

Terms of Reference

A. **Title:** Terminal Evaluation of Project 94900 Accelerating the BUB through Inclusive and Effective Governance

B. **Project Description**

Project Information		
Project title	Accelerating the BUB through Inclusive and Effective Governance	
Atlas ID	Project ID 00094900; Output ID 98964	
Corporate outcome and output	UNDP Strategic Plan Output 3.2: Functions, financing and capacity of sub-national level institutions enabled to deliver improved basic services and respond to priorities voiced by the public	
Country	Philippines	
Region	Asia Pacific	
Date project document signed	11 May 2016	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	11 May 2016	30 September 2019
Project budget	US\$ 11.16M	
Project expenditure at the time of the evaluation	US\$ 10,197,978	
Funding source	Government of the Philippines	
Implementing party	United Nations Development Programme	

In light of significant socioeconomic disparity and poor governance systems, the Philippine government launched in 2012 the Bottom-Up Budgeting (BUB) initiative. BUB aims to deliver poverty-reduction projects through a participatory local governance process. The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) is one of the national agencies implementing BUB.

DSWD anchored on three programmes, namely: the Kapit-Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan-Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social - National Community-Driven Development Program (KALAHI-NCDDP), Protective Services Bureau (PSB) and Sustainable Livelihood Programme (SLP) in the implementation of BUB. However, due to weak social infrastructure, financial and administrative bottlenecks, low government and CSO capacities, as well as policy gaps, implementation performance has been challenging. While DSWD has introduced several initiatives to accelerate delivery for 2015 projects, it faced an immense challenge in 2016, wherein it will have to address the 2015 backlog in addition to delivering on the 2016 projects within an election year. It is in this respect that UNDP offers support to assist in the implementation of BUB through a government financing initiative amounting to US\$ 11.16 M.

This UNDP project aims to deliver, in partnership with DSWD, 100% of 2015 and 2016 backlog, composed of 487 projects, or 941 subprojects in 15 Regions in 271 cities/municipalities (54 LGUs: 4th class, and 30 LGUs: 5th class).

The project results contribute to SDGs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12 and 16. It is implemented with the support of governance hubs which consists of CSOs and High Education Institutions/State Universities and Colleges which will pilot enhanced governance infrastructure that will enable DSWD, LGUs, and civil society to execute BUB effectively and, over time, independently.

Purpose of Evaluation

Evaluations are critical for UNDP to progress towards advancing human development. Through the generation of evidence and objective information, evaluations enable UNDP to make informed decisions and plan strategically. This evaluation is intended to demonstrate the level of change in the project outputs indicators and the project's contribution to outcome level changes, which are normally demonstrated as changes in the performance of institutions or behavior changes. It must also consider whether resources have been properly and judiciously harnessed towards implementation and delivery of stated outputs and the extent to which these outputs contributed to observed results achieved. The evaluation must also identify any operational issues that may be improved to facilitate better program implementation and delivery for similar programs in the future. The evaluation will be used by all main parties (UNDP and partner government agency) to assess their approaches to development assistance and to design future interventions. It is expected to ensure accountability and to generate knowledge for wider use.

Objective

The evaluation will identify the level of achievement in project outputs and the contribution to results at the outcome level, including unintended positive and negative results. The evaluation will also aim to identify the key lessons learned and best practices.

The evaluation will assess:

- The relevance of the project
- The effectiveness of the achievement of results at the output levels and the level of efficiency in the use of project resources
- The usefulness and sustainability of the results for the project beneficiaries
- UNDP's performance as a development partner
- UNDP's added value to the expected results

C. Scope of Work

The Evaluation consultant will primarily be responsible in the conduct of the project terminal evaluation. Under the overall guidance of the Evaluation Reference Group, and reporting to the UNDP evaluation manager, the evaluator shall assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the *Accelerating the BUB through Inclusive and Effective Governance* Project by reviewing progress towards project results based on the project document and annual work plans. The evaluation will also review the project's theory of change vis-à-vis the project's achievements and risks and assess the project's potential effects on the target groups. It will likewise highlight strengths, weaknesses/gaps, good practices, and provide forward looking recommendations for future government financing projects.

