National Governance and Public Administration Reform (GPAR)- Governance for Inclusive Development Programe (GIDP)

Final Evaluation

Terms of Reference

April 2021

Contents

PROJECT INFORMATION	
Project title	National Governance and Public Administration Reform (GPAR)-Governance for Inclusive Development Programme (GIDP)
Atlas ID	Project ID: 00093816 Output ID: 00098509
Corporate outcome and output	UNDP Strategic Plan output 32.: Functions, financing and capacity of sub-national level institutions enabled to deliver improved basic services and respond to priorities voiced by the public UNPF Outcome 3: Institutions and policies at national and local level support the delivery of quality services that better respond to peoples' need.
Country	Lao People's Democratic Republic (*Given the ongoing COVID 19 pandemic and travel restrictions that are in place, the consultant may be required to conduct many of the in-person missions/activities remotely using electronic conferencing means. However, required travel costs could be included into the financial proposal so that travel to Vientiane capital can be done if/when restrictions are lifted*)
Region	Asia and Pacific
Date project document signed	12 May 2017

Project dates	Start	Planned end
	1 April 2017	30 September 2021

Project budget	Originally USD 9.4 million revised to 6.8 million in 2020
Project expenditure as of December 2020	Government contribution: USD 0.53 million UNDP: USD 0.70 million UNCDF: USD 0.92 million SDC: USD 3.36 million UNDESA: USD 0.04 million MPTF: USD 0.21 million Total: USD 5.76 million
Funding source	SDC (4 million), UNDP (1 million) and UNCDF (1 million), GoL (0.5 million), UNDESA (2020-21: 0.07 million), MPTF (2020:0.2 million)
Implementing party	Ministry of Home Affaires (MoHA)

Background and context

The Governance for Inclusive Development Programme (GIDP) is a joint UN project (UNDP and UNCDF) that supports the government's Sam Sang initiative to strengthen its public administration's ability especially at the local level to achieve the goals of better service delivery, promote wider governance improvements and increase citizens' systematic engagement, where basic services are coordinated, planned, tracked, and reported. GIDP was conceived to act as a platform for providing tools and scalable learning that encourage more inclusive service delivery and local development, which benefits a wide section of Lao people. The linkage to national partnerships and the Governance

Sector Working Group (GSWG) provides the opportunity for national policy advocacy and discussions on the progress of the GPAR GIDP and on governance matters in general.

The GIDP has been formulated under the framework of the National Governance and Public Administration Reform Programme (NGPAR) of the Government of Lao PDR (GoL), with the Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA) to lead the implementation, with cross-sector cooperation and implementation by the Ministry of Finance (MoF), Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), and Provincial and District administrations. GIDP is the third project implemented by UNDP-UNCDF under the NGPAR programme and is built on the established partnerships through two programmes within the
government's NGPAR - Strengthening Capacity and Service Delivery of Local Administration (GPAR SCSD Jun 2007-May 2011) and the National GPAR Programme Support Programme (GPAR NGPS 2012-June 2016).

This programme is responsive to the growing emphasis on the need for multi-sector planning and the use of data/information to inform the content, nature, and scope of district plans. In line with national socio-economic development plans, the GIDP was expected to improve service delivery through the District Development Fund (DDF) mechanism vis-à-vis intergovernmental fiscal transfer system and two 'model' One Door Service Centres (ODSCs). This programme also systematically captures villagers' perception on access and quality of basic services and promotes opportunities for collaboration with civil society in local development and services apart from enabling Provincial People's Assembly (PPA) members to increase their oversight over the district administration.

Recognizing the contribution that is made by the civil society organizations, the programme was expected to forge collaboration between local authorities and CSOs to identity innovative ways of improving service delivery and in promoting community participation for local development. The three GIDP outputs contributing to inclusive service delivery and development, accountability framework, citizen's engagement and partnerships and policy dialogue are all interrelated and designed to create a virtuous loop that promotes good governance and accountability as well as sub-national and national partnerships. The lessons learned from the programme is expected to feed into the national policy dialogue on socio-economic development through the Governance Sector Working Group (GSWG).

Cross-cutting theme: Gender mainstreaming contributing towards gender equality.

