**Terms of Referenc for the Mid-term Evaluation of the National Registration and Identification System Project**

1. **Background**

Malawi developed a National Registration and Identification System Project in October, 2016 following a successful proof of concept phase. The goal of the project is to establish a permanent and continuous national registration and identification system in Malawi. The project has the following outputs:

1. Up to 9 million Malawians are registered and issued with a National Identity card in 2017
2. NRIS is transitioned to a permanent and continuous registration system
3. Government MDAs are assisted to adopt the use of the NRIS.
4. Project is efficiently managed, staffed and coordinated, and is implemented with national ownership.

The project has been implemented with financial and technical assistance from DFID, EU, USAID, Norway, Irish Aid and UNDP from 1 November 2016 through basket fund arrangement with UNDP as the managing agent. The initial budget for the project was $50,868,742 of which $20,858,400 was government contribution and the rest was provided by the development partners.

The project implemented a mass registration exercise between 01 November 2016 and 31 December 2018 during which period 8.94 Million Malawians were registered and issued with national identification cards. To date 9.3 million Malawians have been issued with national identification cards. UNDP and the National Registration Bureau under the Ministry of Home Affairs are the main implementing partners for the project.

During the mass registration phase the project engaged over 4200 Registration personnel who were deployed in centres throughout the country. Given the complexity of the exercise PricewaterhouseCoopers were engaged to provide human resource services. Card production was outsourced to a firm in France. Subsequently, the project has deployed registration personnel in all 28 district councils and selected Post Offices across the country in registration and card distribution exercises.

The project was designed to be completed by December 2018 but was extended to 31 December 2019 to provide time for refurbishing of some Post Office buildings to host registration services and support use of national identification cards by service providers in the public and private sectors.

The project has been further extended and revised to incorporate outputs on child registration, issuance of birth certificate and use of birth certificates. This component is being implemented with technical support from UNICEF. The current phase of the project has been extended to 31 December 2021.

The project has not been evaluated since its inception. According to UNDP policies it is mandatory to evaluate projects of its resource size twice: at mid-term and at the end of its life. While some elements of the project which started in 2016 are continuing, most components were completed by December, 2019. It is important to evaluate the project now while would-be key informants to evaluators and project personnel are still around and still remember important details of the project.

The evaluation is going to take place during a Covid 19 pandemic which has affected almost all countries in the world. As of 30 December, 2020 Malawi had 6388 confirmed cases and 188 confirmed deaths. Among the measures taken to prevent the spread of the virus, Government has ordered use of masks in all public places, in government offices and public transport and banned gatherings of more than 100 people.

1. **Purpose of the Evaluation**

The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the progress made towards the achievement of the expected results and identify challenges to improve project implementation and make necessary course corrections. In addition, to fulfilling UNDP’s accountability requirements, the evaluation will also document lessons for improving project design, efficiency effectiveness and impact of similar projects in future.

The evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations will be shared with key government stakeholder including financing and technical partners, namely: DFID, EU, Government of Ireland, Norway, USAID, UNICEF and GoM.

1. **Scope and Objectives of the Evaluation**

**3.1 Scope**

The evaluation will assess the performance of the project using OECD/UNEG standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability. The evaluation will also assess the implementation strategy including the implementation modalities and extent to which the design, implementation and monitoring of the project incorporates a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach and environmental considerations. Project evaluators will be required to re-produce a theory of change for the project to provide a conceptual framework for the analysis of its key elements.

The exercise will cover the period 1st November, 2016 to 31, December, 2019 but only addressing outputs and parameters which were included in the project document developed in October, 2016. The evaluation will cover all districts of the country and will be executed within 33 working days during period from 25 January to 15 April, 2021. A relatively long period of time is being provided to ensure thorough interviews in the wake of Covid 19.

**3.2 Objectives**

More specifically, the objectives of the evaluation will be:

* To assess progress made towards the achievement of the expected results;
* To assess effectiveness of the project in achieving the specific expected results and analyse any factors contributing and which hindered progress ;
* To what extent was gender equality and human rights issues were incorporated in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting;
* To what extent are district post offices ready to provide registration services after the development phase?;
* To analyse the appropriateness of post offices as centres for registration and issuance of national identify cards;
* To review factors aiding and impeding use of ID cards by public sector, private sector and civil society organizations;
* To make recommendations, if any, to improve the design, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and strategies and directions of similar projects in future;
* To document lessons learnt to inform future national identification and registration projects.
	1. **Evaluation questions**
1. **Relevance**
* How relevant is the project to the global, regional and national development goals?
* How relevant is the project to the development needs of the people/beneficiaries, in particular women and vulnerable groups including persons with disability and albinism.?
* Whether the outcome and outputs of the project were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with SMART indicators disaggregated by sex, age and location;
* Whether the relationship between outcome, outputs, activities and inputs of the projects are logically articulated.
1. **Effectiveness**
* How effective are the project strategies in delivering expected/planned outputs and outcomes?
* Are the project strategies effective in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries especially the vulnerable population including those with disabilities and albinism, what results are being observed?
* Is there a suitable Monitoring and Evaluation Framework? How often is the framework used to monitor expected project outcomes?
* To what extent are human rights, gender and disability issues mainstreamed in the project strategies and implementation?
* Regarding the project output on capacity building, how effective are the projects’ capacity building interventions.
1. **Gender equality**
* To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
* Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
1. **Efficiency**
* Are the processes of achieving results efficient? Do the actual results justify the costs incurred and were the resources effectively utilized?
* What project strategies or factors are contributing to project implementation efficiency?
* Do the project interventions duplicate existing similar interventions and were there any collaborations with similar interventions?
* How did the project financial management processes and procedures affect the performance of the project implementation?
* Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering results?

