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|  | **UNITED NATIONS JOB DESCRIPTION** |

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Position Information** |
| Job Code Title: Terminal Evaluation  Supervisor: UN Team and M&E Focal Point  Level: Individual Consultant  Duration: 45 days  Duty Station: Harare |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| II. Organizational Context |
| In 2019, the United Nations Secretary General’s Peacebuilding Fund supported the “Building Trust and Confidence in Zimbabwe’s Transition” Project **(See attached project document).** The support was provided to contribute to;  *Improved national capacities for gender and youth inclusive dialogue, consensus-building and reconciliation, with participation of marginalized and at-risk groups (women, youth and people living with disabilities)*  The support was mainly meant to support confidence building in Zimbabwe’s transition through a broad-based approach around three inter-linked output areas namely:   1. Dialogue, engagement and accountability mechanisms for stakeholder and citizen participation in the Transitional Stabilization Programme (TSP) and the National Development Strategy as per the project’s no cost extension. **(See attached approved No Cost Extension)** 2. Improved dispute resolution services and social protection systems in marginalized and at-risk communities. 3. National healing and reconciliation strategy implemented by the NPRC in collaboration with key stakeholders   During the design of the project a collaborative approach was adopted in the design of the programme benefiting from three levels of in-country stakeholder consultations. First, was during Phase 1 of the joint UN/WB/AfDB Needs Assessment – which led to the production of a sectoral notes (6) on Social Cohesion and Citizen Participation and (17) on Social Protection respectively. Consultations were held with national counterparts including the Government (Office of the President and Cabinet, Ministry of Finance and other line Ministries); independent commissions including the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission and the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission – Civil Society and Faith Based organizations – including women and youth groups. Development partners – including international organizations were consulted in the process. Second phase of consultations was after the elections, coinciding with the joint PBSO-DPA-UNDP HQ Mission to Zimbabwe. During this mission, further consultations were held with the Government (through the Office of Vice President); civil society organizations; international NGOs, development partners, youth, and women organizations to validate the priority areas and assess the post-election risk factors). Internally, a technical inter-agency committee comprised of UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP and UN Women has collaboratively steered the design of this project.  The project seeks to contribute to SDG16 on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. The project was also meant to contribute to the Z**UNDAF outcome on Public Administration and Governance** **Outcome 2** on *Increased citizen participation in democratic processes in line with the provisions of the Constitution and relevant international norms and standards* and the **Social Services and Protection** **Outcome 3** which seeks to see Households living below the food poverty line having improved access to and utilization of social protection services. From a gender perspective, the **Project also sought to contribute to ZUNDAF Outcome 2.2 which focuses on empowering women and girls to effectively participate in social, economic, and political spheres.**  From a financial perspective, the project was availed with a budget of USD$3,143,861.00 from the Peacebuilding Fund and catalytic funding of approximately USD$400,000 from the UNDP Country Office and UNDP Global. In a bid to scale-up the project and design a successor project, additional funding of NOK1,000,000.00 was made available by the Royal Norwegian Government. |

|  |
| --- |
| III. EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES |
| The main aim of the final project evaluation is to highlight and analyse the results, identify challenges, lessons learnt, good practices, conclusions and recommendations That will help to improve future joint programming, strengthen organisational learning and accountability. The UN family in Zimbabwe, through the UNDP Zimbabwe Country Office, is commissioning this evaluation on good governance to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project, which can be used to strengthen existing programmes and/or to set the stage for new initiatives. More importantly it will inform the planning and prioritization in this area for the new CPD expected to be developed before the end of 2021 and which will be set for approval later in 2021 for implementation under a new programme cycle from January 2022.  The purpose of the evaluation is to generate lessons to deepen understanding of how the project was designed, managed, and implemented, as well as identifying its results. The following specific objectives will be key to the Evaluation:   1. Assess the performance of the project in achieving planned results and contribution to achievement of UN Country Programme Document (CPD), UN Strategic Plan and Government of Zimbabwe development goals and results; 2. Identify and assess the strengths, weaknesses, constraints and opportunities of the Building Trust and Confidence in Zimbabwe’s Transition Project and to recommend any necessary changes or course correction measures in the implementation and design of future similar development initiatives; 3. Look at the peace infrastructure and draw out potential advantages it may bring to Zimbabwe as formal infrastructure for conflict resolution and prevention; and 4. Draw, based on above objectives, lessons and recommendations for sustaining the Building Trust and Confidence in Zimbabwe project results, and providing guidance for the future strategic direction peacebuilding projects in Zimbabwe.   In a broader context the evaluation will ultimately serve as an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Zimbabwe with an impartial assessment of the results of the peacebuilding support. The evaluation will also provide perspective on the ever-evolving peace and peacebuilding context in the country and priorities that have an impact on governance. It will also provide the Country Office with insights as relates for needs for strategic re-alignments and prioritization with a specific focus within its peacebuilding sphere of work. |
| KEY QUESTIONS  |  |  | | --- | --- | | KEY/EVALAUATION COMPONENTS | EVALUATION COMPONENTS | | Relevance and Strategic Positioning | * To what extent are the respective UN Agencies engagement in governance support a reflection of strategic considerations, including UN’s role in the particular development context in Zimbabwe and its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners? * To what extent has been the method of delivery been appropriate to the development context? * Has UNDP, UN-Women & UNICEF been influential in national debates on governance and peace issues and has it influenced national policies on legal reforms, human rights protection and peace and reconciliation efforts? * To what extent has the project influenced the relevance of peacebuilding support to Zimbabwe in the Governance and Peacebuilding sector | | Process | * How was the project conceived and designed? What was the role of each development partner design/modification/implementation? To what extent was it participatory and done through consultations? * Was there a conflict analysis, involving input from a wide range of stakeholders? Was there a geographic mapping of high needs areas and a prioritizing of peacebuilding needs? How would/did that have helped? * When additional funds were received in the course of the implementation, what was the role of contributing partners in designing, modifying, and implementing project activities? * Were there special components built in for women, youth & children and for any particular hotspot areas? * Was there a capacity assessment (including HACT assessments) of any of the program relevant institutions (not only at national level but local and especially in high‐risk areas) * Was there a Project LPAC at which efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, value for money, gender dimensions were discussed and addressed? * Was the results framework developed with SMAR indicators? Was that relevant and did it help? Was the RRF utilized as a monitoring instrument during implementation? * To what extent did UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women work together towards common strategic objectives? * What was the process for compiling project reports and work plans, and their quality? * How effective was the project management in providing technical oversight? * How well did the monitoring system function? Was baseline data collected/available/used in measuring achievements? * How were the principles of do no harm integrated in day‐to‐day management and oversight? * How did the programme evolve due to changing context- in view of COVID-19? What programme adaptations were made and what were the effects to the programmes’ results. | | Effectiveness | * What evidence is there that the support has contributed towards an improvement in government capacity, including institutional strengthening? * Has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women worked effectively with other UN Agencies and other international and national delivery partners to deliver governance and peacebuilding services? * How effective has UNDP been in partnering with civil society to promote peace and good governance in Zimbabwe * Has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women utilised innovative approaches, techniques and best practices in its peacebuilding and governance programming? * Is UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving government and peacebuilding effectiveness and integrity in Zimbabwe? * Considering the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women country office, is UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women well suited to providing governance and peacebuilding support to the country? * What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women performance in this area? * As a supplement to project and other reports, implementing partners and stakeholders will be queried, as appropriate: What was achieved/not achieved and what factors were involved per activity? * Were the main beneficiaries reached and to what extent? * If objectives were not attained, what were the key challenges? | | Efficiency | * How timely were: recruitments of staff and consultant? Procurements of goods and services? Project technical committee meetings held, and decisions implemented? Oversight meetings held and decisions implemented? * Were there delays in expenditures? If so, what were the reasons and how could they have been fixed? Have they been fixed? * Were there delays in implementation? How could those delays have been better handled? * What was the implementation capacity of the individual RUNOs and their implementing partners? * Were systems put in place to ensure accountability and mitigate against mismanagement and/or corruption? * To what extent did project outputs result from an economic use of resources? In what ways could resources have been better utilized? * Did coordination and oversight mechanisms work sufficiently? How to improve? | | Sustainability | * What is the likelihood that UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women governance and peacebuilding interventions are sustainable? * What mechanisms have been set in place by UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women to support the government of Zimbabwe to sustain improvements made through these interventions? * How should the peacebuilding portfolio be enhanced to support central authorities, local communities, and civil society in improving and maintaining peace dividends over the long term? * What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability? | | Partnership Strategy | * Has the partnership strategy in the governance and peacebuilding sector been appropriate and effective? * Are there current or potential complementarities or overlaps with existing national partners’ programmes? * How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs? * Has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women worked effectively with other international delivery partners to deliver on good governance initiatives? * How effective has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women been in partnering with civil society? | | Human Rights | * To what extent have indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women work in support of good governance and peacebuilding? | | Gender Equality | * To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of governance o the project? Is gender marker data assigned to the project representative of reality? * To what extent has UNDP governance and peacebuilding support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects? * Information collected should be checked against data from the UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women country office’ Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period 2019-2020. | | Cross Cutting Issues | * To what extent were poverty, environmental issues, gender, disability and human rights addressed? * Have they been mainstreamed in all relevant outcomes? | | Lessons Learned | * What key lessons were learnt from the project? * How can the Evaluation outcome inform the repositioning and refocusing of the CPD going forward? * How could this project be done better in terms of design and implementation of the project in view of the peacebuilding and governance context? | | Recommendations | * What are the key recommendations for the inclusive governance & peacebuilding institutions evaluation with regards to the current and the overall Country’s development priorities? * Are there intermediate outcomes/aspects which you consider a success? * Have there been any unintended outcomes (positive or negative)? * What recommendations would you give for the project? | |
| METHODOLOGY The evaluation should be based on the five criteria laid out in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance, as defined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines.  The evaluation should be based on an analysis of secondary and primary data collected from various sources, including project quarterly reports, implementing partners’ (IPs) reports, minutes of project board meetings, interviews with key informants and focus group discussions (FGDs) with project beneficiaries.  The methodology should include;   1. Desk review of project document, modification documents, work plans, project implementation reports, monitoring and institutional level lessons learned report, curricula developed, peace message products and other relevant documentation from project personnel, partners etc. 2. Key informant interviews and additional document and data collection through: 3. Semi‐structured individual and group interviews with internal partners, e.g UNDP governance team and other UNDP staff; UN Women and UNICEF staff, Peacebuilding Support Office, the UNRCO staff, project team and related staff and other governance or other relevant project staff. 4. Semi‐structured, in‐person interviews with institutional partners and external stakeholders including experts and key informants, government counterparts, locally/non‐locally based donor representatives, other programme relevant UN or non‐UN projects which interacted, NGO partners, Eminent Persons Group, direct beneficiaries, indirect beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders. 5. Focus group discussion at relevant levels and in diverse geographic areas including representatives of CSOs and INGOs, and beneficiaries. 6. Field visits and direct observations in two locations outside of the capital to ensure geographic diversity, relevance and diversity of stakeholders representing a range of government and civil society implementing partners, and beneficiaries. |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES) The evaluation shall be completed by at most 40 days from the date of contracting.  The key evaluation products the evaluation team will be accountable for producing shall include:   * Evaluation inception report — This inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. 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 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 should provide 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. (due 1 week after contract signature) * Draft evaluation report — The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. (Due within 4 weeks of contract signature) * Final evaluation report - Final analytical report, based on feedback received from the programme team, not exceeding 50 pages, including 2‐3-page executive summary (Within six weeks of contract signature)   . | | |  |  | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES The Consultant will undertake the following tasks:   * Consult with the Project management team on the scope of work, methodology and possible case studies to be selected. * Draft the inception report outlining the assessment methodology as well as the work plan; * Draw on output from lessons learnt exercises conducted by implementing partners to   inform the end of term evaluation;   * Develop the research questions and interview questionnaires based on the agreed evaluation plan and methodology; * Organize multi stakeholder consultations, bilateral meetings with individual stakeholders, and field trips to generate evidence that will be analysed and used for writing the draft report; * Submit to UNDP final and approved evaluation report, including a 2‐3-page executive summary, with evidence-based conclusions, lessons learned and key recommendations for future reference. * The final report will also include the following annexes: The Terms of Reference for the evaluation as well as methodology and list of questions used during the interviews and list of key informants. | | |  |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| IV: Institutional Arrangements |
| SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE The Consultant shall have a minimum of a Master’s degree in Peace Studies, Development or equivalent in Social or Political Science, Economics, Development, Conflict Prevention, Law, Human Rights or other relevant fields;   * Excellent spoken and written communication skills in English * At least 10 years of professional experience. * Experience in the design and evaluation of conflict prevention and peace building programs, including an awareness regarding specific approaches and techniques for the evaluation of such initiatives; * Experience working with UN/UNDP and understanding UNDP’s mandate and role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding. * Extensive knowledge of result‐based management evaluation, UNDP policies, procedures, as well as participatory monitoring and evaluation methodologies and approaches. * Experience in working with donors; * Strong ability in managing confidential and politically sensitive issues, in a responsible way, and in accordance with protocols. * Exhibiting experience of working within politically sensitive environments, exhibiting a high level of diplomatic discretion when dealing with national authorities; * Sound understanding of UN mandate and role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding more broadly, prior working/consultancy experience with UNDP/UN a strong asset; * Strong communication skills and demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities  MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS The consultant will report to the Team Leader of the Governance and Peacebuilding Unit of the UNDP during the assignment. RENUMERATION The daily rate for consultancy fees will depend on the qualification and experience of the consultant. Consultants are expected to explicitly indicate their daily rates when applying for this assignment. Payment will be made as per below:   * 20% upon submission of an acceptable inception report that considers the comments and suggestions from the review of the inception report. * 40% upon submission of the draft end of assessment report and presentation of draft Report to a stakeholder Validation Meeting; and * 40% upon submission and acceptance of final report  EVALUATION ETHICs The evaluation shall be guided by the four guiding principles as espoused by UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation which are;   * Integrity * Accountability * Respect * Beneficence   The evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and should at all times adhere to evaluation ethics and procedures that safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers and measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. |

# GENERAL CONDITIONS: PROCEDURES AND LOGISTICS

The consultant/CSO/educational institution is expected to work from their own premises.

All costs pertaining to presentation of the study methodology and other elements of the Technical Proposal to the Technical Evaluation Panel, travel or field visits related to preparation of the Proposal, travel related to Negotiations/Technical discussion and other pre‐award activities are to be borne by the Institution/Contractor and should not be included in the Financial Proposal submitted.

For the entire period of this project/contract all travel (international and within Zimbabwe) related to any contract emerging from this RFP, including all travel for consultations and discussions, meetings for planning and execution of potential works, travel to target towns etc. will have to be borne by the Institution/Contractor and must be included in the Financial Proposal submitted. The Institution/Contractor is responsible to make all relevant travel arrangements, including Visa, hotel, transportation and other relevant costs.

UNDP may, as a courtesy, facilitate through the provision of a letter of certification that travel is related to this project/contract, provide/indicate names of hotels/guest houses used by UN, but all arrangements are the responsibility of the Institution/Contractor, both financially and action‐wise.

**Policy both parties should be aware of:**

* UNDP has a zero-tolerance policy towards sexual exploitation and abuse.
* Members of the contracting company are not entitled to payment of overtime. All remuneration must be within the contract agreement.
* No contract may commence unless the contract is signed by both UNDP and the Contractor.
* The data and information collected during this data is under the sole and full ownership of the UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF and the United Nations Secretary Generals Peacebuilding Fund.
* No member of the contracting company may travel prior to contract signature.
* Members of the contracting company will not have supervisory responsibilities or authority on UNDP budget.
* Contracting company will be required to sign the Health statement for consultants/Individual contractor prior to taking up the assignment, and to document that they have appropriate health insurance, including Medical Evacuation.

**UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Code of Conduct**

This end of project evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing the collection of data and reporting on its data. The consultants must also ensure the 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 PBF participating UN Agencies and partners. The UNEG Guidelines note the importance of ethical conduct for the following reasons:

* Responsible use of power: All those engaged in evaluation processes are responsible for upholding the proper conduct of the evaluation.
* Ensuring credibility: With a fair, impartial and complete assessment, stake- holders are more likely to have faith in the results of an evaluation and to take note of the recommendations.
* Responsible use of resources: Ethical conduct in evaluation increases the chances of acceptance by the parties to the evaluation and therefore the likelihood that the investment in the evaluation will result in improved outcomes.

The evaluators are expected to provide a detailed plan on how the following principles will be ensured throughout the evaluation (see UNEG Ethical Guidance for descriptions): 1) Respect for dignity and diversity; 2) Right to self-determination; 3) Fair representation; 4) Compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (e.g., ethics of research involving young children or vulnerable groups); 5) Redress; 6) Confidentiality; and 7) Avoidance of harm.

Specific safeguards must be put in place to protect the safety (both physical and psychological) of both respondents and those collecting the data. These should include:

* A plan is in place to protect the rights of the respondent, including privacy and confidentiality
* The interviewer or data collector is trained in collecting sensitive information, and if the topic of the evaluation is focused on violence against women, they should have previous experience in this area
* Data collection tools are designed in a way that are culturally appropriate and do not create distress for respondents
* Data collection visits if possible are organized at the appropriate time and place so as to minimize risk to respondents
* The interviewer or data collector is able to provide information on how individuals in situations of risk can seek support

|  |
| --- |
| **VI. Signatures- Job Description Certification** |
| Incumbent (*if applicable)*  Name Signature Date |
| Supervisor  Name Signature Date |
| Chief Division/Section  Name Signature Date |