<u>Terms of Reference</u>

MID TERM REVIEW

Township Democratic Local Governance (TDLG) Project

ASSIGNMENT TITLE:	**Team Leader for Mid Term Review of TDLG Project**
DURATION:	**September-November (29 fee days)**
REPORTING LINE:	**Chief of Unit, Governance and Sustainable Peace**
	UNDP Myanmar
DUTY STATION:	**Home based and Yangon with field travel**

1. Background and context

Since the adoption of the new constitution in 2008, Myanmar is on a path towards greater political, administrative and fiscal decentralization. Central to this process is the shift of decision-making power and budgets from the union level to the subnational level. State/Region governments and State/Region parliaments have been established, with their own budgets, their own decision-making power and their own accountability mechanisms, including checks and balances. However, the township administrations have so far been largely left out of this decentralization process.

In Myanmar the public services are largely delivered through township level administration where people interact with public service providers but the township administrations have little, if any, influence over budget decisions. This situation hinders township officials from effectively addressing local needs, discourages public participation in planning and decision-making processes, and sustains a local governance structure with weak accountability and transparency.

<u>About the Project:</u> Township Democratic Local Governance Project (TDLG) addresses the institutional challenges in Myanmar's local governance structures, emphasizing planning at the township level as one entry point in trying to make local governments more inclusive and responsive to people's needs. The project is designed along four work streams to strengthen the capacities of township administrations to meet local needs for public services; to facilitate information sharing and meaningful participation by the public in planning processes; to facilitate township administrations engaging with Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAOs) on service delivery coordination (and involve them in township planning processes); to foster participation of civil society in local governance/ township planning ; and to utilize lessons learned by the project to advocate for policy change.

TDLG Project document was signed in November 2017 with the expected completion date of the first phase in December 2020.

The primary beneficiaries of the project are men and women of target townships in Bago Region and Mon State. The ultimate beneficiaries are the population of Myanmar as the project aims to develop *systems* of good local governance and fiscal decentralization to the lowest administrative level.

TLDG works with government institutions at all levels ((Union, State/Regions (S/R) and township)) and applies the introduced democratic (local) governance systems and processes, while recognizing the general population, as well as non-State actors. TDLG therefore provides a feedback loop through information, consultation, civic engagement and civil society forums, whereby the township administrations can practice and learn to be more transparent and participatory providing concrete opportunities for an expanded range of local actors through Ward/Village Tract Administrators (W/VTAs), 10 house hold leaders, and Hluttaw (parliament) members (as their elected representatives), Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and EAOs together with township administrations to engage in inclusive processes that may generate learning and inspire wider democratic transition initiatives beyond the scope of this project. Another essential part of the project is to address issues of inclusiveness, particularly with regards to women in official local governance structures and their ability to engage in and inform planning processes— thereby providing them voice and participation. To this end, the project started working with the INGO Oxfam to strengthen CSO's participation and strengthen women's leadership skills for their meaningful participation in township planning process in Mon State.

TDLG is using local development grants as an incentive to enhance institutional change, test fiscal decentralization and develop local governance systems. TDLG covers 10 townships in Mon State and 5 in Bago Region. Apart from Mon State and Bago Region, TDLG also covers 5 townships in Rakhine State through the Rakhine Area-Based Programme (RABP).

The TDLG Project Document includes provisions for conducting a mid-term and final project evaluations. To comply with the Project Document's requirements, this mid-term evaluation is initiated *to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability"* of TDLG activities in Bago Region and Mon State.

Total budget: As per the Project Document, the total budget of TDLG for Bago region and Mon State is about USD 19 million for the period of November 2017 – December 2020. The project structure is composed of an international Chief Technical Advisor, international Project Manager, international UNV responsible for M&E, as well as a national Project Management Analyst, Project Associate and 2 drivers. The project staff in Bago and Mon comprise 2 Senior Technical Specialists and 15 Township Governance Officers.

Key partners: As per the Project Document, the project is primarily focusing on sub-national governance, particularly at the level of township administrators. The key partner is the Government of Myanmar. At the State/Region level, the primary partners are the state/region governments, the Township Planning and Implementation Committees (TPIC) represented by different government departments. Others include W/VTAs, representatives of Parliament, EAOs, CSOs, as well as Oxfam and SDC, DFID and other donors.

