



**Country Programme Document (CPD) for the Philippines (2019-2023)
Mid-Term Review**

Terms of Reference

1. Background and context

The 2019-2023 UNDP Philippines Country Programme Document (CPD) is the overall framework for UNDP to draw on its signature solutions to support the achievement of the Philippine Development Plan and the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The CPD sets the strategy for UNDP to strengthen institutional capacity to deliver targeted programmes that ensure no one is left behind; assist the country’s structural transformation to low-carbon and climate-resilient development; and address the key drivers of conflict and instability. Strengthening governance and concentrating UNDP engagement on targeted geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas provide the integrating focus of its work.

UNDP Philippines CPD for 2019-2023 has identified three priorities:

- (i) To improve access to quality social services for the poor, marginalized and at-risk, UNDP will further develop the capacity of targeted local governments, strengthen governance in key national agencies, and expand citizen engagement in government policy and programmes;
- (ii) UNDP will support the transition to low-carbon, climate-resilient development by enhancing risk-informed policies and programmes, supporting the implementation of the Paris Climate Agreement, and improving natural resource management; and
- (iii) To respond to the drivers of conflict and risks to stability, UNDP will assist the transition of armed groups from combatants to civilians, establish transitional justice mechanisms and community security platforms, and provide socioeconomic opportunities for communities in conflict-affected areas.

The key result areas of the CPD are specified below.

CPD (PFSD) Outcomes	CPD Outputs
OUTCOME 1: The most marginalized, vulnerable, and at-risk people and groups benefit from inclusive and quality services and live in a supportive environment wherein their nutrition, food security, and health are ensured/protected.	1.1. Government capacities enhanced to utilize resources and track progress against the Sustainable Development Goals. 1.2. Public financial management strengthened for efficient and effective execution of budgets allocated for the delivery of basic services. 1.3. Existing platforms for citizen engagement strengthened to build strong local constituencies for democracy and governance reforms.

CPD (PFSD) Outcomes	CPD Outputs
<p>OUTCOME 2: Urbanization, economic growth, and climate change actions are converging for a resilient, equitable, and sustainable development path for communities.</p>	<p>2.1. Climate-sensitivity models and hazard maps developed and applied to help NGAs and LGUs better understand and plan for the extent, scope, and distribution of medium and long-term risks.</p> <p>2.2. Enabling policies, private sector engagement, monitoring, reporting and verification systems strengthened to help the country meet its commitments to the Paris Climate Agreement.</p> <p>2.3. Partnerships strengthened and economic models introduced to reduce biodiversity degradation from unsustainable practices and climate impact.</p>
<p>OUTCOME 3: National and local governments and key stakeholders recognize and share a common understanding of the diverse cultural history, identity and inequalities of areas affected by conflict, enabling the establishment of inclusive and responsive governance systems and accelerating sustainable and equitable development for just and lasting peace in conflict affected areas in Mindanao.</p>	<p>3.1. Effective participation of former combatants in local governance, public administration, and political processes supported to secure lasting peace.</p> <p>3.2. Platforms for transitional justice and community security established and operationalized to respond to the deep sense of marginalization.</p> <p>3.3. UNDP-assisted combatants and conflict-affected communities provided with incentives and capabilities to become productive members of society in times of peace.</p>

The Country Programme context has changed notably owing to the COVID-19 pandemic and the urgent need to adjust the programme and project priorities to respond to its immediate, mid-term, and long-term impact to the country. To this end, UNDP and the wider UN system has carried out a Common Country Assessment, updated the UN and Government of the Philippines Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development (PFSD) 2019-2023, produced a number of policy papers, and developed the Socio-economic framework for the Philippines response.