Evaluation purpose, scope, and objectives

Evaluation Purpose
The purpose of this final external evaluation is two folds: accountability and institutional learning. The findings will inform the partners of GIDP about the programme's achievements and support institutional learning of the stakeholders engaged, both from the Government and development partners. The evaluation is to guide UNDP-UNCDF and government partners to take stock of the progress made in public administration reforms and identify areas for making governance inclusive for all. The draft 9th NSEDP aims at improving the efficiency of the public sector in providing basic services to citizens through DDF, ODSCs, digitalization of services and in creating opportunities for citizens to provide feedback on improving services. It is, therefore, critical for the UNDP-UNCDF teams to understand the main strengths and weaknesses of the current project and to use it a reference guide for developing projects for improving governance. As such, the aim is not to only evaluate the achievements of GIDP but informing the direction and design of next public administration reforms project and UNDP's continued involvement with MoHA within the governance sector in Lao PDR.

With the 9th NSEDP- 2021-2025) currently being finalised by the GoL, this evaluation should identify ways for the next phase of public administration reforms in line with the NSEDP and in particular, the MoHA Five Year Plan (2021-2025) on improving governance through public administration reforms.

Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The independent evaluation will be forward-looking and explore opportunities for UNDP to position itself as a strategic partner of GoL in the governance sector. The scope of the evaluation will specifically encompass the role MoHA, MPI, MoJ and in taking ownership of promoting wider governance improvements after the end of the programme and on the basis of the results of the GIDP. The evaluation will look at systems strengthening, and application of various tools developed by GIDP to improve accountability and citizen's participation. The extent to which the programme learnings have fed into the national policy dialogue will be one of the areas of evaluation.

Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

1. The evaluation will address 3 fundamental questions: What did the project intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the project achieved its intended objectives?
3. What factors have contributed to or hindered the project's performance and eventually the sustainability of the results?

Relevance
- To what extent has the GIDP programme addressed key governance issues as outlined in the 8th NSEDP-Outcome 2, MoHA Sector Plan 2021-25 and recommendations of the RTIM pertaining to governance?
- To what extent is the programme aligned with the national development needs and priorities including Sam Sang Directive and has been able to address relevant targets under SDG 16?
- As the programme is about inclusive development, how well does the design of the programme address the needs of the vulnerable groups such as women, ethnic groups, and persons with disabilities in the country?
- What opportunities has the programme created or identified in improving local governance?
- Has the programme pro-actively addressed emerging demands and opportunities unforeseen during the design of the intervention, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the country context and governance landscape, including national priorities, legislative and policy updates, changes in power relation among key stakeholders?
- Has the programme resulted in empowerment and capacity development of the local authorities and PPA members as envisaged in the programme design and if so, are the efforts sustainable?
- Is there any indication of the government continuing the efforts of promoting accountability and citizen's as well as NPA /private sector engagement?

Effectiveness
- In which component did the programme have the least number of tangible achievements? What have been constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?

- How and to which extent have the three main components complemented each other, strategically contributed to the project's objectives and made use of the initially proposed interlinkages of the three main components in a virtuous loop?
- To what extent were the overall objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? How/to which extent have the activities/outputs strategically contributed to those?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- To what extent are the intended beneficiaries satisfied with the results? How well are gender and ethnicity considerations been considered?
- To what extent has the programme work been able to form and maintain partnerships with other development actors, including other UN agencies, Development Partners, Civil Society Organisations, or government agencies?
- Has there been regular reviews of the progress to ensure that the programme is on track to achieve the desired results and to inform course corrections if needed? How has the programme reacted to challenges identified, including addressing recommendations from the Mid-Term Review and the GSWG Secretariat Capacity Assessment conducted in 2019?
- Has the governance mechanism (GIDP Programme Board) provided their guidance and functioned well? If not, comments and recommendations to be provided.
- Are the outcome indicators measured against baseline and target values (if available) and reflects quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the achievement?
- To what extent has the programme achieved or led to unexpected development results or outcomes, which were not originally envisaged in the Project Document and Theory of Change?

