**TERMS OF REFERENCES**

**Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through /GPN ExpRes**

**Services/Work Description:** Consultant for the Final Evaluation of the EU co-funded project titled “Support for Effective Cooperation and Coordination of Cross-border Initiatives in Southwest Ethiopia-Northwest Kenya,

Marsabit-Borana & Dawa, and Kenya-Somalia-Ethiopia” (SECCCI)

**Project/Programme Title:** Support for Effective Cooperation and Coordination of Cross-border Initiatives (SECCCI)

**Consultancy Title:** Consultant for project Final Evaluation

**Duty Station:** Home-based

**Duration:** 30 working days (evaluation to be finalized by 30/06/2021 the latest)

**BACKGROUND**

The SECCCI project is an integral part of the EU cross-border programme “Collaboration in Cross-Border Areas of the Horn of Africa Region”. The project is intended to address the drivers of conflict and instability, irregular migration and displacement and environmental degradation in the selected cross-border areas (clusters) of Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia, through improved cross-border coordination and cooperation.

The project, implemented by UNDP Regional Service Centre for Africa, in partnership with IGAD and UNEP operates in 3 cross-border clusters[[1]](#footnote-1) in the Horn of Africa and is in its last year of implementation and will run until 20 February 2021 (it has a total life span of three years (36 months) from February 2018 to February 2021).

Specific Objectives are:

* To strengthen regional policy frameworks, structures and protocols for cross-border cooperation between national and local Governments, the private sector, civil society and international technical and financial partners in development.
* Capacity building of communities, local governments and civil society to fully engage in processes for development planning and results.
* To ensure effective cooperation and coordination, monitoring and evaluation of cross-border initiatives including involvement of relevant national and regional actors in these processes.

Expected results are:

* Regional Policy frameworks, structures and protocols for cross-border cooperation between national and local Governments, the private sector, civil society and international technical and financial partners are strengthened.
* Capacity of communities, local governments and civil society to fully engage in processes for development planning and results are built.
* Effective cooperation & coordination, M&E of cross-border initiatives in place, including involvement of relevant national and regional actors in these processes.

Target beneficiaries are:

Local citizens and direct beneficiaries: women, youth, citizens in target project clusters;

Elderly groups, peace committees, ethnic/cultural minorities;

Opinion makers: national and regional mass media, key influencing people in the communities, member of

Parliament at the target cluster level, CSOs;

Key stakeholders are: relevant government agencies, federal, regional and local government representatives at the

Cluster level, political parties and diplomatic community.

The cross-border areas in which the project is implemented are characterized by complex challenges: poorly developed physical infrastructure; remote location from the respective capitals; poor education indicators and high unemployment and poverty levels; low levels of formal employment income generating opportunities. These conditions are further exacerbated by no less complex recurring conflicts as a consequence of resource limitations (water and rangeland); theft of cattle (rustling); political instigation; high unemployment of women and youth.

Particularly in the first part of 2020, many of the project’s activities could not take place as foreseen due to the movement and gathering restrictions imposed by the spread of Covid-19 in the project’s Clusters of intervention. In fact, many of the project’s activities consist in trainings and community dialogues, which imply the physical participation of different stakeholders – usually coming from both sides of the borders – including members of local communities (e.g. pastors, elders, youth, etc.), who often do not have access to internet connection. As part of mitigation measures, some of the foreseen in-presence activities were re-structured in order to be implemented online. In addition, the project agreed on a partial repurposing of some project funds to provide PPEs and COVID response items to local authorities and stakeholders in the 3 Clusters.

As the project comes to an end officially on 20 February 2021, a Final Evaluation of the project needs to be conducted in order to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project, which can be used to strengthen existing project interventions and to set the stage for new initiatives.

The final evaluation exercise is expected to be conducted in accordance with UNDP Evaluation Guidelines and OECD/DAC standard evaluation criteria and principles. Mixed method approach needs to be adopted using qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods and tools.

The global travel restrictions due to the Covid-19 pandemic, pose a great challenge in collection of primary data

from project stakeholders, which would usually be planned through in-person interviews and visits to field locations. Given the extraordinary situation, field missions will not be possible. Therefore, all stakeholder’s consultations need to be conducted remotely.

**SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK**

The SECCCI project is managed by the UNDP Regional Service Centre in Addis Ababa, through a partnership with 2

other implementing partners: IGAD and UNEP.

The partnership is regulated through an exchange of letters between the organizations, while the contract with

the EU was signed by UNDP RSCA.

As the project comes to an end officially on 20 February 2021, a Final Evaluation of the project needs to be

conducted in order to review the overall project cycle, draw conclusions, assess the project’s performance and

extract lessons learned from the experience.

