

**Terms of Reference**

**Post Title: International Consultant/Lead Evaluator for Mid-Term Review** **of the Parliamentary Project**

**Project Title:** Modern Parliament for a Modern Armenia (MAP)

**Project number:** Project ID: 00082042 / Output ID: 00091127

**Contract modality:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Starting Date:** 20 September 2021

**Duration:** September-October 2021 (estimated 25 consultancy days)

**Duty Station:** Home based with 1-week mission to Armenia (alternatively distant support, depending on COVID-19 restrictions)

1. **Background and context:**

UNDP MAP The Project is designed to strengthen the National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia (NA) in its new and fundamentally enhanced role within the governance system in carrying out critical functions of law-making, oversight, and representation. With a long-term goal of improving the overall effectiveness of the Parliament as a policy-making institution, the Project is designed to support the newly elected NA to take advantage of the modern governance tools and mechanisms that are focusing on improved quality, transparency and inclusiveness of parliamentary operations and enhanced parliamentary capacity for gender-responsive policy-making.

The three components of the Project are focused on the areas of Legislative capacity, Legislative transparency, and Legislative responsiveness. To that end, a three-stage strategy is applied:

1. catalytic stage of needs assessment, strategic agenda-setting, and pilots of the designed approaches,
2. full-fledged implementation of the strategic agenda, tested strategies and activities,
3. evaluation of the implementation, policy recommendations, and Project closure.

The MAP Project is implemented by UNDP and for particular activities the Project engaged a support from the Responsible Parties, CSO organizations, the International Centre for Human Development (ICHD) the OxYGen Foundation and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy. Actions implemented by the partners represent a comprehensive package of support to the National Assembly with a long-term goal of enhancing the overall effectiveness of the Parliament as a policy-making institution.

The Project expected outcomes are:

1. Quality of legislative oversight and policymaking is improved
2. Increased transparency and accountability of the NA
3. Legislative responsiveness, inclusivity and participatory approach is embedded in MP's work

UNDP Armenia hereby seeks the services of an international consultant specialised in parliamentary development evaluations to lead the team of two evaluators to conduct the Mid-Term Review of the “Modern Parliament for a Modern Armenia” Project, which as a parliamentary development Project with a strong focus on non-partisan role, demand-driven and strong ownership approach that UNDP is renowned and trusted for. The international Lead Evaluator will be responsible to lead the team of two international evaluators, as well as for the overall design and writing of the mid-term evaluation report.

The team leader is expected, should the COVID-19 permit, arrive to Yerevan for live interviews. The second evaluator can be home based and attend the online interviews.

The evaluator cannot have participated in the Project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project document) and shall not have a conflict of interest with the Project’s related activities.

Basic project information in a table format:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project title  | Modern Parliament for a Modern Armenia (MAP) |
| Atlas ID  | Project ID: 00082042; Output ID: 00091127 |
| Corporate outcome and output CPD 2016-2021UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 | Outcome 2: By 2020, people’s expectations for voice, accountability, transparency, and protection of human rights are met by improved systems of democratic governanceOutput 2.4: Frameworks and dialogue processes engaged for effective, transparent engagement of civil society and citizens in national and local development.Outcome 2. Output 2.2.2 “Constitution making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability” |
| Country  | Armenia |
| Region  | UNDP Europe and the CIS Region |
| Date project document signed  | August 2019 |
| Project Dates | Start 15 August 2019 | Planned End 31 December 2022 |
| Project budget (resources required) | USD 5,000,000 |
| Project budget (resources allocated) | USD 4,303,266.44 |
| Project expenditure at the time of evaluation  | USD 2,154,247.02(May 2021) |
| Funding source  | UK, The Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sida, Government in-kind contribution |
| Implementing Party | UNDP Armenia |

**2. Objectives and Scope of work:**

The overall objective of the mid-term review assignment is to assess the continued relevance of an intervention and the progress made towards achieving its planned objectives, effectiveness, efficiency as well as, if available already at this stage, the impact and sustainability of interventions under the “Modern Parliament for a Modern Armenia” Project.

The evaluation findings may be used:

* to align/modify the planned scope of activities with the proposed recommendations to ensure all the Project objectives are reached within the lifetime of the Project;
* to maximize the Project impact;
* for further programme development in the field and resource mobilization.

The evaluation will be carried out in close cooperation and consultation with the Project team and the National Assembly administration based on the project results framework, reviewing the Project documents and conducting interviews with main stakeholders, members of the beneficiary groups and selected communities. Interviews should be organized and held, should the circumstances permit for travel due to the COVID-19 pandemic, by the Lead Evaluator live, and online for those meetings with donors and parties that are out of Armenia, for special groups, etc. Findings of the mid-term evaluation will be communicated to the Project Board and Responsible Parties (RPs) on the MAP Project (As mentioned in background – ICHD, Oxygen and WFD).