Observed changes in the Project:

The TDLG project has been working with the General Administration Department (GAD) as a key partner since the beginning of the project. An important decision was taken by the Government in early 2019 to move GAD from the Ministry of Home Affairs to the newly established Ministry of the Office of the Union Government. This move might have

implications for further decentralization reforms. It is foreseen that the GAD will play a greater role in drafting new policies affecting union and sub national administrative reform in the future. Currently there are no known changes in GAD's mandate.

Additionally, a recent development is the decision of Bago Region government to allocate 57% of its regional budget to townships prior to the start of FY 2018/2019 annual planning process. The funds will be allocated through a need-based allocation formula, which is an approach that is based on the successful partnership between the Government and the TDLG project that also uses a need-based allocation formula.

Finally, despite the fact that township level has so far been largely left out of the decentralization process, important initiatives have been taken to increase information to citizens about public affairs such as the publication of the Citizen Budget that explains the governments budget cycle at both Union and State/Region level and is used by Government to enhance transparency and accountability. Citizens budgets are now developed in almost all states and regions and the TDLG is supporting governments in their dissemination of the Citizens budget to the public.

Key challenges: The project faced some challenges in implementing project activities such as problems with filling the Project Manager position and frequent rotations within the Government requiring continuity of capacity development support provided by the project. Systemic engagement of formal structures such as TPICs was also found critical for more sustainable development outcomes.

The political context and national level dialogue on peace process have had an impact on local level in terms of how sub-national administrations perceive and how EAOs react to it. Further restrictions from Union government have made the project's engagement with EAOs even more challenging. These restrictions have slowed down the interventions requested by the EAOs, particularly facilitation of township level meetings between the EAOs and township officials from the respective departments.

Identifying best practices for engagement of CSOs in participatory planning processes at the sub-national level has also been a challenge. Different partnership arrangements with regards to CSO engagement were sought and put in place in Bago Region and Mon State and more learning is required to explore the most feasible option for CSO engagement. UNDP's partnership with Oxfam, which is emphasizing the role of Civil society's engagement with township administrations on social accountability, is specifically designed to create entry points and constructive spaces for township administrations and local CSOs and interest-based groups, including women's groups, to amplify local issues in the planning process and testing social accountability tools to strengthen the social contract between the government and citizens.

Cross-cutting issues: According to UNDP Programme and Project Management policies "all programming applies the core principles of human rights, gender equality, resilience and sustainability, and leaving no one behind. Social and environmental sustainability are systematically integrated. Potential harm to people and the environment is avoided wherever possible, and otherwise minimized, mitigated and managed".

As such women's participation in the township planning process is an essential area of work where the project applies two-pronged approach to integrate gender equality into planning processes and to support women to utilize the enabling environment to advocate for women's concerns. The project uses a systematic participatory planning methodology and all township plans were prepared in line with the principles of good local governance (inclusivity, participation, cross-sectoral analysis, while using data and statistics). In addition, the planning process also covers the level of elected representatives (10 household leaders) to improve the gender balance amongst people's representatives in selection of projects.

In the TDLG project, a conflict sensitive approach is applied through engagement with government, partners, civil society, community leaders to improve prospects for non-discrimination, fulfilment of human rights and to promote principles of equality and inclusion.

A large component of TDLG involves the implementation of infrastructure projects. Even in stable environments, infrastructure projects may cause disagreements and even tensions if area-specific matters and the needs of diverse groups are not duly considered at the planning stage. Conflict sensitivity considerations are not just important in relation to immediate project implementation but equally the impact of the project on community relationships. Infrastructure plans should ensure that clear roles, capacity, and resources will be in place for longer term maintenance of these infrastructures.

Linkage with the partner Government's strategies and priorities: The TDLG project is guided by the principles of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) on strengthening of institutions, including use of data, inclusive participation, policy coherence, leave no one behind, human-rights based approach, and conflict sensitivity, among others, and promotes the achievement of the SDGs at the local level. TDLG specifically contributes to SDG 16 on peaceful communities and just, responsible and accountable institutions.