The evaluation will also provide an analysis of the data generated from the client satisfaction surveys that were collected by partner CSOs. To the extent possible, the evaluation will assess the

contributions of the project to the quality of life of the BUB beneficiaries, namely: Extreme Poor from urban and rural families (Pantawid Pamilya Pilipino Program- 4Ps beneficiaries), Youth (out-of school youth), Solo Parents, Senior Citizens, Women, Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD) students, Supervised Neighborhood Play (SNP) (children who are not able to avail ECCD center- based services), Government Employees (child development workers, municipal/ city employees, etc), Persons with Disabilities (PWDs), fisher folks and farmers.

The conduct of the evaluation should be based on the following criteria and key guide questions and may employ the following methodological approaches.

a. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

1. Relevance

- a. Did the project design and choice of activities and deliverables properly reflect and respond to specifically identified needs of the government and of the beneficiaries? How were the needs determined and assessed?
- b. How valid is the Theory of Change? Were the planned and actual activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended outcomes?

2. Efficiency

- a. To what extent was the project managed and delivered in a cost-effective way?
- b. How was the project managed in terms of timeliness?
- c. How did project risks influence the efficiency of project implementation? Were all major risks adequately identified before and during project implementation?

3. Effectiveness

- a. To what extent is the project successful in achieving results, both expected and unexpected?
- b. How effective was the project in building the capacities of partners and beneficiaries?
- c. To what extent has the use of UNDP accelerated the implementation of the project effective in the following areas: budgeting, procurement, HR augmentation, partnerships and CSO engagement, finance, and monitoring?
- d. To what extent has UNDP met standard integrity/accountability measures in the delivery of civil works projects, goods, and services?
- e. What are the innovative approaches or strategies that the project introduced?
- f. What value has UNDP added? Both expected and unexpected?
- g. Is the project reaching the intended beneficiaries, rights holders and duty bearers?
- h. To what extent has the project been effective in policy/systems influencing at the national and local level?
- i. Did the project build effective synergies with other existing initiatives?
- j. What are the results of the client satisfaction surveys carried out by partner CSOs?
- k. To what extent does the project integrate gender equality, women's empowerment, and human rights?

4. Sustainability

- a. To what extent can project results be continued without the project's further involvement?
- b. To what extent has the project built in systems to address future risks? (e.g. wastage, over-budgeted specs)
- c. What are the learnings and best practices?

b. Methodology

Methodological approaches may include some or all of the following:

- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- **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 work plans
 - Activity designs
 - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports
 - Results-oriented monitoring report.
 - Highlights of project board meetings
 - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- **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 final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- **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.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
 - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

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

D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The Evaluator is expected to deliver the following outputs with an indicative schedule. The total length of the contract shall ideally be two and a half (2.5) months, with a tolerance of one (1) month depending on the value-added work to be proposed compared to the requirement. The total duration of the evaluation will be a minimum of 40 days spread over 2.5 months.

Deliverables / Outputs	Target Due Dates	Review & Approvals Required
<u>Inception Report</u> with attachments/ annexes	Draft within two (1) weeks from the start of the contract	To be presented to and commented on by ERG
Revised, with matrix of key inputs from Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) with feedback	Revised within one (1) week from presentation to ERG	<i>Approval:</i> Evaluation Manager
<u>Presentation of preliminary findings</u>	Within six (7) weeks from the start of the contract	To be presented to and commented on by ERG
		<i>Approval:</i> Evaluation Manager
<u>Draft Evaluation Report</u>	Within seven (7) weeks from the start of the contract	To be presented to and commented on by ERG
A matrix of key inputs from the ERG with feedback	Within one (1) week from presentation to ERG	<i>Approval:</i> Evaluation Manager
<u>Final Report and evaluation audit trail</u>	Within ten (10) weeks from start of the contract	<i>Approval:</i> Project Manager
Refinement of the final draft with matrix of key inputs from the ERG with feedback		

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP 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.
- **Presentation of preliminary findings.** Immediately following an evaluation, the evaluator will present preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria.

- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be submitted by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** or participation in knowledge-sharing events

E. Institutional Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the PMU through the Project Manager (PM) and the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst. Both will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Team pertaining to required technical and financial documents, coordinating with stakeholders, setting up interviews, arranging field visits, and looking after the evaluation budget and schedule. They shall likewise assist in distribution of draft reports to stakeholders for their review, consolidation of comments, and in organizing key stakeholders' meetings for presentation of the salient points of the draft/final reports. Both will provide support in the procurement process for the selection of a service provider (i.e., publication of the TOR and assessment of proposals).

The UNDP M&E Analyst will brief the Evaluation Team on UNDP evaluation norms and standards, reviewing and quality assuring the inception/draft/final reports, and in publishing findings and management responses at the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center.