The interview will be held with the following organizations and individuals as a minimum:

Key Stakeholders:

* Speaker’s Cabinet
* Chief of Staff’s Cabinet
* Members of the Parliament
* Parliamentary staff
* Donors: SIDA/Swedish Embassy and GGF/UK Embassy

Other stakeholders:

* RPAs (OxYGen, ICHD, WFD)
* Audit Office
* Ombudsman’s Office
* Development partners working with parliament (COE, EU, USAID etc.)
* CSOs

**3. Evaluation Criteria and Key guiding questions:**

All Project related documents and materials will be thoroughly reviewed in the Inception phase by the Evaluator to finalize the evaluation design with a clear Evaluation Matrix, a clear logic and workplan of the evaluation, which shall be agreed by all parties. Five core OECD DAC evaluation criteria, namely the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, as well as sustainability and impact (to the extent possible) will be analysed. Key evaluation questions will include, but are not limited to the following:

***Relevance***

* Are the Project activities/components relevant to the actual/defined needs of the beneficiaries? Were the objectives clear and feasible? How do the main components of the Project contribute to the planned objectives and are logically interlinked?
* Is the Project in line with the current priorities of the country? Is the National Assembly of Armenia committed to the Project? How is the Project aligned with and supports the national, regional and community strategies/plans?
* Has the Project involved relevant stakeholders through consultative processes or information-sharing during its preparation phase? Was the needs assessment/analysis on women’s political participation carried out at the beginning of the Project reflecting the various needs of different stakeholders? Are these needs still relevant? Have there any new, more relevant needs emerged that the Project should address?
* How Project adjusted to COVID-19 and post-war conflict context with activities and mode of operation?

***Effectiveness***

* How effective has the Project been in establishing ownership by the stakeholders? How has the Project encouraged ownership on behalf of the beneficiaries for learning and applying the newly acquired knowledge and skills in practice? Can the Project management and implementation be considered as participatory?
* Is the Project making sufficient progress towards its planned objectives/outcomes/outputs? What are the key achievements, challenges, and implementation lessons? How can these be applied to the Project?
* To what extent has the online capacity building work been effective and did it serve its purpose?

***Efficiency***

* To what extent has the UNDP made good use of the human, financial and technical resources, and has used an appropriate combination of tools and approaches to pursue the achievement of Project results in a cost-effective manner?
* Was there a clear distribution of roles and responsibilities of key actors involved?
* To what extent did the Project capitalize on other complementary initiatives to the Project to reinforce the results of the Project?
* Have Project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered? To what extent are the activities and achieved results cost-efficient?

***Sustainability (to the extent possible)***

* To what extent has the Project been able to support the National Assembly in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure ownership and the durability of effects under the ongoing government reforms initiatives in this Mid-term period?
* Is there a need to adjust the Project (i.e. timeline in relation to COVID-19 and post-conflict situation)? If so, do Project objectives and strategies have to be adjusted?
* What are the possible sustainability prerequisites for each of the Project components? What are the hindering factors for ensuring the sustainability of Project outcomes beyond the Project lifecycle?

***Impact (to the extent possible)***

* Has the Project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term political or social changes for individuals, communities and institutions in achieving the SDGs agenda?
* To what extent has the Project achieved its overarching goal of improved quality, transparency and inclusiveness of parliamentary operations?
* Has the Project had any intended or unintended secondary effect throughout the implementation?

**Cross-cutting issues:**

**Institutional development and capacity building**

* To what extend did the Project contribute to the institutional building of various new mechanisms and tools.
* Has the Project contributed to institutionalization of new organizational structure units to support the roles of the parliament?
* To what extent did stakeholders (National Assembly, CSOs) enhance their capacities on addressing cross-cutting topics?

**Participatory deliberation**

* To what extent are the participatory themes integrated into the Project’s activities?
* To what extend did the Project contribute to raising the dialogue culture and public participation?
* To which extent had the Project contributed to inclusion of CSOs in the consultations with the National Assembly?

**Innovation**

* To what extends has the Project innovative approach and tools contribute to the work of the National Assembly in terms of oversight and outreach?

**Gender equality**

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

**Human rights, leaving no one behind**

* To what extent have disadvantaged/marginalized groups such as poor, persons with disabilities, etc benefited from MAP?

Please note that specific questions are expected to be included in the inception report. The Lead Evaluator will finalize the specific questions to be used in coordination with UNDP.

1. **Evaluation methodology**

**The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).** The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner: key stakeholders will be involved in all phases of the evaluation, including the planning, inception, fact-finding and reporting phases.

In this evaluation mixed method approach will be applied by combining qualitative and quantitative components to ensure complementarity. The two independent evaluators will collect data from desk review and verify them with soft in-depth interviews. The analysis will be built on triangulating information collected from different stakeholders (Project staff, Project partners, stakeholders, and beneficiaries) through different methods including secondary data and documentation review and primary data. It should critically examine the information gathered from the various sources and synthesize the information in an objective manner. If contradictory information is obtained from different stakeholders, an effort should be made to understand the reasons for such information, including any gender-based factors and differences.

The Lead Evaluator shall review the following documents before conducting any interviews: Project documentation, progress reports, work plans, monitoring data, workshop reports, country data, policies, legal documents, etc.

Preliminary suggestions for data collection methods to be envisaged include:

* Desk review including review of analysis of existing documents, legal and policy framework;
* Review of monitoring and evaluation reports, available reports and analysis generated through the Project;
* Interviews with key and other beneficiaries (as listed above).
* Key interviews with partners and stakeholders as specified above;
* Focus groups where possible

As mentioned, because of COVID-19 the interviews and focus group discussions may be conducted online to ensure no risk for evaluator and interviewees.

The independent evaluator will interview key stakeholders (including but not limited to Project implementers, decision makers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.), and appropriate data collection methods for each interviewee category (such as semi-structured or in-depth interviews, expert interviews), in close coordination with the MAP team.

A combination of these methods should be proposed by the independent evaluator in the detailed evaluation methodology in the inception report.

In close cooperation with the Project team, the Evaluator will also be responsible for the development of appropriate instruments, interviews and for each of the methods selected.

The evaluation will follow the principles of the **UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards** in particular with regard to independence, objectiveness, impartiality and inclusiveness and will be guided by the UN ethics guidance as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process, especially apropos conflict of interest, confidentiality of individual informants, sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, discrimination and gender equality, to address issues of vulnerable population.

Should face-to-face interviews be impossible, due to COVID-19 restricting measures, data will be obtained through online means and digital tools, following the guidelines.

**5. Evaluation products (key deliverables)**

1. **Evaluation Workplans and Inception Report:** Evaluation methodology, including (online) data collection tools/questionnaires, list of beneficiaries and stakeholders to be interviewed, interview schedules and reports.
2. **Draft Evaluation Report:**  After the field activities (online interviews conducted), the Lead Evaluator will submit a draft evaluation report of MAP, highlighting achievements, constraints, and lessons learnt as well as corrective measures where required and recommendations
3. **Final evaluation report:** Evaluation report in English including key recommendations (minimum 30 pages plus annexes). Evaluation report shall be in line with the UN Evaluation Group standard 4.9. It shall be evidence-based, presenting the Project’s progress vis-à-vis the Results Framework, based on triangulated data, findings and recommendations on Project planning, programming, necessary adjustment to the course change, etc.
4. Separate 1-2 pager **summary brief** with infographics summarizing the key findings of the evaluation for sharing with external audiences.

**Related Evaluation Activities**

To achieve the objectives and produce the deliverables of the evaluation, the Lead Evaluator will be expected to:

1. Contextualize MAP interventions.
2. Prepare Inception Report.

1. Conduct meetings (online interviews) with stakeholders
2. The UNDP project team will brief the Lead Evaluator and evaluation team and provide all necessary details and clarifications on the documents made available for the document review.
3. The evaluation team will have meeting and discussions with the project team, Chief Technical Advisor, Democratic Governance Portfolio Manager and other unit staff as relevant, UNDP Resident Representative a.i.
4. The evaluation team will meet with relevant National Assembly representatives and government counterparts, project implementing partners, civil society partners, etc to learn on their experiences with the project.
5. The evaluation team will meet with donor representatives and relevant development partners.
6. Consultation on draft report and recommendations following the submission of the draft report, undertake consultations with UNDP to receive feedback for incorporation into the final report

**6. Evaluation team composition, required competencies and skills for Lead Evaluator:**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct MAP evaluation under the leadership of the Lead evaluator. The selection of the consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

**Required qualifications, competencies and skills for Lead Evaluator**

***Education:***

* + - PhD in development studies, law, social sciences, law or similar field. MA in development, law, social science would be taken into account where experience prevails.

***Experience***

* + - 10 years of professional experience in programme/Project development, analysis, monitoring and evaluation for or with a parliament and international organizations in the above-mentioned areas;
		- 5 years of experience in development and application of methodologies for evaluation and assessment, including tools and techniques.
		- Experience of leading evaluations and teams
		- Experience in working in a parliament of with a parliament
		- Proven experience in leading parliamentary evaluation for UNDP

***Languages***

* + - Fluency in English, Russian is an asset.

***Competencies/Skills:***

* + - Strong data collection, analysis and **writing skills in English**;
		- Strong knowledge of parliamentary development principles;
		- Substantive knowledge of concept and principles of local development and governance processes, as well as subject-matter international instruments;
		- Strong analytical capacity and creative thinking;
		- Proven capacity to write analytical reports;
		- Strong planning skills and ability to respect deadlines;
		- **Excellent communication and oral presentation skills in English;**
		- Excellent teamwork skills; ability to consult, involve and work with stakeholders of different backgrounds, points of view and interests;
		- Demonstrated initiative, high sense of responsibility and discretion;
		- High level of integrity, **professionalism and respect for diversity.**
		- Availability to travel as required.

**7. Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant 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 with the express authorization of UNDP and partner.

**8. Implementation arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing MAP mid-term review resides with the Commissioning Unit, which is UNDP Armenia Office. The Commissioning Unit will contract the Evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country, if the travel will be possible.

UNDP Armenia Resident Representative a.i. is the Evaluation Commissioner (EC) of MAP mid-term review (evaluation) and the Results-Based Management Programme Analyst will act as the Evaluation Manager (EM). EC will be supported by EM in safeguarding the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensuring production of quality evaluation in a timely manner. To ensure independence and impartiality, EM will serve as the focal person for this evaluation, ensuring that the evaluation is conducted as per the evaluation plan and in line with this ToR.

MAP Chief Technical Adviser, Democratic Governance Portfolio Lead, and the Project team will provide information and necessary documents, if requested will set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits information, provide other facilitation support to EM and the Lead Evaluator if required before and during the assignment period.

This TOR is the basis upon which the compliance with assignment requirements and overall quality of services provided by the Lead Evaluator will be assessed by UNDP. Lead Evaluator will perform the TOR tasks in coordination with other international evaluator as will be hired for MAP mid-term review process. Lead Evaluator will steer the overall mid-term review process and will be responsible for quality assurance and timely submission of the evaluation deliverables and the final report.

1. **Time frame for the evaluation process:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description of deliverables**  | **Delivery time** |
| * **Inception report:** Evaluation methodology, including (online) data collection tools/questionnaires, list of beneficiaries and stakeholders to be interviewed; interview schedules and reports are finalized and agreed with the UNDP Evaluations manager and MAP Team;
 | 26 September 2021 |
| * **1st draft Evaluation Report** is submitted and accepted;
 | 20 October 2021 |
| * **The final draft report** is presented and accepted. **Separate 1-2 pager summary brief with infographics summarizing the key findings of the evaluation for sharing with external audiences.** Stakeholders debriefing discussion is organized.
 | 5 November 2021 |
| * **The Evaluation Report is finalized** based on the feedback of the above-mentioned parties and audit trial. The Management Response is prepared accordingly.
 | 10 November 2021 |

\*UNDP reports are quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines - <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

**Payment Mode:**

100% of the payment will be made upon satisfactory delivery of all the Deliverablesand approval by the Commissioning Unit and MAP Chief Technical Adviser.

**Key Documents to review**

* Project Document
* Results Framework
* Annual and Progress/Monitoring Reports with annexes
* Other relevant documents provided by the implementing partner or requested by the Consultant
* Project Budget and Expenditure reports
* CCA and UNDAF Evaluation, other relevant Evaluations (UNDP, stakeholders, etc), UNDP Annual Results-Oriented Analysis Report

***Indicative structure of the Evaluation Report:***

***Contents page***

***Opening pages (acknowledgments, list of acronyms)***

***Executive Summary (5-6 pages)***

**Chapter I Background, Object and Methodology**

* 1. Introduction
	2. Background and context of the Project
	3. Object of the Evaluation
	4. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation
	5. Evaluation Methodology (short)
	6. Major Limitations
	7. Ethical considerations, Human Rights and Cross-cutting aspects

**Chapter II Analysis and Findings**

2.1 Relevance

2.2 Effectiveness

2.3 Efficiency

2.4 Sustainability

2.5 Impact

**Chapter III Conclusions and Recommendations**

3.1 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

3.2. Recommendations

**ANNEXES**

1. Terms of Reference
2. Desk Review and Background Documents
3. List of Key Informants Interviewed
4. Detailed Methodology
5. Interview Guides and Survey Instruments
6. Output tables
7. **Application process**

**Evaluator will be selected from UNDP rosters**

Candidates will be evaluated using a cumulative analysis method taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' technical qualifications, experience and financial proposal. The contract will be awarded to the candidate whose offer has been evaluated and determined as technically responsive/compliant/acceptable to the requirements of the ToR and received the highest cumulative (technical and financial) score out of below defined technical and financial criteria.

**Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the technical evaluation would be considered for financial evaluation.**

**Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation - max. 70 points**

**Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation - max. 30 points.**

1. Application should include the following documents: **CV**, including Education/Qualification, Processional Certification, Employment Records /Experience
2. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Application may be submitted via email to the following e‐mail address: **silva.abelyan@undp.org**