TDLG also contributes to the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (2018-2030) - MSDP:

- *Goal 1: "Peace, National Reconciliation, Security and Good Governance" through the Strategy 1.4: "Enhance good governance, institutional performance and improve the efficiency of administrative decision making at all levels" and Strategy 1.5: "Increase the ability of all people to engage with the government"*
- Goal 2: *"Economic Stability and strengthened macroeconomic management"* through the Strategy 2.4: *Strengthened Public Financial Management to support stability and the efficient allocation of public resources.*

TDLG contributes to the following outcome of the UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021): *"Citizen Expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance"* and the following Outputs of UNDP's Country Programme Document (2018 – 2022) - CPD:

- CPD Output 1.1: Effective public institution enabled to develop and implement evidence-based policies and systems that respond to the needs of the people

- CPD Output 1.2: Institutions at union and subnational levels enabled to develop effective systems and procedures for performing their representative and oversight functions.

Project Summary:

PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Township Democratic Local Governance Project	
Atlas ID	00089167	
Corporate outcome and output	CPD outcome 1.1	
Country	Myanmar	
Region	Bago Region, Mon State	
Date project document signed	11.12.2017	
Project dates	**Start**	**Planned end**
	01.11.2017	31.12.2020
Project budget	**19,130,175 USD** (total budget required as per project document) Switzerland (SDC): 10,028,106 United Kingdom (DFID): 5,173,656 Sweden (SIDA): 158,179[1]	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	**3,204,714.92 USD[2]**	
Funding source	Switzerland (SDC), United Kingdom (DFID), Sweden (SIDA)	
Implementing party	UNDP Myanmar	
Responsible Party	Oxfam (Output 2)	

---

[1] SIDA contribution budgeted in 2018 and 2019 for local governance work under UNDP's SERIP project output 4. While this contribution is not part of the TDLG project per se but the SERIP project, it is acknowledged here as it also contributes to achieving results in Bago and Mon, and at the union level.

[2] This amount reflects latest available expenditure data for 2017 and 2018 for SIDA, SDC and DFID funds. Expenditure for Jan-Jun 2019 will be available during July 2019.

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) will assess the progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document and identify early signs of project success and areas for improvement that will guide the future direction of the project.

The specific objectives of this mid-term evaluation are to review and make recommendations related to;

- Participatory Planning process at township level, evidence-based success factors and sustainability;
- Engagement with EAOs and CSOs;
- Advocacy for policy change based on lessons learned by the project;
- Partnership arrangements with the Implementing Partners put in place by the project and their effectiveness;
- Document challenges, successes, lessons learnt of the project in line with project design, also evaluating how conflict sensitive programme management (CSPM) and gender mainstreaming have been applied in the project.

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

The MTR will be conducted in line with OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

The key questions to be addressed during the evaluation include:

Relevance:
- To what extent is the project in line with sub-national and national development priorities (MSDP), CPD outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent did the project follow a clear theory of change built with stakeholders?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design and implementation?
- 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 and implementation processes?
- Are the project's objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame? If not, does it provide space for flexibility to be responsive to policy changes that would directly affect the achievement of project objectives?
- How did the project promote UNDP principles of gender equality, inclusiveness, human rights-based approach, and human development? How were these cross-cutting areas mainstreamed into the project?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc. changes in the country e.g. the move of GAD to the Ministry of the Office of the Union Government in December 2018, or the withdrawal of the Karen National Union (KNU) from official peace talks in 2018,

the signing of the National Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) by the New Mon State Party (NMSP) in February 2018, etc.?