The Evaluation consultant will be responsible for implementing all evaluation-related activities and in producing the evaluation products listed in the deliverables section of this TOR. While the PMU will provide the information required and support in coordinating with stakeholders, the Evaluator will have to manage its own schedule and logistical arrangements in the conduct of interviews and site visits.

Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

F. Duration of Work

The Evaluator will be hired for an indicative period of 2.5 months, from 29 July 2019 to 18 October 2019. The contract may be extended upon the agreement of both parties.

G. Duty Station

The Evaluator's primary duty station is in Manila but he/she should be able to travel to locations within the country for fieldwork, consultations, and other on-site activities required for the evaluation. The Evaluator may be asked to report physically to UNDP as agreed during the inception report, and when physical participation, such as consultations with stakeholders and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) meetings, will be necessary.

H. Qualifications

The evaluator shall each have the following minimum qualifications:

Qualification	Points Obtainable (100 points max)
At least a Master's Degree in economics, political science, social science, public administration, business management, or other relevant fields. A higher degree as well as specialized training in M&E, project management, etc. are advantageous	20
At least five (5) years of work or consultancy experience in the monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects, with preference to those with demonstrated specialization/ experience in evaluations, and those with work experience in the government or international organizations.	20
A portfolio of at least two (2) published and unpublished research work in relevant policy/program areas and/or research output from consultancy projects in the last two (2) years. Research works may include applied research studies, e.g. evaluation, action research, policy papers, etc. At least one (1) of these should be an evaluation;	30
Demonstrated experience in the application of various quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, with demonstrated specialization in either quantitative or qualitative research, or both;	20
Fluency in the English language and proven ability to write high-quality technical reports (applicant will be required to provide work samples);	10
TOTAL	100

Specific Competencies

Core values

- Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards;
- Demonstrates professional competence to meet responsibilities and post

requirements and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;

- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

Core competencies;

- Results-Orientation: Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals, generates innovative, practical solutions to challenging situations;
- Communication: Excellent communication skills, including the ability to convey complex concepts and recommendations, both orally and in writing, in a clear and persuasive style tailored to match different audiences;
- Team work: Ability to interact, establish and maintain effective working relations with a culturally diverse team;
- Client orientation: Ability to establish and maintain productive partnerships with national partners and stakeholders and pro-activeness in identifying of beneficiaries and partners' needs and matching them to appropriate solutions.

I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The contract price is all-inclusive of remuneration and travel expenses that will be required during the conduct of the evaluation study. Likewise, the contract price is fixed regardless of the changes in cost caused by external and internal factors. The table below indicates the payment schedule:

Payment Schedule	Percentage of Contract Amount	Payment Conditions
1 st payment	20%	Upon submission of workplan
2 nd payment	20%	Upon submission and acceptance of inception report
3 rd payment	30%	Upon presentation of mission evaluation highlights and submission and acceptance of presentation materials Upon submission and acceptance of draft evaluation report
4 th and final payment	30%	Upon submission and acceptance of final evaluation report and other related documents

J. Recommended Presentation of Offer

For purposes of generating Offers whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative analysis, it is best to recommend the preferred contents and presentation of the Offer to be submitted, as well as the format/sequencing of their presentation. The following documents may be requested:

- a) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

- b) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. A methodology is recommended for intellectual services, but may be omitted for support services *[Note: this is optional for support services]*;
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

This section should indicate all the criteria which shall serve as basis for evaluating offers, which may be done in either of the following manner:

- a) Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max. of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%; or
- b) Lowest price method – where the award will be made to the qualified/responsive individual who offered the lowest price.

Option (a) is ideal for intellectual services where the methodology or approach to the work may differ from one individual to another and directly impacts the quality of the result. Option (b) is ideal for standard type of services where there are not many possible ways of undertaking/performing the work.

If Option (a) is chosen, the key criteria for rating the qualification and methodology must be stated together with their equivalent percentage weight, so that Offerors can craft their offer appropriately.


L. Annexes to the TOR

Pertinent documents on the project may be accessed through this link,
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1zWTbcJrzhyZsYsUMXhS_HrybgIZkotBJ?usp=sharing

Additional information can be provided by the project team upon the request of the evaluator.

M. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Signature	
Name and Designation	<u>Harvey Buena, Programme Manager</u>
Date of Signing	<u>1 JULY 2019</u>