Efficiency

- How cost-effective and time-efficient is the implementation of activities to achieve the outputs by programme implementing partners during the evaluation period? What measures are being taken to ensure competitiveness?
- What are the transaction costs for each component?
- How efficiently did the various modalities of the joint partners, UNDP and UNCDF provide the required support to the government in implementation of the programme?
- To what extent are the planned funding and timeframe enough to achieve the intended outcomes?
- How well did the implementing partners mobilise resources to fill the funding gaps as envisaged in the programme document? What lessons can be learned from this element? And how can the programme do better?

Sustainability

- Are stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation, and monitoring of the programme?
- To what extent has the programme contributed to the wider governance improvements and what are the indications that the government will benefit from systems strengthening, capacity development and tools developed by the programme to realize inclusive development after the project's completion?
- What were the major factors which influenced non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?

- To what extent is the Government of Lao PDR increasing its capacity and ownership for improving public administration during the period in question? What impact has this had on external support?
- Is the Exit Strategy/Transition Plan developed by GIDP being implemented d is the plan regularly reviewed and adjusted according to the project progress, including its financial commitments and capacity?
- To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project will be able to continue after donor funding ceased?
- To what extent has the lessons learned fed into national policy dialogue on socio-economic development through the Governance Sector Working Group?

Inclusion
- As the programme is about inclusive development, how well did the implementation of the programme in accordance with the plan address the most marginalized and vulnerable groups such as women, people with disabilities and ethnic minorities in the country.
- To what extent has the project contribution to wider governance improvement result in promotion and protection of marginalized and vulnerable groups such as women, persons with disabilities and ethnic minorities?

Gender Equality
- How well did the project ensure that women, girls, boys, and men have equal access to basic service delivery?   What lessons can be learned from this element? And how can the programme do better?
- As the programme is about increasing accountability and citizen engagement, how well did the programme ensure that women's meaningful participation in the decision-making process at the local level?

Methodology

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The evaluation will be carried out by an independent evaluation team. The evaluation team should adopt an integrated approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis tools to generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits where/when possible. Methodological approaches may include some or all of the following:
- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia
  - Project document (contribution agreement).
  - Theory of change and results framework,
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
  - Annual workplans.
  - Quarterly and annual reports.
  - Results-oriented monitoring report.
  - project board minutes.
  - financial reports.

- Mid-term external project evaluation (2019) and UNDP CPD evaluation
- Exit Transition Plan (2020)
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organisations, UNCT members and implementing partners:
  - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
  - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators. In line with the UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, gender disaggregation of data is a key element of all UNDP's interventions and data collected for the evaluation will be disaggregated by gender, to the extent possible, and assessed against the programme outputs/outcomes.

Evaluation products (deliverables)

These products could include:

- **Evaluation Inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP-UNCDF after the desk review and should be produced and endorsed by UNDP 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 (see template in the annex).
- **Kick-off meeting.** Evaluators can seek further clarification and expectation from UNDP, SDC, UNCDF and Government partners in the kick-off meeting
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP-UNCDF may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report (50 pages max including executive summary and lessons learned).**[1] 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, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.

---

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

- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluators in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluators to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report (see template in the annex).**
- **Presentations to stakeholders**
- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.

Evaluation team composition and required competencies

(a) Evaluation Team Leader (25 working days)

S/he has overall responsibility for providing guidance and leadership on conducting the evaluation and preparing and revising the draft and final reports. The Evaluation Team Leader should have experience in evaluation of good governance, public administration, public policy, and management, leading the evaluation on those specific areas, with responsibility for drafting and finalising reports. Specific responsibilities include the following:

- Leading the documentation review and framing of evaluation questions.
- Leading the evaluation team in planning, execution and reporting.
- Incorporating the use of best practice with respect to evaluation methodologies.
- Conducting the debriefing to the stakeholders (Government of Lao PDR, UNDP, UNCDF and key selected development partners).
- Leading the drafting and finalisation/quality control of the evaluation report.
- Building capacity of the national evaluation consultant.

    Required Qualifications
- Master's degree or equivalent in public administration, public policy and management, development studies, political science, social science or other relevant fields.
- Proven record of leading complex programmatic evaluations for at least ten years, including governance reform programme.
- Experience in governance initiative in Lao PDR is preferable.
- Demonstrable in-depth understanding of Results-Based Management and strategic planning; preferably M&E in Public Administration and/or Governance including sub-national administrations.
- Fluency in English both in speaking and writing.
- Strong drafting and analytical skills.
- Experience in evaluating a financing mechanism is an asset.
- Knowledge of the context of Lao PDR is an asset.