Effectiveness

- To what extent does the project contribute to country program outcomes and outputs, national development priorities (MSDP), UNDP strategic plan and SDGs?
- To what extent were the project outputs and objectives achieved? Which of these outputs and objectives are being achieved, and where is the project facing challenges and which ones?
- Is the objective of the project clearly articulated in relevant documents and translated into operational practices?
- What have been the main limiting factors constraining the project's effectiveness? How were they mitigated by the project? How likely is it that these factors will remain or change until the end of the project (and what that means in terms of changing directions for the project)?
- To what extend has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective including engagement with non-government actors (CSOs and EAOs)? Have these actors been successfully integrated into project implementation? Are there other models/ partnership arrangements/ approaches that need to be considered to better achieve project outputs 2 and 3 (engagement with CSOs and EAOs) and if yes, what would they look like?
- How are different stakeholder views considered in project implementation?
- How does the project engage with actors and processes beyond grants? What are the areas where it can influence change (i.e. around broader local governance systems, democratization and decentralization)?

Efficiency

1. To what extend was the project management structure (e.g. project boards) as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
2. To what extent have the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective (e.g. value for money)? To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources?
3. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and at the right time to achieve outcomes? To what extent have resources been used efficiently?
4. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management? What are the key areas of learning in the first two years, are there robust learning/feedback loops, and how has the project adapted in response?
5. What are the linkages (i.e. data and parliament engagement) that have been found to be important to project success, and how well are these being integrated?
6. Are the risks of the project clearly assessed – and accurate? Does the project have sufficient ability to adapt to changing context and mitigating risk?
7. Is the strategic approach (piloting/one state one region) assumptions of the project effective in meeting the objectives of demonstration/influence?

8. How does the project objective fit with the political and institutional incentives of the key actors – and how does a better understanding of these incentives shape the direction of the project?

Sustainability

1. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?

2. Are there any social, financial, political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs?

3. To what extent do the activities of the project contribute to sustainable changes in the country (both at beneficiary level and national/policy level)?

4. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?

5. To what extend did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?

6. To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives? What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?

7. How are linkages between other actors/development partners programmes established, and what is the influence of TDLG?

8. Should the project explore to initiate an expansion to other geographic areas? Does TDLG need to explore other models of delivering local governance work to be more sustainable (e.g. focus on technical assistance in combination with Government cost sharing/ loans received by Gov to cover the implementation of grants)? Any other recommendations related to upscaling/ replication of the TDLG model?

9. What is the long-term sustainability plan? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

Human rights

- To what extend the beneficiaries (right holders) have participated in various stages of planning, implementation and monitoring/evaluation of project activities?
- 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

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

Conflict Sensitivity/Do No Harm

- To what extent has engagement with government, partners, civil society, community leaders, EAOs is improving prospects for non-discrimination, human rights and principles of equality and inclusion
- Which government authorities and which EAO institutions are we working with and to what extent are they considered legitimate and trusted by all communities in all project locations?
- To what extent have conflict sensitivity considerations been integrated into project design, implementation and M&E to ensure TDLG intervention do No Harm?
- What is the impact of the project interventions on stakeholder (government, EAOs and communities) relationships
- What measures has the project put in place to ensure that governance structures are not unintentionally reinforcing tensions, conflict, discrimination and exclusion but rather strengthening social cohesion through project activities?
- Might any of our actions, including mitigation measures to limit escalating tensions between project stakeholders unintentionally contribute to conflict including non-participation of EAOs in mixed controlled areas?
- How is the project addressing any grievances that are arising from our programming, especially mixed controlled areas?

4 Methodology:

The evaluation will be conducted primarily to assess the progress of the project against the project document to assess against the context to provide recommendations for any adjustments to the project design, management and implementation. The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase.

A suggestive list of approaches for information review/analysis are as follows and the consultant team are expected to present a more robust methodology, including data sources, in the proposal and the 'inception report':

The evaluation design will include both the qualitative and quantitative methods involving primary and secondary data collection.

- **Desk review of all relevant documentation**. This would include a review of inter alia

    - MSDP, CPD and Project document (contribution agreement).

    - Theory of change and results framework, including monitoring system.

    - Programme and project quality assurance reports.

    - Annual workplans.

    - Activity designs.

    - Semi-annual and Annual progress reports.

    - Monitoring reports.

    - Minutes of project board meetings.

    - Risk matrix and mitigation measures

    - EAO engagement strategy for TDLG

    - Country Programme Conflict sensitivity mainstreaming strategy

    - Other secondary documentation

- **Interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, members of parliament, donor community members, representatives of key international and national civil society organizations, EAOs and implementing partners to gather diverse views from stakeholders engaged in project implementation.

    - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.

    - **Surveys questionnaires, guidelines for interviews and Focus group discussions** to be reviewed/finalized and pretested.

- **Visit to selected field sites** and undertake **key informant interviews** with government officials, and other stakeholders who have been involved in implementing activities under the program and/or participated in various program activities, and program's beneficiaries. **Focus Group Discussions** to be held whenever appropriate. All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.

- **Other methods** such as observational visits (keeping in mind the requirement of seeking prior travel approval as required by Government)

- **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 Evaluation Steering Committee, UNDP and the evaluators.

5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

The evaluation team will be accountable for producing following Deliverables/Expected outputs. These products include:

Deliverables	Payments
■ **Evaluation inception report (max 10 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. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection and analysis procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.	25 percent
■ **Evaluation debriefings.** Debriefing meetings should be held (i) after collecting primary data from the field focusing on the initial findings and observations and (ii) a formal briefing should be held at the end of the mission including a power point presentation with all major findings and recommendations.	
■ **Draft Midterm evaluation report (within an agreed length).**[3] Draft Mid-Term Evaluation report with all major findings and recommendations. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time,	25 percent

---

[3] A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.

addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.	
▪ **Presentation of draft report** to evaluation steering committee	
▪ **Final Draft Mid-Term Evaluation report** incorporating comments received, and including a clear succinct Executive Summary ▪ **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.	
▪ **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation steering committee**	
▪ **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.	
▪ **Final evaluation report.** The final report should be accompanied by digital copies of the processed data files, transcripts and associated materials.	50 percent

6. Institutional arrangements

6.1 Reporting line:

The Consultant will report to the Chief of Unit, Governance and Sustainable Peace Unit.

6.2 Logistical arrangements:

- For all international travel:
    - Candidates are requested to include international travel costs from probable point of departure in the financial proposal and arrange the flight. The travel cost should be based on the most economical class fare, with most direct routes.
    - UNDP will provide support for the visa process and reimburse the visa fee, based on the actual receipt.
    - UNDP will provide terminal charges at the applicable UN rate.
    - UNDP does not consider travel days as working days.
- For all in-country travels:
    - For in-country missions, UNDP will arrange, and cover costs related to all domestic travels – such as transportation(s) between the agreed in-county duty stations and living allowances - in accordance with UNDP's regulations and policies.
    - UNDP will facilitate security clearances required to travel in-country (if applicable).
- Other logistical matters:
    - The Contractor is expected to use their own computer.

7. Evaluation team composition and required competencies of Team Leder

The MTR team should consist of four **members** including **an experienced Team Leader (International)** with documented experience of fiscal decentralization and local governance, **a technical person with expertise on conflict sensitivity and gender (International), a person with documented experience of Myanmar's context (national)** and **a person who brings experience in translating/interpreting**. The members should have extensive knowledge about the country context and local governance issues. Both national and international expertise will be combined to ensure quality, innovation and local context. Fluency in English is required of all team members.

The team leader (International) should have

Qualification and Work Experience
- advanced degree (Master's or preferably Ph.D.) in social sciences, development studies, local governance and fiscal decentralization, political sciences, public administration, international relations and/or related fields.
- a minimum of 15 years of demonstrated experience in leading evaluation of development projects and programs on local governance, democratization and fiscal decentralization.
- documented experience of local development grants
- proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing
- proven track record of working in conflict affected /fragile states
- knowledge of the national/regional situation and context;
- work experience in South East Asia and in Myanmar would be an asset.
- excellent command of English in speaking and writings.

