation report audit trail. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- v) Summative evaluation report.
- vi) Presentations to stakeholders

8. Evaluation team composition and required Competencies

The end line evaluation will be conducted by an independent consultant (an international evaluation expert) with support from a national evaluation associate. The international consultant must have extensive experience in strategic programming of development assistance in post-conflict countries within the broader areas of public administration and public financial management in post conflict settings. Preferably, the consultant should also have substantial knowledge of and experience with the monitoring and evaluation of similar initiatives in volatile environments. The required qualifications and technical competencies are listed below:

Qualifications

- i) Minimum Master's degree in Economics, Public Policy and Management, Public Administration, Development Studies, International Development, or any other relevant educational background.

Technical competencies

- ii) At least 7 years (and recent – latest should have been conducted within the past 2 years) professional experience in conducting evaluations of public financial management, public administration and economic governance initiatives in post-conflict settings.
- iii) At least 5 years' experience in the fields of public financial management, public administration, institutional capacity building, economic governance, gender mainstreaming and human rights promotion.
- iv) Excellent writing skills with a strong background in report drafting.
- v) Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views.

9. Implementation Arrangements

The UNDP South Sudan Country Office will select a qualified and experienced evaluation consultant through UNDP procurement processes in consultation with the partners. UNDP will be responsible for the management of the consultant and will in this regard designate an evaluation manager and focal point. Project staff will assist in facilitating the process (e.g. providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants).

The project manager and evaluation manager will convene an evaluation reference group comprising of technical experts from partners and UNDP to enhance the quality of the review. This reference group will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detailed comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and articulation of findings and approve the final report. The reference group will also advise on the conformity of processes to UNDP and UNEG standards.

The consultant will take responsibility, with assistance from the project team, for setting up meetings and conducting the review, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The consultant will report directly to the designated evaluation manager and focal point and work closely with the project team. The consultant will

work full time, based in UNDP South Sudan and will be required to travel to the project locations as part of the evaluation. Office space and limited administrative and logistical support will be provided. The consultant will use her/his own laptop and cell phone.

UNDP will develop a management response to the evaluation within 2 weeks of report finalization.

10. Timeframe for the Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be carried out over a period of 30 working days broken down as follows:

Deliverables	Days
Inception report	5
Evaluation debriefing:	20
Draft Evaluation Report	
Final Evaluation report	5
Evaluation report audit trail	
Power point Presentation for stakeholders	
Total number of working days	30