**Evaluation purpose**

UNDP commissions evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to

development results at the regional level as articulated in the Regional programme document (RPD). These are

evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the

Evaluation Plan of the Regional Bureau for Africa outcome evaluations are being conducted to assess the impact of

RSCA development assistance across the major thematic and cross cutting areas of sustainable and inclusive

growth, gender equality and conflict management and use of the environment. The Regional Office in Addis Ababa

Ethiopia is commissioning this evaluation to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency

and sustainability of current programming, which can be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the

stage for new initiatives. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing stakeholders and

partners with an impartial assessment of project implementation progress.

**Scope of the Final Evaluation**

The outcome evaluation will be conducted with a view to assess the project’s performance and achievements visà-

vis the project’s overall objectives and to conduct impact assessment on the various beneficiaries. The

evaluation will consider the pertinent project outcomes and outputs focused towards improved cross-border

cooperation and coordination, as stated in the SECCCI’s project document. The Final Evaluation will cover the time

frame from project start date on 22 February 2018 to 21 February 2021. Interventions to be covered by this

evaluation are SECCCI Project activities implemented by UNDP RSCA, in partnership with UNEP, IGAD and UNDP

Country Offices of Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia and currently focused on three cross border clusters namely:

1. Marsabit - Moyale at the Kenyan, Ethiopian border (Cluster IV);

2. Turkana – Omo at the Kenyan and Ethiopian Border (Cluster I);

3. Mandera – Gedo – Doolow at the Kenyan, Ethiopian and Somali border (Cluster II).

**Objectives of the Final Evaluation**

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

* Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. Refer to the immediate objectives, outputs, indicators and activities.
* Provide evidence of UNDP’s contribution to Africa’s development effectiveness improved cross-border coordination and cooperation, including the contributory factors and impediments.
* Provide stakeholders in regional programme countries and among development partners with an objective assessment of the development contributions that have been achieved through UNDP RSC support and partnerships with other key players through the regional programme during the given period.
* Determine the strategic positioning and relevance of UNDP in this sector – the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps - especially about the appropriateness of their partnership strategy (including choice of beneficiaries), their ToC, and any need for mid-course adjustments to meet the outcomes.
* Distil lessons for future programming, including to inform higher level evaluations and future decision making and planning of similar projects in the same sector.
* Contribute substantively to the Administrator’s accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board.
* Facilitate learning to inform current and future programming at the regional and corporate levels.

**Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. Thus, the outcome evaluation seeks

to answer the following questions, focused on the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency

and sustainability:

Relevance

* To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
* To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
* To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design?
* To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
* To what extent did UNDP adopt gender-sensitive, human rights-based and conflict-sensitive approaches?
* To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country

Effectiveness

* To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
* To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
* To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
* Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
* To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
* To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
* To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the

realization of human rights?

Efficiency

* To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
* To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
* To what extent did UNDP promote gender equality, the empowerment of women, human rights and human development in the delivery of country programme outputs?
* To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost effective?
* To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* Discuss what needs to be done to ensure the sustainability of the project;
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
* To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
* To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
* To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
* What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

Financial risks to sustainability

* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability.

* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?

Environmental risks to sustainability

* To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?

**Evaluation cross-cutting issues questions**

The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

Human Rights

* 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

* 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?

Capacity Building

* Did the governance programme of the RSCA adequately invest in, and focus on, Regional and national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency
* Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc.) delivered by the governance programme adapted to country needs

Covid-19

* How did Covid-19 impact the implementation of the project?
* Were project activities reprogrammed in order to implement them despite the limitations imposed by Covid-19?

SDGs:

* An analysis on the project’s contribution towards the achievement of the UN 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) needs to be included in the final evaluation.

Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on UNDP RSCA

results in this area of support, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP RBA could adjust its programming,

partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the governance

portfolio fully achieves current planned outcomes and is positioned for sustainable results in the future. The

evaluation is additionally expected to offer lessons for UNDP support in Region and elsewhere based on this

analysis.

**Final Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

The outcome evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator, and will engage a wide array of stakeholders

and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments where programmes or advisory support were provided,

academics and subject experts, private sector representatives etc.

The outcome evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change’’ (TOC) approach to determining causal links

between the interventions that UNDP RSCA has supported and observed progress in democratic governance at

the regional level. The evaluators will develop a logic model of how UNDP RSCA governance interventions are

expected to lead to improved regional and national and local government management and service delivery.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP RSCA support should be triangulated from a variety of

sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder

interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

**Evaluation ethics**

The project evaluation method is designed to assess the project achievements, generate lessons learned and

develop recommendations with active participation of the partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries to guarantee

continuation of interventions when donor support has ended. An objective external point of view from the

Consultant will be valuable to the learning process.