The Team Leader is responsible for the timely completion and submission of all deliverables. The specific responsibilities include

- Desk review of relevant documents
- Lead in drafting and finalizing inception report and final report
- Take a lead in collecting primary and secondary information, analysis and report writing
- Capture and integrate the perspectives of key stakeholders, including, government, development partners/donors, CSOs etc.
- Take a lead in sharing information and making presentations/debriefings
- Ensure comments are sufficiently addressed in the MTR report
- Ensure to incorporate analysis on cross cutting issues (Human rights, Gender and Conflict Sensitivity)

8. Evaluation ethics

The evaluation is expected to adhere to a framework supporting human rights-based (HRBA), results-oriented and gender responsive monitoring and evaluation. Towards this purpose, the project evaluation will encompass the principles of gender equality and human rights,

ensuring that the evaluation process respects these normative standards, and aims for the progressive realization of same by respecting, protecting and fulfilling obligations of non-discrimination, access to information, and ensuring participation through a combination of consultative and participatory evaluation approaches.

9. Implementation arrangements

Evaluation management structure

1. **Evaluation Commissioners (EC):** Senior management who owns the evaluation
2. **Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC):** Key project stakeholders as advisory
3. **Evaluation Management Group (EMG):** Selected members for day to day management
4. **Evaluation Manager (EM):** Programme specialist as Lead for evaluation management
5. **Evaluators:** Third party

Detail of roles and responsibility of evaluation management structure is mentioned below:

1. **Evaluation Commissioners (EC):** Country office senior management, who "own" the evaluation plan for their programme/project. The key role of the EC will be the following:
   - Lead and ensure the development of a comprehensive, representative, strategic and costed evaluation plan
   - Responsible for the timely implementation of the evaluation plan
   - Ensure evaluability of UNDP initiatives: clear and comprehensive results frameworks are in place and effective monitoring is implemented
   - Establish appropriate institutional arrangement to manage evaluation- appoint evaluation manager;
   - Safeguard the independence of the exercise and ensure quality of evaluation;
   - Ensure management response are prepared and implemented
   - Accountable for quality and approval of final TOR, Final evaluation report and mgt responses

2. **Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC):** Key project stakeholders, government partners and/ or donors including representatives from project management boards. The key role of the Evaluation Steering Committee will be the following:
   - This is the primary decision-making entity for the evaluation as it consists of members of the evaluation commissioners and other key stakeholders
   - Perform advisory role throughout the evaluation process
   - Composition and level of engagement of ESC can be discussed and finalized with consensus during finalization of ToR
   - Endorse the ToR for the evaluation
   - Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation
   - Ensure that evaluation standards, as provided by UNEG, are adhered to, including safeguarding of transparency and independence
   - Provide advice on the evaluation's relevance, on the appropriateness of evaluation questions and methodology and on the extent to which conclusions and

recommendations are both credible considering the evidence that is presented and are action-oriented
- Review the evaluation products, provide feedback and ensure final draft meets quality standards. Endorse the final evaluation report
- Endorse the communication plan for the dissemination of evaluation findings. Communication plan to be prepared by evaluation task manager
- Review and endorse management response to the evaluation
- Ensure participation of donors as observers in the selection of consultants/ consultancy firms to carry out the MTR

3. **Evaluation Management Group (EMG):** Programme unit head/Programme Specialist, M&E focal point of the project; Project Manager, QA and Reporting Specialist of Country offices. This group will support the Evaluation Manager for the day-to-day management of the evaluation process. More specifically, it will:
   - Prepare the terms of reference for the evaluation in consultation with the Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC);
   - Ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation in alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
   - Support the Evaluation Manager for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation activities and management of the evaluation budget;
   - Hire the team of external consultants
   - Ensure participation of relevant stakeholders;
   - Review and provide substantive comments to the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework, methodology, and evaluation matrix;
   - Substantive feedback on the draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes, and to ensure that the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable;
   - Inform the Evaluation Steering Committee on progress;
   - Prepare management response to the evaluation for ESC's review
   - Contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.