(b) National Evaluation Consultant (20 working days) (Advertised and Recruited Separately)

S/he will support the Team Leader and provide knowledge of governance sector as well as Lao cultural and development context; and when needed support as an interpreter between English and Lao. The consultant will advise the Team Leader on relevant aspects of the local context. The national consultant will also be responsible for the translation of the executive summary into Lao language. The National will consult with Team leaders and UNDP on the contents of the report to ensure accuracy.

    Required Qualifications:
- Master's degree or equivalent in good governance, public administration, public policy and management, development studies, political science, social science or other relevant fields.
- Experience in undertaking an evaluation.
- Strong working knowledge of Lao PDR (in particular the social, economic and development context).

- Experience in governance initiative in Lao PDR is preferable.
- Thorough understanding of the development issues and challenges in the Lao PDR.
- Familiarity with the Lao Government's governance programme, strategies, and policies
- Experience with assessment methodologies; programme development and project implementation
- Excellent interpersonal, communications and facilitation skills
- Cultural and gender sensitivity and ability to work with people from different backgrounds
- Experience with social science research.
- Fluent Lao and English.

Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' which are available here: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102 . 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 collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorisation of UNDP and partners.

Implementation arrangements

The below table outlines key roles and responsibilities for the evaluation process. UNDP and evaluation stakeholders will appoint an Evaluation Manager, who will assume the day-to-day responsibility for managing the evaluation and serve as a central person connecting other key parties.

Role	Responsibilities
Commissioner of the Evaluation: UNDP	- Lead and ensure the development of comprehensive, representative, strategic and costed evaluation. - Determine scope of evaluation in consultation with key partners. - Provide clear advice to the Evaluation Manager on how the findings will be used. - Respond to the evaluation by preparing a management response and use the findings as appropriate. - Safeguard the independence of the exercise. - Approval of TOR, inception report and final report. - Allocate adequate funding and human resources.
Evaluation Manager: M&E Focal Point/PSU	- Lead the development of the evaluation TOR in consultation with stakeholders. - Manage the selection and recruitment of the Evaluation Team. - Manage the contractual arrangements, the budget and the personnel involved in the evaluation. - Provide executive and coordination support. - Provide the Evaluation Team with administrative support and required data. - Liaise with and respond to the commissioners.

	▪ Connect the Evaluation Team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation ▪ Review the inception report and final report.
PROGRAMME (UNDP Governance Unit)/UNCDF PROJECT MANAGER (MoHA)	▪ Provide inputs/advice to the evaluation on the detail and scope of the terms of reference for the evaluation and how the findings will be used. ▪ Ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations. ▪ Provide the evaluation manager, in a timely manner, with all required data and documentation and contacts/stakeholders list, etc. ▪ Support the arrangement of interview, meetings, and field missions. ▪ Provide comments and clarification on the terms of reference, inception report and draft evaluation reports. ▪ In consultation with Government, respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP-UNCDF ▪ Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders including the project board. ▪ Responsible for the implementation of key actions on evaluation recommendations in partnership with Implementing partners.
Regional Evaluation Focal Points	▪ Support the evaluation process and ensure compliance with corporate standards. ▪ Provide technical support to country offices including advice on the development of terms of reference; recruitment of evaluators and maintaining evaluator rosters; implementation of evaluations; and finalisation of evaluations, management responses and key actions ▪ Ensure management response tracking and support M&E capacity development and knowledge-sharing. ▪ Dispute resolution when issues arise in implementation of evaluations.
Evaluation Partner- SDC/UNCDF	▪ Involved in the review of key evaluation deliverables, including kick off meeting, terms of reference, the inception report, and successive versions of the draft evaluation report ▪ Provide inputs/advice how the findings will be used. ▪ Assist in collecting required data
Evaluation team (lead by Team leader)	▪ 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, 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. ▪ Finalise the evaluation, taking into consideration comments and questions on the evaluation report. Evaluators' feedback should be recorded in the audit trail. ▪ Support UNDP efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination if required

Time frame for the evaluation process

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office, indicating for each the due date or time frame (e.g., workplan, agreements, briefings, draft report, final report), as well as who is responsible for its completion.

Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and inception report				
Meeting briefing with UNDP-UNCDF (programme managers and project staff as needed)	-	At the time of contract signing 14 May 2021	UNDP or remote	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team	-	At the time of contract signing 14 May 2021	Via email	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	6 days (for both international and national consultants)	Within two weeks of contract signing 14-21 May 2021	Home- based	Evaluation Team
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	Within two weeks of contract signing 31 May 2021		Evaluation team
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report 7 June 2021	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups and other methods	8 days (for both international and national consultants)	Within four weeks of contract signing 14 June 2021	In country With field visits	UNDP to organise with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	0.5 day (for both international and national consultants)	21 June 2021	In country	Evaluation team
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (60 pages maximum including executive summary and lessons learned)	8 days (4 days for national consultant)	Within two weeks of the completion of the field mission 30 June 2021	Home- based	Evaluation team
Draft report submission	-	1 July June		Evaluation team
Consolidated UNDP-UNCDF and stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within one week of submission of the draft evaluation report 19 July 2021	UNDP	Evaluation manager and evaluation reference group
Debriefing with UNDP	0.5 day (for both international and	Within one week of receipt of comments 16 July 2021	Remotely UNDP	UNDP, evaluation reference group, stakeholder and evaluation team

	national consultants)			
Finalisation of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office and UNCDF,	2 days (1 day for national consultant)	Within one week of final debriefing 22 July 2021	Home- based	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (60 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	Within one week of final debriefing 31 July 2021	Home- based	Evaluation team
Estimated total days for the evaluation	**25 for international team leader** **20 days for national consultant**			

Application submission process and criteria for selection

Criteria	weigh	Max.Points
Technical Criteria	0.70	70
a. Education / background	**0.10**	**10**
• Individual team member meets educational requirements, with experience in relevant evaluations.	0.10	10
b. Experience and competencies of consultant	**0.45**	**45**
• Proven record of leading complex programmatic evaluations for at least ten years, including governance reform programme.	0.11	11
• Demonstrable in-depth understanding of Results-Based Management and strategic planning; preferably M&E in Public Administration and/or Governance including sub-national administrations.	0.10	10
• Previous experience evaluating programme in Lao PDR or similar settings in the region is an advantage	0.10	10
• Excellent presentation and drafting skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.	0.10	10
• Sound teamwork skills, analytical and organisational skills.	0.02	2
• Knowledge of the context of Lao PDR is an asset.	0.02	2
c. Proposed work plan and approach to carry out the assignment	**0.15**	**15**
• All aspects of the TOR have been addressed in sufficient detail.	0.06	6
• Implementation schedule (and timing).	0.06	6
• Quality assurance measures	0.03	3
Financial Criteria	**0.30**	**30**
• Transportation and DSA costs should be factored into the financial proposal		
Total points obtainable	**1.0**	**100**

TOR annexes

<table>
<tr><td>

Annex A: Updated Project Results Resource Framework

Project Title: Governance for Inclusive Development Programme (GIDP)

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

- GIDP Outcome Statement (CPD Outcome 3/UNPF Outcome 7): Institutions and policies at national and local level support the delivery of quality services that better respond to citizens' needs

- GIDP Outcome Statement: Local institutions are able to increase the coverage of basic services and include citizens' feedback in the planning cycle for services provision by 2020

number of additional households (160,000 by GIDP) receive two or more basic services2 from their districts
- Baseline: 373,948 (2015) / Target: 160,000 (by 2021)3

number of people (disaggregated by sex, age, disability & ethnicity) give feedback on services received
- Baseline: 0 / Target: 20,000 (by 2021)4

number of district level multi-sector, participatory annual service project plans implemented as planned
- Baseline: 662 / Target: additional 60 (by 2021)5

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Contributing to:

UNDP CPD (2017-2021) Output 3.1: Local administrations able to develop and finance multi-sectoral plans based on community priorities

UNDP Strategic Plan Output 2.2.2 (2017-2021): Constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability.