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct

upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in

the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

**Impact of Covid-19**

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. Travel to the country has been restricted since and travel in

the country is also restricted. 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.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants 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, consultants, stakeholders and if

such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants

can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

**Expected Outputs and 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. The evaluation inception report shall include a

workplan and evaluation schedule;

**Evaluation debriefings:** Immediately following the evaluation, the Evaluator will give a preliminary

debriefing of the final evaluation and findings;

**Draft evaluation** report for comment, including executive summary. 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;

**Evaluation report audit trail** detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed.

Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the

evaluator to show how they have addressed comments;

**Final evaluation report** addressing comments, questions and clarifications;

- Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group;

**Lessons Learned report**: The lessons learned report should cover the different facets of the governance

programme implemented by the RSCA. This report should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

**Time frame for the evaluation process**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | **Deliverables / Outputs Estimated Duration** | **Deliverables / Outputs Estimated Duration** | **Deliverables / Outputs Estimated Duration** |
| 1 | Inception report and evaluation matrix | 7 Working days | SECCCI Project Manager |
| 2 | Draft evaluation report and Stakeholder workshop presentation | 16 Working days | SECCCI Project Manager |
| 3 | Final evaluation report | 7 Working days | SECCCI Project Manager |
| Total |  | **30 Working days** |  |

**Institutional arrangements/reporting lines**

RSCA SECCCI Project Team will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the Evaluator to assist

in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants,

etc.). The Regional Office Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The

Programme Officer (Quality Assurance)/SECCCI Programme Manager in the RSCA will arrange introductory

meetings within RSC and the Cluster Lead or his designate will establish initial contacts with partners and project

staff. The consultant will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to

advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The Management of RSC/RBA will

develop a management response to the evaluation within four weeks of report finalization.

As the final evaluation will be conducted remotely, UNDP will support the implementation of remote meetings. An

updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided to the evaluation team.

**Experience and qualifications**

1. Academic Qualifications: Advanced degree in social sciences, international development, political science, conflict studies, monitoring and evaluation, communication related subjects.
2. Years of experience: Extensive (at least 5-year) professional experience and proven track record within the preparation of reviews and evaluation processes (experience with UNDP and/or EU-funded projects is an asset);

At least 3 years of experience in approaches for design, monitoring and evaluation of projects at regional, sub-regional or country level. Previous experience with UNDP will be an asset; Familiarity with the context of the HoA and prior experience working on cross border cooperation are highly desirable.

1. Language: Excellent oral and written skills in English. Knowledge of Swahili and Amharic will be an asset
2. Competencies: Strong background in M&E;

Excellent drafting, writing, proof reading and narrative reporting skills;

Demonstrated experience with UNDP and EU evaluation requirements is desirable;

Strong working knowledge of the UN and its mandate in the region, and more specifically the

work of UNDP in support of cross-border initiatives in the region;

Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation

methodologies; including experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable;

R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators;

Coordination experience working with government, development partners, and international

partners would be an asset;

Excellent knowledge of and extensive experience in the East and Horn of Africa region in the past

seven years is desirable (experience in Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia will be an asset);

Experience working with international technical assistance projects in the African countries would be an asset;

Experience in engaging in multi-stakeholder processes in domestication of regional protocols;

Experience working with or supporting regional bodies (eg. IGAD and AU) is desirable.

**Payment Modality**

Payment to the individual contractor will be made based on the actual number of days worked, deliverables

accepted and upon certification of satisfactory completion by the manager.

**Annex 1 - Intervention Results Framework and Theory of Change**

**Annex 2 – List of Key stakeholders and partners**

**Annex 3 - Documents to be consulted**

**Annex 4 - Evaluation Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATION MATRIX** | | | | | | |
| **Relevant**  **evaluation**  **criteria** | **Key**  **Questions** | **Specific**  **Sub-**  **Questions** | **Data**  **Sources** | **Data collection**  **Methods/Tools** | **Indicators/**  **Success**  **Standard** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex 5 - The code of conduct (to be signed by the evaluator upon signing he contract)**

1. Cluster 1: South Omo-Turkana bordering Ethiopia and Kenya. Cluster 2: Marsabit-Borana and Liben bordering Ethiopia and Kenya. Cluster 3: Mandera-Gedo-Doolow-Dawa which is at the Mandera Triangle bordering Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)