4. **Evaluation Manager (EM):** Program Officer from the country office. Evaluation manager will work as the Secretariat of the EMG.
   - Participate in all stages of the evaluation process: (a) evaluability assessment;
   - (b) preparation; (c) implementation and management; and (d) use of the evaluation
   - Lead the development of the evaluation terms of reference
   - Participate in the selection/ recruitment of external evaluators
   - Safeguard the independence of evaluations
   - Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data and documentation
   - Liaise with the programme/project manager(s) throughout the evaluation process Connect the evaluators with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation

- Review and approve inception reports including evaluation questions and methodologies
- Review and comment on draft evaluation reports, circulate draft and final evaluation reports Collect and consolidate comments on draft evaluation reports and share with the evaluation team for finalization of the evaluation report
- Contribute to the development of management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP
- Ensure evaluation terms of reference, final evaluation reports, management responses, lessons learned, and other relevant information are publicly available through the ERC within the specified time frame
- Facilitate, monitor and report on a quarterly basis implementation of management responses and key actions
- Facilitate knowledge-sharing and use of findings in programming and decision-making

5. **Evaluation team:** This team has to be a third-party firm/group/individuals who have never been involved directly or as implementing partners in any part of the project/program design, advisory role and/or implementation of any component of the project. Their tasks will be as per the ToR and contractual agreement:
- Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the terms of reference as appropriate
- Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix, in line with the terms of reference
- Keep to standards and ethical principles in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
- Draft reports and brief the evaluation manager, programme/project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations
- Finalize the evaluation, taking into consideration comments and questions on the evaluation report. Evaluators' feedback should be recorded in the audit trail
- Deliver the products agreed to the right standard and quality;
- Account for what the team has done (and spent).

10. **Timelines**

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE	PLACE
Phase One: Desk review and inception report			
Briefing meeting with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	1 day	September	Remotely
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	3 days	September	Remotely
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	September	
Phase Two: Data-collection mission			
Initial consultations with UNDP, donors and concerned stakeholders (Yangon)	5 days	September	In country
Field visits, in-depth interviews and focus group discussions	10 days	October	In country
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day	October	In country
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing			
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages)	5 days	October	Remotely
Draft report submission	-	October	
Debriefing	1 day	November	Remotely
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments	3 days	November	Remotely
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	November	Remotely
Estimated total days for the evaluation	**29**		

11. Application submission process and criteria for selection

The application submission process -*both financial and technical* is included in the RFP.

Criteria for selecting the best offer

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, qualified individuals are expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly, the individuals will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following conditions:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable as per the Instruction to Bidders (ITB) of the Standard Bid Document (SBD), and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
  a. Technical Criteria weight is 70%
  b. Financial Criteria weight is 30%

Recommended presentation of technical proposal

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, the individuals are advised to use a proposed Table of Contents.

Confidentiality and proprietary interests

The consultants shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy or the Government without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of the UNDP. This assignment will be administrated by UNDP hence UNDP rules, policies and procedures will apply.

Proposed standard technical proposal evaluation criteria

Technical Proposal Evaluation: Proposed methodology, approach and implementation plan	
To what degree does the Proposer understand the task?	4
Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	4
Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	4
Is the methodology well explained and meets the ToR requirements?	4
Is the presentation clear? Is the sequence of actions and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient delivery of the task?	4
Sub total	**20**
Technical Proposal Evaluation: Education and qualifications	

July 2019 | UNDP MYANAMAR COUNTRY OFFICE- TDLG MID TERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

advanced degree (Master's or preferably Ph.D.) in social sciences, development studies, local governance and fiscal decentralization, political sciences, public administration, international relations and/or related fields.	8
a minimum of 15 years of demonstrated experience in leading evaluation of development projects and programs on local governance, democratization and fiscal decentralization	10
documented experience of local development grants	7
proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing	7
proven track record of working in conflict affected /fragile states	7
knowledge of the national/regional situation and context	6
excellent command of English in speaking and writings.	5
Sub total	**50**
Total	**70**

12. TOR annexes

Below is a list of annexes to the ToR that provide additional detail about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the evaluation:
- Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan
- UNDP Strategic Plan (2018 – 2022)
- UNDP Country Program Document (2018-2022)
- TDLG Project Document (2017 – 2020)
- TDLG Annual Progress Report 2018
- TDLG Fast Facts 2018
- UNDP Evaluation Policy
- UNEG Norms and Standards
- UNDP Evaluation Guidelines
- TDLG Procurement Guidelines
- TDLG Grant Manual
- TDLG Monitoring and Evaluation framework

Evaluation matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report).
Sample evaluation matrix

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