



*Egypt*

Terms of Reference-

**Programme Title:** Social Fund for Development – Phase IV  
**Post Title:** Short Term Consultant for Project Evaluation (Open to national and international applicants)  
**Contract Duration:** 20 working days  
**Deadline for application:**

**I. BACKGROUND**

- The Social Fund for Development (SFD), established in 1991 with UNDP assistance, was a semi-autonomous institution chaired by the Prime Minister. UNDP has been a partner of the SFD since its inception in 1991 and has provided technical and institutional capacity development support. SFD's mandate was to: (1) Reduce poverty by supporting community level initiatives, (2) Increase job creation and employment opportunities, and (3) Encourage small and micro enterprise development. SFD applies UNDP Rules and Regulations in addition to the approved policies by its board.
- The current Phase IV of cooperation between UNDP and SFD started in 2008 was designed to a) further develop and enhance the technical and institutional capacities of SFD to become amongst the first tier of national development agencies operating in middle-income countries; and b) support SFD efforts aiming at taking all necessary exit measures to allow for it to become a sustainable organization that contribute in poverty reduction and job creation in Egypt, and to be able to finance its various activities from its own resources, with a board headed by the prime minister.
- In April 2017, Prime Ministers' decree no. 947 for year 2017 established the new entity "Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Development Agency" through the merger of the Social Fund for Development (SFD) and the Industrial Training Council (ITC). Some functions of, the Industrial Modernization Centre (IMC) and, the Technology and Innovation Industrial Council may be merged with the new Agency. The new agency will, in addition to the mandate given to the entities act as the entity concerned with the small, medium and micro enterprises as well as entrepreneurship. It will aim to put in place a national programme to develop, promote medium, small and micro-enterprises, and, and provide an adequate enabling environment for entrepreneurship development; encourage citizens to enter the job market



*Egypt*

through these enterprises; disseminate and promote the culture of entrepreneurship, research, creativity and innovation; coordinate all exerted efforts from the concerned agencies in this sector. The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Development Agency will also focus on legislative and institutional development of the entire sector; connecting and integrating the sector with local and global value chains and promoting the sector's contribution to exports; facilitating access to concessional financing. In addition to this new mandate, the Agency will carry one duties and responsibilities previously endorsed by its forming entities and in particular the former Social Fund for Development.

## II. OBJECTIVE

As an integral part of the project implementation cycle, UNDP will commission an independent project evaluation that will analyze the achievements of the project against its original objectives to provide project partners with an independent review of project outputs and an outlook on opportunities for future cooperation. The evaluation will review technical and managerial aspects and consider issues of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability.

The overall objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- Provide an objective assessment of the progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and the impact produced so far under the area of intervention
- Identify factors that have facilitated and/or impeded the achievement of objectives to generate lessons from experiences in the project respective interventions to inform current and future programming
- Evaluate the gender impact of the project through the various activities
- In light of the new mandate of the Agency , provide recommendation for strategic pillars of cooperation between the Agency and the UNDP, capitalizing on the capacity and knowledge basis created throughout the past phases of cooperation and taking into account the challenges and opportunities ahead. Provide clear and actionable recommendations to suggest effective and realistic future phase of cooperation for UNDP and the project partners.
- Upon consultation with the partners, provide a blue print for a new cooperation framework.

The evaluation timeframe covers the duration of the current project starting from 2008 to-date.



*Egypt*

### III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The project should be evaluated against the following criteria:

- *Relevance*: the degree to which the project was, and remained relevant in the context in which it is being implemented.
- *Efficiency/management*: assessing the outputs realized in relation to the inputs provided (project management structure...)
- *Effectiveness*: the extent to which the project objectives were achieved. Using evaluative evidence, the evaluation will analyze the contributing factors, unintended outcomes (positive or negative, direct or indirect)
- *Impact and sustainability*: the evaluation should assess the lasting change brought about by the project.
- *Gender and social inclusion sensitivity*: to what degree was the project sensitive to gender and social inclusion.

### IV. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation Questions should include at least the following questions:

- Were stated outputs achieved? If not, what progress toward the outputs has been made? To what extent the project has the project been able to build the institutional capacity of the SFD (now MSMEDA)?
- What factors have contributed to achieving (or not achieving) intended results?
- Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
- Did the project make the best use of its resources to achieve its results? Has the project been efficient in implementing its activities?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- What unintended change (positive/negative) has the project had on the targeted beneficiaries?
- What good practices are emerging from the project? What are the likelihood for good practices to be replicated or scaled up for sustainability purposes?
- To what extent the MSMEDA's operational and institutional structures (project management unit and systems) is strengthened to effectively implement activities? To what extent has



*Egypt*

UNDP support achieved its target and objectives according to the project plan and stated objectives?