The constant changing conditions also required UNDP to work on innovative approaches that would allow UNDP to deliver more relevant, effective, efficient, and sustainable development interventions. It is therefore critical at this point to assess the need for further adjustments to the Country Programme direction and priorities to align with changes in national priorities as specified in the updated Philippine Development Plan 2017-2022, as well as changes in the global context and in donors’ priorities, in order to respond to and mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Objectives and scope of the review

2.1. Objectives of the MTR

The 2019-2023 UNDP Philippines CPD has entered the mid-point of its implementation in 2021. This milestone calls for a mid-term review (MTR) to take stock of achievements, progress, and challenges,

as well as to inform management's course corrections as warranted and adaptive approaches to ensure the CPD makes the intended impact and contributes to the overall development results at the country level. The CPD MTR is being conducted to assess the contribution of the CPD to the achievement of development outcomes, the strategic alignment of UNDP programming with the country needs, operational risks especially following the outbreak of the COVID-19 which has led to emergence of new priorities, as well as the level of ambition of the original estimates around the CPD funding requirements.

UNDP is commissioning this MTR to review the Country Office (CO) progress against CPD output results vis-a-vis its programming strategies and contributions towards the outcomes, CO integrated work plan, as well as resource mobilization and partnerships strategies for the remaining years of CPD implementation.

The formulation of the CPD took place during a time of considerable socio-political changes in Philippines, and the implementation was premised on several assumptions. These assumptions and risks will be revisited in terms of the new context and the impacts of COVID-19 pandemic.

Specifically, the MTR aims to assess the achievements and progress made against planned results as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt over the three years of CPD implementation against the programme theory of change. This will include the following:

- Review Philippines CO's programme relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability in terms of the many changes in the development priorities and UNDP CO context.
- Provide recommendations to revise the resource mobilization strategy in view of the remaining years of CPD implementation (as adjusted for the COVID-19 crisis). Suggest options for re-prioritization of CO planned interventions and results based on targets to the resource mobilization model of the Country Programme, taking into consideration current pipeline of projects and donor landscape.
- Suggest ways to enhance partnership and communication of the country office in view of enhancing resource base to strengthen partnership and communication with the government and development partners
- Review the three CPD outcomes on the extent to which progress has been made towards the outcomes and the UNDP contribution to the observed change? How has delivery of country programme outputs led to outcome-level progress? Have there been any unexpected outcome-level results achieved beyond the planned outcome? This includes partnership strategies, resource mobilization, and embedding of the human rights-based approach.
- Review progress against and the effectiveness of the UNDP results framework, specifically the outcome and output indicators, baselines and targets, assessing how relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvements, if any. Review the data collection and monitoring systems existing in the country to ensure evidence-based measurement of progress against results and how that contributes to results-based management of the country programme.
- Assess the programmatic progress/coverage and gaps and what can be derived in terms of lessons

learned for future UNDP support to inclusive economic growth, governance and rule of law, and resilience, disaster risk reduction and climate change, as well as gender equality and social inclusion and overall sustainable development, and provide recommendations for re-positioning and re-focusing of the CPD within Philippines's development context and in light of the impact of COVID-19 outbreak.

- Assess the relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP in support of Philippines' development priorities towards achieving the Agenda 2030. Specifically, assess the extent to which UNDP contributed to high level policy changes and reforms.
- Assess the level of innovation and or adoption of innovative approaches in programming.
- Provide forward-looking recommendations that could possibly inform the next cycle of the country programme, taking into account the broad corporate direction and mandate on socio-economic recovery following the COVID-19 crisis, which will need to inform the current and next programming cycle.

2.2. Scope of the MTR

The scope of the MTR will include the entirety of UNDP's programmatic operations in Philippines and therefore will cover interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources and donor funds. The MTR should pay attention to the current status of implementation within which the UNDP programme continues to operate. The roles and contributions of UNDP to the wider UN programming framework, including the cooperation and the jointwork with other agencies will also be captured by the review.

This MTR will cover the period 2019-2021 (first half) of the CPD (2019-2023) implementation. It will be conducted with a view to enhancing the country programme while providing strategic direction and inputs to the revisions needed. The MTR Consultants will assess UNDP's overall intervention including an assessment of objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The evaluation will assess how lessons learned are being captured and operationalized throughout the period under investigation.

Given the recent developments in the republic context and severe socio-economic impacts of COVID-19, this MTR presents an opportunity to review and redefine the strategic focus of UNDP Philippines (in terms of the scope and focus of the CPD and corresponding projects/programme portfolios which identifies specific development challenges that UNDP should address and the interventions to support it). It also presents an opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of UNDP's contribution to the country's development, which includes an assessment of the progress-to-date. The review will consider both local changes linked to the socio-political transformation as well as other national and sub-national priorities.

The first stage of the CPD MTR will be to conduct an assessment of the current context taking into account the latest socio-economic and political developments both at national and sub-national levels as well as relevant developments at global level, an analysis of the CPD Theory of Change and whether it remains valid, and a review the progress against the CPD RRF including the output results and the resource mobilization targets. The second stage is to assess the relevance of the CPD to the current

context taking into account the emerging national and global development priorities and severe impacts posed by the COVID-19 outbreak. The third stage is to assess the business model and the financial sustainability of the UNDP CO in light of the CO resource overview and mobilization targets. The fourth and final stage will be the provision of key lessons learnt, strategic directions and recommendations, including any proposed adjustments to the design of the current Country Programme, including proposed revisions to the Results and Resources Framework. This exercise would allow UNDP to engage with key stakeholders and partners to discuss achievements and ways forward in view of the evolving context and development landscape.

3. Review Criteria and guiding questions

The MTR will follow the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria - **Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability**. Human rights, gender equality and social inclusion will be added as cross-cutting criteria. The evaluation should help the management to answer the following key questions:

- (i) What have been the major achievements against the CPD outcomes and outputs, and lessons learnt, with a view towards enhancing the relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the current programme cycle?
- (ii) How realistic is the CPD in terms of size, scope, and planned results given the available resources and resource mobilization opportunities? What would be the suggested key mid-course adjustments based on the context analysis? What have been UNDP's contributions, gaps and missed opportunities to enable further progress to the country's development priorities as identified in the Results and Resources Framework? To what extent does the CO have capacities to deliver on the intended results?
- (iii) To what extent has the CPD implementation succeeded in contributing to the achievement of the Philippine Development Plan, the UN Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development, and the Sustainable Development Goals?
- (iv) To what extent is UNDP's selected method of implementation and partnership modalities suitable to the country and the development context?

The guiding questions outlined below should be further refined by the MTR team and agreed with UNDP.

Relevance

- To what extent is the country programme relevant to the evolving context and the national development agenda given the COVID-19 pandemic?
- To what extent is the CPD aligned with the national development needs and priorities and should adjustments in CPD implementation be considered in line with the PDP, PFSD, and SDGs?
- To what extent is the CPD responsive to the changing environment in country at national and subnational levels and should adjustments be considered to adapt to these changes?
- To what extent is UNDP engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including the role of UNDP in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?
- To what extent did UNDP adopt gender-sensitive, human rights-based and conflict-sensitive

approaches?

- To what extent does the CO have capacities to deliver on the intended results?

Effectiveness

- To what extent is the current CPD on track to achieve planned results (intended and unintended, positive or negative) in country programme result framework? What were the key contributing factors for achieving or not achieving the intended results?
- What have been the key results and changes attained? How has delivery of country programme outputs led to outcome-level progress?
- Is the programme on track to achieve its intended results? What strategic and programmatic revisions should UNDP consider achieving the intended results?
- What evidence is there that UNDP support has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening?
- To what extent has UNDP been able to form and maintain partnerships with government agencies and other development actors including bilateral and multilateral organizations, civil society organizations and the private sector to leverage results?
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider going forward?
- To what extent is UNDP able to effectively implement integrated approaches to a thematic issue or a geographic area (i.e. UNDP's integrated offer in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao)?

Efficiency

- To what extent has the CO been able to utilize the core resources to leverage external funding to support achieving CPD results?
- To what extent have the programme or projects outputs been efficient and cost effective?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP have in place helping to ensure that projects are managed efficiently and effectively?
- To what extent and how has UNDP mobilized and used its resources (human, technical and financial) and improved inter-agency synergies to achieve its planned results in the current CPD cycle?
- To what extent were resources used to address human rights and inequalities in general, and gender issues in particular?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- Have UNDP's systems created capacities (human resource, systemic and structural) for sustained

results of its programmes and what could be done to strengthen sustainability?

- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- Does the CO have the capacity to sustain its operations in terms of financial and programmatic implementation based on the resource projection and donor landscape?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?
- Are there any financial, social, or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of CPD outputs?

Human rights

- How well does the design of the CPD address the needs of the most vulnerable groups in the country?
- 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 and social inclusion

- What results has UNDP achieved in promoting gender equality?
- What mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to ensure gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?

Partnerships

- To what extent has forged partnerships during the period contribute to achieving Country Programme results?
- To what extent is UNDP's selected method of implementation/ partnership modalities suitable to the country and the development context?
- What changes should be considered in the current set of partnerships with national institutions, CSOs, UN Agencies, private sector and other development partners in the Philippines, in order to promote long-term sustainability and durability of results?
- How the partnership and communication of the country office can be enhanced for enlarging resource base through strengthening partnership and communications with the government and development partners.

4. Methodology

The review methods provided here are indicative only. The review team should review the methodology and propose the final methods and data collection tools as part of the inception report. The methods and tools should adequately address the issues of gender equality and social inclusion. The MTR should build upon the available documents, consultations and interviews which would provide an opportunity for more in-depth analysis to understand progress towards results, results achieved, and challenges faced.

The review team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Senior Management and other key stakeholders. 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 and site visits.

Therefore, the review team will work closely with UNDP CO to undertake the review adopting at least the following approaches. All findings and recommendations have to be based on evidence and data.

4.1. Desk review

The MTR team is expected to review all available documents, such as the project documents and evaluation reports, Project annual progress reports, ROARs, Partnership surveys, donor reports, as well as national policy documents and reports, and other documents that the team considers useful for the MTR and use the information for analysis.

4.2. Semi-structured interviews with key informants (Key Informant Interviews - KIIs)

The review team should develop semi-structure interview questionnaire and adopt inclusive and participatory approach to hold consultations and interviews with a range of key stakeholders including from sister UN agencies, national and subnational government counterparts, development partners, civil society representatives, private sector, media and academia. Efforts will be undertaken to gather feedback of the beneficiaries in communities.

4.3. Project and portfolio analysis

The review team should conduct separate discussions/consultation with the three portfolio teams as well as selected projects to gather credible information and triangulate the information extracted from the desk review.

4.4. Surveys and questionnaires including participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.

4.5. Others

An inception report is to be presented to UNDP following an initial desk review which details the review team's research design and methodology, while presenting preliminary findings on the context analysis and the country programme's relevance in the evolving context. While selecting the respondents, the review team should ensure gender balance.

The review team should ensure triangulation of the various data sources to maximize the validity and reliability of data. Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP CO will be organized during the field mission.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). The contractor can work remotely with local evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, contractor or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, contractor, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national contractor can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5. Expected Results/Deliverables

The review team should submit the following deliverables:

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Presentation of preliminary findings.** Immediately following an evaluation, the evaluator will present preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be submitted by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**

- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** or participation in knowledge-sharing events

6. Management arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Results Based Management Analyst. The evaluation manager is responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Team pertaining to required technical and financial documents, coordinating with stakeholders, setting up interviews, arranging field visits, and looking after the evaluation budget and schedule. The evaluation manager shall likewise assist in distribution of draft reports to stakeholders for their review, consolidation of comments, and in organizing key stakeholders' meetings for presentation of the salient points of the draft/final reports.

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

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

7. Use of MTR results

The findings of this MTR will be used to revise the CPD strategic focus, the output-level targets, as well as the resource mobilization, partnership, communications strategy in the changing political and socio-economic context post COVID-19. The CO will use the lessons learned and way forward for future course of action of the UNDP business plan. Therefore, the MTR report should provide critical findings and specific recommendations for future interventions.

8. Requirement for experience and qualifications

The Firm shall be hired from among the Pre-qualified List of UNDP Philippines' monitoring and evaluation firms, selected through secondary competition. The Firm shall make available at the very minimum, a Project Lead, who shall serve as the main representative and liaison of the Firm and UNDP, and at least two (2) key personnel.

a) Expertise of the Firm

- At least 5 years' experience in producing high quality research outputs on development programs of government and international organizations;
- At least (3) years' recent experience in conducting quantitative and qualitative research and/or monitoring and evaluation assessments across multiple geographic locations;
- At least 3 years' experience in research work relative to joint, multi-dimensional programmes between the Philippine government and international development organizations

b) Key Personnel

- A team of at least three (3) members, with an assigned Team Leader or Project Lead who shall serve as main representative and liaison of the Firm or team of experts. Key evaluation personnel should have experience in monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects.

Team Leader/M&E Specialist:

- At least a Master's Degree in economics, political science, social science, public administration, business management, or other relevant fields. A higher degree as well as specialized training in M&E, project management, etc. are advantageous;
- At least seven (7) years of experience in working with development programmes with focus on any of the following areas: governance, human rights, peace and development, climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, Sustainable Development Goals, poverty, gender equality and related cross-cutting development issues;
- At least seven (7) years of work or consultancy experience in the monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects, with preference to those with demonstrated specialization / experience in evaluations, and those with work experience in the government or international organizations;
- A portfolio of at least five (5) published and/or unpublished research work in relevant policy/program areas and/or research output from consultancy projects in the last three (3) years. Research works may include applied research studies, e.g. evaluation, action research, policy papers, etc. At least one (1) of these should be an evaluation;
- At least five (5) years' experience in the application of various quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, with demonstrated specialization in either quantitative or qualitative research, or both;
- At least five (5) years' experience in project/team leadership and management

Two (2) Evaluation Team Members:

- At least a Master's Degree in economics, political science, social science, public administration, business management, or other relevant fields. A higher degree as well as specialized training in M&E, project management, etc. are advantageous;
- At least five (5) years of work or consultancy experience in the monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects, with preference to those with demonstrated specialization / experience in evaluations, and those with work experience in the government or international organizations;
- A portfolio of at least three (3) published and/or unpublished research work in relevant policy/program areas and/or research output from consultancy projects in the last three (3) years. Research works may include applied research studies, e.g. evaluation, action research, policy papers, etc. At least one (1) of these should be an evaluation;
- At least three (3) years of experience in working with development programmes with focus on any of the following areas: governance, human rights, peace and development, climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, Sustainable Development Goals, poverty, gender equality and related cross-cutting development issues;
- At least 3 years' experience in the application of various quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, with demonstrated specialization in either quantitative or qualitative research, or both;

9. Evaluation Ethics

This 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 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 authorization of UNDP and partners.

The consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.

In particular, the consultant(s) must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programming relating to the CPD under evaluation.

10. Timeframe

The duration of the MTR will be a maximum of 40 person-days. The tentative schedule will be the following:

Planned Activities	Deliverables	Tentative Person-Days
Desk review and preparation of inception report with final design, methods, and tools	Inception report	5 days
Stakeholders meetings and interviews	Evaluation debriefing	12 days
Analysis, preparation of draft report, presentation of draft findings	Draft MTR report and Presentation	15 days
Incorporate feedback and finalize and submit report	Final MTR report	8 days
Total		40 days