1. **Implementation:**
* How did project management arrangements and procedures affect the performance of project implementation? What partnerships were built or strengthened to improve performance of project implementation?
* How effective was the delivery of inputs specified in the project documents, including selection of responsible institutions, institutional arrangements, identification of beneficiaries, scheduling of activities and actual implementation;
* The fulfillment of the success criteria as outlined in the project document;
* The responsiveness of the project management to significant changes in the environment in which the project functions (both facilitating or impeding project implementation);
* Determine whether or not lessons learnt from other relevant programmes/projects were incorporated into the project.
* The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on project delivery.
1. **Coherence**
* Is the project compatible with other interventions providing civil registration services in the country?
* To what extent is the project coherent with other UNDP interventions in Malawi?
1. **Sustainability**
* To what extent are the project positive results likely to be sustained after the completion of the project?
* What strategies does the project have to ensure continuation and sustainability of the project outcomes after completion of the project?
* What are the key factors that will require attention to improve prospects of sustainability of project outcome?
* How are the capacities strengthened at individual and organisational level to ensure sustainability of project results?
* What are recommendations for similar intervention in future to ensure sustainability?
1. **Methodology**
	1. **Preparatory phase**

The Consultant will be given key documents of the project to prepare and submit inception report in consultation with the project management team considering limitations dictated by COVID 19 prevention measures. She/he will prepare a work plan and finalize methodology of the evaluation.

* 1. **Project theory of change validation**

The Consultant will be required to re-construct a theory of change for the project to provide a conceptual framework to assess various elements of the project.

**4.3 Desk Review**

The evaluator will be expected to review key programme documents (e.g. project documents, progress reports, monitoring visits reports, disbursement report/financial report etc.) to respond to some of the evaluation questions.

**4.4 Field data collection**

Evaluators will make arrangements to collect both qualitative and quantitative data from selected project sites across the country taking into account limitations paused by the COVID 19. Current local restrictions do not allow an international evaluator to visit Malawi to take part in field data collection. The evaluator will be expected to conduct virtual discussions and interviews with focus groups, key informants, some beneficiaries, project staff and stakeholders to understand their perception of the project and validate some of the project interventions and results. A national evaluator will be part of the evaluation team and will undertake field visits where it is possible under the guidance of the international evaluator.

1. **Management and implementation arrangements**

**Country Office Evaluation Management**: UNDP CO management is ultimately responsible and accountable for the quality of the evaluation process and products under the leadership of the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative - Programme (DRR-P). The DRR-P will assign an **Evaluation Manager** (UNDP M&E Specialist) who shall be responsible for engaging and debriefing the Consulting team, coordinating review of reports, and ensuring compliance with UNDP/UNEG evaluation standards, ethics and code of conduct for evaluations. The CO Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report

The CO management will develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

 **Project Management**: The Programme Analyst responsible for Democracy Consolidation, NRIS Project M&E Officer will support the evaluator on a daily basis with respect to providing background information and progress reports and other documentation, setting up stakeholder meetings and interviews, arranging field visits and coordinating with beneficiaries and key stakeholders.

**Evaluation Reference Group**: An Evaluation Reference Group comprised of officials from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, National Registration Bureau (NRB), European Union, UNICEF, Reserve Bank of Malawi, Malawi Confederation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (MCCCI) and UNDP reference group will be established to guide the evaluation to ensure its credibility and utility. The reference group will be expected to assist in key aspects of the evaluation process including reviewing evaluation Terms of Reference and methodology, providing documents, providing detailed comments on the draft inception and evaluation reports and dissemination of evaluation findings, lessons learnt and recommendations.

**Evaluators.** Will be an independent international consultant and supported by a national consultant. Both should not have worked for UNDP or involved with national partners, in the design or implementation of the project.

The external evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc).

The evaluators will be expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of office equipment and supplies, communication, accommodation and transport. Furthermore, the evaluators will be expected to familiarize themselves with the United Nations Evaluation Group’s standards and norms for conducting project evaluations.

The evaluators will provide the Evaluation Manager with regular updates and feedback.

1. **Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluators are expected to deliver the following:

* **Inception reports** – will be expected to be formulated within 5 days of the start of the assignment. The reports will include a detailed approach and methodology including validation of project theory of change, schedule, division of labour, draft data collection protocols and an evaluation matrix. The evaluators will **propose a performance rating scheme** to be carried out for the five evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.
* **Draft evaluation report** – The Evaluators will present a Draft Report within 5 weeks after presentation of the inception report.
* **Evaluation audit trail** will be submitted together with the final evaluation report.
* **Final Evaluation Report**. The evaluators will present a Final Evaluation Report 5 days after receiving feedback and comments on the draft report from key stake holders.

**Provisional evaluation schedule**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable**  | **Content**  | **Estimated time-frame** | **Responsible person** |
| **Entry meeting** | Confirm ToR, discuss possible issues and approaches | 1 day | Evaluation manager |
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides understanding of ToR, validation of Theory of Change, performance criteria, clarifications on timing and method, division of labour, risks, evaluation matrix –a template for an Evaluation Matrix will be provided to the evaluator, questionnaires, etc. | 5 days  | Evaluators |
| Presentation and review of Inception Report | Presentation of IR by evaluator  | 1 day | Evaluators and Evaluation Manager |
| Consultations | Project personnel and stakeholder virtual meetings, project site visits (by local consultant), beneficiaries interviews, etc. | 12 days for international consultant; 19 days for national consultant] | Evaluators/Programme Analyst |
| Report drafting | Preparation of report consistent with ToR and IR | 7 days | Evaluator |
| Preparation of draft final report | Consultations with Evaluation Reference Group and revision of draft report, with audit trail | 2 days | Evaluator/Evaluation Manager |
| Validation of findings | Validation meeting with stakeholders | 1 day |  |
| Finalization and submission of final report with an audit trail of comments. | Consolidates and finalizes Draft Final Report in full report with contents as per annex I of the ToR. | 4 days | Evaluator |
| Total number of estimated days for the evaluation: 33 days for international consultant; 39 days for national consultant] |

*.*

 **Required expertise and qualifications**

The evaluation requires two evaluators: an international evaluator who will be the principal evaluator or team leader and a local evaluator. The evaluators should have the following expertise and qualifications.

**7.1 International Evaluator**

* The consultant must be a holder of a minimum of a Masters Degree in Social Science, management sciences or related field.
* Extensive expertise, knowledge and a minimum of 7 years’ experience in institutional development and programming in civil registration or related fields.
* Profound evaluation experience with a minimum of 3 evaluation assignments carried out in a leading position.
* Experience in development programming in sub-Saharan African countries.
* Experience in gender mainstreaming.

**7.2 Local Evaluator**

* The consultant must be a holder of á minimum of a Masters’ Degree in Social Science, Law, Conflict management or related field.
* Minimum of 7 years of experience in experience in institutional development and programming in any of the following fields: democratic governance, human rights, civic engagement, development management or related fields.
* Extensive experience in project evaluation.
* Experience in gender mainstreaming.
* Excellent report writing and communication skills.
	1. **Evaluator’s competencies:**
* Organizational Development and Management
* Strategic thinking
* Team work and leadership skills
* Strong analytical, reporting and communication skills
1. **Time and Duration:**

The evaluators will be hired for a maximum total of 73 work days [33 days for international consultants and 39 days national consultants].

Estimated Contract Start Date: 20 January, 2021**.** Contract End Date: 15 April, 2021.

1. **Time table**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** |  | **Weeks** |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Contract and entry meeting | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inception report, draft revised | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection and analysis |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drafting and submission of draft evaluation report |  |  |  | X | x |  |  |  |  |
| Virtual meeting with Evaluation Reference Group |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Draft report review of draft report by stakeholders and reference group members |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Validaton meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Revision and submission of final report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |

1. **Evaluation Ethics**

Responsibility of the CO to ensure credibility and independence of evaluation; responsibility of Team Leader to provide impartial, evidence-based, report adhering to international evaluation standards, etc.

The evaluation will follow UNEG guidelines on the ethical participation of human participants, including children and other vulnerable groups. All participants in the study will be fully informed about the nature and purpose of the evaluation and their requested involvement. Only participants who have given their written or verbal consent (documented) will be included in the evaluation.

**ANNEX I: RECOMMENDED EVALUATION REPORT CONTENTS**

The final report (maximum 50 pages, excluding annexes, shall be submitted by the consultant upon working on comments and inputs on the draft report.

**T**he suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

Title

Table of contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

Executive Summary

Introduction

Background and context

Evaluation scope and objectives

Evaluation approach and methods

Findings and conclusions

Lessons learned

Recommendations

Annexes

Annex II: List of people met or interviewed

Annex III: List of documents reviewed

Annex IV: Interview questionnaire

Annex V: Interview guide, if any.