- Has the project partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? To what extent has the project been able to build and promote its partnership with other relevant stakeholders for greater results?
- Are the results sustainable? What extent the project interventions have been institutionalized to ensure its sustainability?
- To what extent the current organizational set up is sustainable (financially and operationally)? What are the existing structures and functions that could ensure sustainability of project outcomes in the targeted areas?
- What can be done for strengthening the impact/achievements of the project?
- What are the issues and challenges to be addressed?
- What are the strategic areas of cooperation that can be identified between the partners that will capitalize on their competitive edges and create value on the national level in future cooperation initiatives?
- What kind of interventions can be considered for the future cooperation between MSME Agency and UNDP?
- How can the project be improved for its next phase?
- How to maximize the cooperation in a future set up (format, design...)?

Evaluation questions must be agreed upon between UNDP and MSMEDA and accepted or refined in consultation with the evaluator(s)

## V. METHODOLOGY

Applicants should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and do not have any conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator is expected to use suitable methods to obtain data and information for the analysis and draw up of findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations, in consultation with MSMEDA and UNDP



*Egypt*

Given the strategic relevance of this project, the evaluation is expected to contribute to apply an analytical approach not only to assessing the extent to which objectives have been reached but also identifying the reasons and determining factors behind the observed successes and shortcomings. It is important to take into account the importance of context specific factors affecting project implementation.

The evaluator is expected to suggest a methodology that demonstrates analytical rigor and data accuracy and validation, to support findings and recommendations. The suggested methodology for the evaluation could include:

- **Documentation review:** To review documents such as the project document, project brief, quarterly progress reports, Annual Project Reports (APR), Project Implementation Reports (PIR), Project Technical Reports, and minutes from relevant meetings (list of key documents is annexed)
- **Interviews** with MSMEDA Senior Management and staff, UNDP, and project partners. The Consultant will obtain initial briefings from UNDP and MSMEDA on the objectives and scope of evaluation and clarify any issues as required prior to submitting the inception report. Consult relevant stakeholders/partners of the project
- **Focus Groups:** Organize participatory stakeholders' workshop and focus group discussions to examine the relevant issues.
- **Probing the project outcome/output indicators**, going beyond these to explore other possible indicators, and determining whether the indicators have been continuously tracked.
- **Collecting** relevant information through meetings, consultative sessions, field visits, etc. Obtain other contextual information also as required.
- **Drafting** the evaluation report and making a presentation of findings and recommendations to MSMEDA and UNDP
- **Finalizing** the report with comments and inputs from various stakeholders and partners.

## VI. DELIVERABLES

- **Inception Brief** – The methodology that will be used by the evaluator should be presented in the inception brief and it must be agreed to by MSMEDA and UNDP. The brief will include an



*Egypt*

outline of the main evaluation issues that will be addressed, relevant evaluation questions and the proposed and final methodology that has been agreed upon before the evaluation is set

- **Draft evaluation report and Power Point Presentation on findings and recommendations:** These will be shared with both MSMEDA and UNDP for review following which a meeting will be held to discuss the draft report to ensure that it meets UNDP quality criteria and expectations as stipulated in the Terms of Reference
- **Final evaluation report (See Evaluation Report Template in Annex 3):** The report will be in English and no more than 30 pages in length. Annexes may be added. The Final report will include the evaluation methodology, a brief executive summary, lessons learned from the project and recommendations for the next phase of cooperation.

## VII. QUALIFICATIONS

- M.A. Degree in economics, development or related discipline.
- Technical expertise in the field of micro-finance and SMEs
- Demonstrated experience in leading evaluation studies in the above mentioned field(s);
- Good command of standard evaluation methods and approach
- Expertise in independent policy advice
- Excellent English, both written and spoken
- Good analytical and writing skills
- Good communication skills
- Knowledge and understanding of UNDP activities is an asset
- Experience in designing institutional development and capacity development projects is an asset

## VIII. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP. The UNDP Egypt Country Office is the main operational point for the evaluation and will be responsible for liaising with the



*Egypt*

project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with MSMEDA and other counterparts. The report will be cleared by UNDP and MSMEDA

Resources and Logistical Support Required: It is expected that at least one senior member of the project will accompany the evaluator during the visits in order to facilitate and provide clarifications where necessary. During the evaluation period, the team will require office accommodation that will be provided by the MSMEDA or UNDP as necessary.