UNCDF local development practice theory of change

</td></tr>
</table>

---

[2] Basic services: Community prioritised local services, as defined in DDF Guidelines, viz. Health (e.g. clean water / sanitation, clinics, outreach health services etc.); Education (Schools, promotion, inspection/standards, etc); Agriculture (e.g. irrigation, technical visits/instruction, outreach services, etc.); Public Works (e.g. Access via local bridge & road, markets, outreach services & community-based maintenance, etc)

[3] Activities contributing to the results : DDF, ODS, PSIF and MPTF

[4] Activities contributing to the results: SUFS and PSIF (linked with DDF and ODS)

[5] Activities contributing to the results : DDF, MPTF, PSIF

Outputs	Indicators	Mean of verification	Baselines	Targets	Activities	Responsible Party/ Implementing Organization
1. Targeted local administrations are able to develop and finance the implementation of multi-sector work plans based on community priorities	1.1 Number of DDF-financed district multi-sector project work plans co-financed by the government	1.1. Project proposals on DDF awarded and Report of annual project report	1.1. Year 2015 – 0	1.1. (# DDF awards) 2018: 0 2019: 12 2020: 7 2021: 15 (Total: 34)	I. Upgrade and implement DDF system, guidelines and manuals (incl. State's co-financing and new Inter Ministry Committee) (linked with 1.2)	UNCDF/UNDP MoHA
	1.2. Amount (USD) of government's co-financing DDF funded proposals.	1.2. DDF implementation report	1.2. Year 2015 – 0	1.2.($ DDF BBG co-financed by state budget) 2018:0, 2019: 57,000 2020: 60,000 2021: 61,500 Total: 178,500	II. Screen high priority local basic service infrastructure by District Investment Committees (linked with 1.3) III. Approve and award DDF capital block grant IV. Set up and maintain standardized record system of compliance with GoL planning and financing system and DDF manual	
	1.3.Number of DDF awarded districts *addressing local*	1.3.Project proposals on DDF-SDG LNOB awarded	1.3. Year 2015 – 0	1.3.Number of DDF-SDG LNOB awarded: 2021:10[6] (total: 10)	V. Progress reporting on DDF services granted and delivered, disaggregated by social	

---

[6] DDF-SDG LNOB modality introduced in 2020

	SDG priorities and inequality in service delivery 1.4.Level of satisfaction expressed by women in terms of their participation in the planning process. 1.5.Level of Application of the DDF tools applied to policy and/or regulatory change to support enhanced financing for district administrations	1.4.SUFS results/analysis from citizens who use our DDF project 1.5.(draft) New MOF instruction related *to financing for district administrations*	1.4.Year 2015 – data not available 1.5 Budget law 2016 and Draft PFM Reform Strategy (2017).	1.4.Year 2021: nearly half of targeted respondents are women 1.5. DDF Operational Manual+SOP) - OEBG / PFM support - ministerial instruction) and DDF SDG modality Applied	inclusion (women and ethnic groups, other social groups) VI. TA support to MoF on the design of Provincial Formula-based budget allocation VII. Development of SOP for the DDF SDG LNOB module	

	1.6.Degree of satisfaction expressed by citizens about new model of ODSC (Bajieng district)	1.6.Result from user's feedback forms		1.6. Available information on level of satisfaction (2021)	I. Design, develop and demonstrate model ODSC II. Training on ODSC services matters	MOHA UNDP
	1.7.No. of clients use new model of ODSC (Bajieng district)	1.7. Report of ODSC (bajieng)	1.7. Year 2015 – 0	1.7. No. of client use ODSC in Bajieng district Year 2021- 100		
	1.8.Extent to which ODSC sustains the interest of departments in providing services to citizens.	1.8.Report of ODSC (bajieng) about department which join with the ODSC at the beginning VS end of the GIDP	1.8.Year 2015: 0	1.8.Year 2021: majority of departments rendering services through ODSC continue to retain the interest in providing services in the ODSC		

2.Accountability framework applied at the district level to capture and use citizens' feedback on provision of basic services	2.1. No. of DDF districts applying the updated SUFS giving local citizens' voice on basic service delivery	2.1. GIDP annual report and SUFS reports	2.1.No. of Districts applied SUFS 2015: 2	2.1. 2018: 0 additional 2019: 4 (Surveys) 2020: 6 (results applied[7]) 2021: 4 (Survey) Total: 10 (results applied[8])	I. Update the DSDMS tool and SUFS using participatory techniques II. Field test and report on the updated DSDMS tool and SUFS in selected districts & capacity development on usage (linked with DDF districts)	UNDP MoHA
	2.2.Extent to which citizens feel satisfied about the quality of public services.	2.2. SUFS reports	2.2.Year 2015 – citizens from 2 pilot SUFS district express their opinion about quality of services	2.2.Year 2021 – citizens from 8 new SUFS district express their opinion about quality of services	III. Present findings from the updated DSDMS tool and SUFS to selected districts, PPAs and GSWG IV. Introduce the updated DSDMS and SUFS to other districts	
	2.3. DSDMS revised tools available for PPA and district chiefs to use	2.3.The revised DSDMS tools adopted 2.4.Draft of district socio-economic development plan	2.3.Year 2015 – old DSDMS introduce to district line offices	2.3.Year 2021 - PPA and district chiefs use the DSDMS 2.4.Year 2020/21: 50%	V. Capacity development on evidence-based planning using SUFS results (incl. PPAs) VI. Monitor usage of SUFS results by	

| | 2.4.% of districts who confirmed the application of SUFS recommendations.

2.5.% districts and PPAs confirmed the usefulness of SUFS results

2.6.# of districts' reports on SUFS recommendations made accessible to the PPAs and communities.

2.7.PPA members use the survey results to fulfill their oversight role powers of the citizens pertaining to basic services. | 2.5.Minutes of meetings/workshops on SUFS and

2.6.Handover notes of SUFS report to district and PPAs

2.7.Adopted provincial SEDP | 2.4.Year 2015 – data not available

2.5.Year 2015 – data not available

2.6.Year 2015: 2 districts using SUFS prepared reports on implementation and disseminated through internal channels, but not reports were made accessible to public or media.

2.7.Year 2015 – data not available | 2.5. 2018: N/A
2019: N/A
2020: 4
2021: 4
Total: 8

2.6.2018: N/A
2019: N/A
2020: 4
2021: 4
Total: 8

2.7.Majority of PPA in the SUFS district/ province contribute to SEDP to improve service delivery | PPAs and district authorities.
VII.   Share SUFS reports with concerned authorities, PPAs and communities (recommendations per district, disaggregated by type)
VIII.   Link Digital Service Mapping exercise with DDF | |

	3.1.Perceptions of dialogue partners (govt, academia, civil society, private sector) on utility and quality of multi-stakeholder dialogue process.	3.1.Survey feedback forms	3.1. there were 24 multi-stakeholder policy discussions facilitated under the GSWG but no data on perceptions of dialogue partners on utility and quality of multi-stakeholder dialogue process 1 Very low 2 Low 3 Medium 4 High 5 Very high	3.1. 2018: 25% 2019: 30% 2020: 40% 2021: 50% [Summary of % satisfaction rating using survey data weighting Scoring weights TBC. (E.g. Rating 1 = -2/ Rating 2 =-1 Rating 3=1, Rating 4= +2 Rating 5=+3)]	I. Convene, monitor and report on GS and Sub-WGs according to annual plan and implement activities related to NSEDP and SDGs II. Support MoHA in local governance policy and regulation development III. Support MoHA in developing gender mainstreaming approach, tools and guidelines IV. Deliver policy/law briefing sessions (at the national and provincial levels)	UNDP MoHA
	3.2. synergy amongst the two sub-sector groups	3.2.Inputs for the RTM document, national plans / strategies)		3.2. Year 2021 inputs from 2 sub sector		

	in sharing lessons learned/inputs to inform the ongoing national policy dialogue. 3.3. # of governance related policies / priorities informed through multi-stakeholder discussions facilitated under the GSWG at the national and provincial levels.	3.3.GSWG annual report (indicate number of workshops and topic discussed)	3.2. Year 2015 – inputs from 2 sub sector working group provided for the RTM document 3.3. Year 2012 – 2016 there were 21 – topics discussed under GSWG / SSWG	working group provided and documented for all documentation in the round table meeting process and national agenda eg.9th NSEDP 3.3. 2017: 6 2018: 6 2019: 6 2020: 3 2021: 3 (Total:24)		

	3.4. % of PSIF proposals out of the total awarded that promote partnerships between local administrations and NPAs for improved service delivery; -		3.3. 2015: 0^{9}	PSIF grants 2018: 10% 2019: 10% 2020: 20%	I. Design PSIF implementation manual (promote partnerships) II. Implement and monitor PSIF	

---

[9] Under GPAR SCSD 2012-2016, there were 76 sub project awarded from GPAR *CADEM Fund (Public administration enhancement & modernization grants). This grant support only the central and local administration to build capacity, improve service delivery and address cross cutting issue eg. gender and environment*

Annex B: Key stakeholders and partners

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities. UNDP will provide a complete list of stakeholders and partners to the evaluation team during the desk review phase. the evaluation team should arrange interviews/data collection with the following partners including but not limited to:

- Implementing Partner – Ministry of Home Affaires – Dept of Planning and Cooperation
- Project beneficiaries (5-7/ group)
- Ministry of Planning and Investment and/or Department of Finance at provinces
- Ministry of Finance and/or Department of Finance at provinces
- National Assembly and Provincial People's Assembly
- Sector Working Groups (approx. 1-3)
- Sub-Sector Working Groups
- Donors and non-donor partners (approx. 2-5)
- Civil Society Organization, NGOs, Academic Institutions and Private Sector (approx. 2)
- Chair/members of the National Project Board
- The National Project Director (NPD)
- Deputy National Project Directors (1)
- Project Manager (PM)
- Project Staff in Vientiane Capital (2)
- UNDP staff (3)
- UN agencies (approx. 1-2)
- Other relevant stakeholders

Annex C: Documents to be reviewed

- UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021)
  http://strategicplan.undp.org/
- Lao PDR-United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF 2017-2021)
  http://www.la.one.un.org/sdgs
- UNDP Country Programme Document (2017-2021)
  https://www.undp.org/content/dam/laopdr/docs/Reports%20and%20publications/2016/UNDP%20Laos%20CPD.pdf
- Project Documents and Project Brief
- Project mid-term evaluation reports
- 8th National Social and Economic Plan (2016-2020)
  www.la.one.un.org/images/publications/8th_NSEDP_2016-2020.pdf
- 9th National Social and Economic Plan (2021-2025)
- Governance strategies
- Lao People's Democratic Republic: Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
  http://www.la.one.un.org/media-center/publications
- UNDP Evaluation guidelines
  http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml
- UNEG norms and standard
  http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914
- Human Development Reports
- Other UNDP Evaluation Reports
  http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml
- Gender Inequality Index

http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii
- National Round Table Website
  https://rtm.org.la/
- Voluntary National Review of SDGs – 2018
- DDF-SDG LNOB SOP
- GSWG Capacity Assessment
- Donor Agreements and reports
- Result Analysis Annual Reports
- Programme Monitoring Reports
- Project Board Meeting Minutes
- Service Users Feedback Survey (SUFS) results
- Technical Reports and
- Other relevant documents and resources.

Annex D: Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.

Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.

Annex E: Inception report template

Follow the link: Inception report content outline

Annex F: Required format for the evaluation report.

The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports. Follow the link: Evaluation report template and quality standards

Annex G: Evaluation Recommendations.

Follow the link: Evaluation Management Response Template

Annex H: Evaluation Quality Assessment

Evaluations commissioned by UNDP country offices are subject to a quality assessment, including this evaluation. Final evaluation reports will be uploaded to the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC site) after the evaluations complete. IEO will later undertake the quality assessment and assign a rating. IEO will notify the assessment results to country offices and makes the results publicised in the ERC site. UNDP Lao PDR aims to ensure evaluation quality. To do so, the consultant should put in place the quality control of deliverables. Also, consultants should familiarise themselves with rating criteria and assessment questions outlined in the Section six of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines

Annex I: Code of conduct.

UNDP requests each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report. Follow this link:
http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100