Time-frame for the evaluation process: The evaluation will take place over a period of 6 weeks. The tentative schedule follows:

**a. Preparation Phase (1 week)**

UNDP and MSMEDA will provide the expert with a maximum number of relevant documents – such as project documents, internal progress reports and interim/annual reports for donors. The experts will study the documents as a preparation for evaluation of the project. UNDP gives briefing on the general background of the project such as: how the project was developed and how it was implemented.

**b. Assessment Phase (3 weeks)**

The experts will work at MSMEDA premises and will conduct interviews with stakeholders, counterparts and beneficiaries in order to learn about achievements and challenges and assess the impact of activities.

**c. Reporting Phase (2 weeks)**

The expert will provide an initial draft report to MSMEDA and UNDP one week after finalizing assessment phase. Comments will be provided within 5 working days.



## IX. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

### **Technical Proposal (70%):**

	Weight
Relevant experience	30
Proposed methodology, its appropriateness to the assignment, and timeliness of the implementation plan	50
Sample of previous relevant assignment	20
Total	100

### **Financial Proposal (30%)**

To be computed as a ratio of the Proposal's offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.

Applicants receiving a score less than 70% will be technically disqualified.

## X. TERMS OF PAYMENT

- 30% upon submission of Inception Report
- 30% upon submission of Draft Evaluation Report
- 40% upon submission of Final Report, Executive Summary, and Presentation





*Egypt*

## **XI. APPLICATION:**

Interested applicants must submit the following:

1. CV and Personal History Form (P11)
2. Proposed Methodology outlining how the Consultant will execute the assignment
3. Written sample of prior evaluation and/or assessment work
4. Detailed financial proposal including cost of expected travel outside Cairo

Applications should be submitted through an email titled “MSMEDA Project Evaluation” to the following e-mail address: [nazly.abdelazim@undp.org](mailto:nazly.abdelazim@undp.org)

Deadline for application is 18 October 2018

## **ANNEX I**

All UNDP Programme and project evaluations are to be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. Both documents can be found at the following link: <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business

Evaluators:

- Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
- Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.



*Egypt*

- Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

All staff engaged full or part time in evaluation must sign an Evaluation Staff Agreement Form at the start of their contract (see Annex 3).

## ANNEX 2

**Documents to be consulted**— This is a list of important documents and Webpages that the evaluator should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report.

- Project Documents and any revisions



*Egypt*

- United Nations Partnership Development Framework (UNPDF)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Quarterly Progress Report and detailed activity progress reports
- Project Annual reports
- Minutes of Board meetings and other project management meetings.
- Presentations and other inputs to Board Meetings and project management meetings
- Previous evaluations

### **ANNEX 3**

#### **United Nations Evaluation Group – Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

##### **Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form**

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

##### **Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:**

---

**Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):**

---

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**



*Egypt*

Signed at ( ) on ( )

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

#### ANNEX 4

##### EVALUATION REPORT TEMPLATE AND QUALITY STANDARDS

This evaluation report template is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Ethical Standards for Evaluations'.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience. The report should also include the following:

**Title and opening pages**—Should provide the following basic information:

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



*Egypt*

**Table of contents**—Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

**List of acronyms and abbreviations**

**Executive summary**—A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

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

**Introduction**—Should:

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies, or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention.)
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

**Description of the intervention**—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and asses the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:



*Egypt*

- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other programme or country specific plans and goals.
- Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).

**Evaluation scope and objectives**—The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- **Evaluation scope**—The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- **Evaluation objectives**—The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.



*Egypt*

- Evaluation criteria—The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- Evaluation questions—Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

**Evaluation approach and methods**—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- Data sources—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- Performance standards—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder participation—Stakeholders' participation in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).70



*Egypt*

- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- Major limitations of the methodology—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

**Data analysis**—The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

**Findings and conclusions**—The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- Findings—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.
- Conclusions—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users.





*Egypt*

**Recommendations**—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming.

**Lessons learnt**—As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

**Report annexes**—Suggested annexes include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators