

## Country Programme Document (CPD) 2019-2023 Mid-Term Evaluation

### Terms of Reference

#### 1. Background and context

##### 1.1 Country Context

Namibia is an Upper Middle-Income Country (UMIC), with a Gross Domestic product (GDP) per capita of USD\$ 12.37 billion<sup>1</sup>. Namibia is a constitutional multi-party democracy and features amongst the top 10 most peaceful countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. After experiencing average annual growth of 4.4% between 1991 and 2015, Namibia's economy fell into recession in 2016 and has since struggled to recover. The COVID-19 (coronavirus) pandemic is set to have an unprecedented impact on Namibia's economy and has exacerbated preexisting structural challenges. Real GDP contracted by 7.4% year-on-year (y-o-y) over Q1-Q3 2020. The mining sector, which is an important earner of foreign exchange, declined by 12.2% y-o-y. This was a result of domestic factors and falling global demand (especially diamonds). On the back of local and foreign travel restrictions, the hospitality industry recorded a large contraction of 46.5% y-o-y. Overall, the GDP contracted by 7.3% in 2020<sup>2</sup>. The Human Development Index for Namibia is rated at 0.646, which is above the average for countries in the medium human development group (0.631) and above the average of 0.523 for countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Namibia ranks 5th out of 54 African Countries on the 2016 Mo Ibrahim Index of African governance. With a Gini Index of 56<sup>3</sup>, Namibia is considered one of the most unequal countries in the world. Due to inequalities in human development, Namibia's Human Development Index is revised downward from 0.645 to 0.417, with education, health, and income contributing 25%, 22% and 53.6% to the loss, respectively. With regards to unemployment, UNECA estimates an increase between 0.75 (best-case) and 1.4 (worst-case) percentage points in unemployment, bringing it up from 33.4% to 34.2% and 34.5%, correspondingly<sup>4</sup>.

The Transparency International Perception Corruption Index of 2017 ranks Namibia as the fifth least corrupt country in sub-Saharan Africa. In terms of press freedom, Namibia ranks 1st according to the 2016 World Index. Despite such a strong foundation, Namibia faces several persistent development challenges. It remains one of the most unequal nations in the world, with a Gini coefficient of 0.591. Gender inequality is also high as Namibia ranks 106<sup>th</sup> out of 159 countries with a Gender Inequality Index value of 0.440. As compared to other Upper-Middle Income Country (UMICs), it has the lowest percentage (55%) of its population with access to improved sanitation facilities and only 48% (mainly urban) with access to electricity<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> World Bank, 2020

<sup>2</sup> World Bank Group

<sup>3</sup> BoN, 2020

<sup>4</sup> World Bank Group

<sup>5</sup> Namibia Household Income and Expenditure Survey, Namibia Statistics Agency, 2015/2016

The robust economic growth experienced since independence has neither led to adequate job creation nor has it been inclusive. Resultantly, there has been growing unemployment which is currently at 33.4%, with the youth occupying a share of 43.3%, 38% for women and 29.8% for men respectively. In addition, poverty rate or the population of people living under the poverty line is clustered around 17.4% and a literacy rate of 88.9%. According to the NSA, 43.3% of the total population in Namibia are living in multidimensional poverty<sup>6</sup>. Worse off the disabled persons unemployment is 39%. Unemployment is also highest in rural areas at 39.2% compared to 30.3% in urban areas<sup>7,8</sup>. The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated unemployment, as many staff in tourism industry are losing their jobs, affecting youth disproportionately, with youth demanding government action for creation of jobs.

### 1.2 Introduction to the CPD

UNDP Namibia Country Programme Document (CPD) for 2019-2023 is informed by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and is aligned with the Namibia Fifth National Development Plan (NDP5) (2017 - 2022) and the United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) for the period 2019 - 2023. Leveraging UNDP's investments in the past, this country programme is guided by the corporate Strategic Plan for the period 2018 - 2021. The NDP5, covering the period 2017 - 2022 prioritizes to achieve Inclusive, Sustainable and Equitable Economic growth, Build Capable and Healthy Resources, Ensure Sustainable Environment and Enhance Resilience and Promote Good Governance through effective institutions. In line with UNDP's comparative advantage in providing policy advice and capacity building, the country programme posits three pathways: diversified pro-poor employment; sustainable environment and resilience; and inclusive governance to accelerate achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and achieve inclusive green growth , accountable institutions for poverty eradication and inequality reduction. The programme seeks to leverage synergies with other United Nations agencies and contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Taking into account the above, the planned mid-term evaluation (MTE) will firstly seek to assess progress made towards the achievement of the CPD outputs and realization of the CPD outcomes in order to appreciate UNDP's contribution to both the UNPAF and the NDP 5 at the national level as well as UNDP's Namibia's contributions to the UNDP global strategies, including the global development agenda 2030. Secondly, MTE shall draw lessons that will then inform the remainder of the country programme period. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that the Country Office (CO) is planning to undertake a facilitated exercise that will look both internally and externally to inform the how and what as far as the remaining period of the programme cycle, drawing on experience and lessons learnt over the past period. Some of this work is currently ongoing towards the design of the CO portfolios.

### 1.3. Changed Programming Context

2020 saw the world over-impacted by the first truly global pandemic in over a century. The impact on Namibia, as on the rest of the world, has been devastating. Not only on the health and well-being of the nation and people, but also on the wider socio-economic fabric of the nation. On 17 March 2020, a State of Emergency was declared in Namibia, followed by travel restrictions and a national lockdown after the country had registered sixteen cases in April 2020. Other measures included instituting a 14-day quarantine for people entering the country, a work-from-home policy, and the closure of selected ports.

---

<sup>6</sup> NSA, MPI, 2021

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid4

In Namibia, from 3 January 2020 to 24 June 2021, there have been 77,333 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with 1,224 deaths, reported to WHO. As of 20 June 2021, a total of 123,954 vaccine doses have been administered<sup>9</sup>. The capital city, Windhoek, is currently under lockdown until the 15<sup>th</sup> of July, due to high number of Covid-19 infection death related cases.

The implication of the measures against COVID-19 on the United Nations (UN) and the UNDP programming has been significant. By large it has negative consequences; however, it has opened the space for UNDP to engage on issues related to health and social protection. Further, it enables the UN System under the technical leadership of UNDP to fully embrace the interconnectedness of the 17 SDGs.

In the area of **diversified pro-poor employment**, UNDP has provided support towards strengthening the institutional frameworks for inclusive growth strategies. Examples of support provided includes the training of entrepreneurs in basic entrepreneurship skills for poverty, the establishment of the Sustainable Development Goals Impact Facility (SDGIF), which will be used to provide grant funds to match financing to support women and youth in business, social enterprises and micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) to address the challenges of the financing gap they face, and the establishment of the National Disability Forum, that seeks to bring together a cross-section of stakeholders with an interest in, or responsibility for the rights of persons with disabilities, among others.

Some projects still face challenges such as the absence of project boards to govern the projects and lack of government cost-sharing support. Lastly, COVID 19 significantly impacted the ability of government efforts, notably slower implementation pace and resource limitations as most of the funding had to be redirected to respond to COVID 19.

In the area of **sustainable environment and resilience**, UNDP's interventions are largely aimed at boosting the provision and use of cleaner, more affordable energy in rural areas, strengthening the institutional and legislative aspects of disaster risk management, and supporting ecosystem-based climate change adaptation measures and biodiversity conservation. UNDP has provided support to improve environmental management and build resilience. Some examples of support provided range from mobilization of financial resources, the development of adaptation and mitigation measures contained in the updated Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) report, completion of National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (NGHGI), the establishment of the Conservation Relief, Recovery & Resilience Facility (CRRRF)( which aims to provide financial relief to Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) institutions affected by the COVID pandemic), launching of five landscapes to implement integrated landscape management in agricultural and forested areas, to the construction of auction and marketing kraal and community forestry's offices. UNDP financially supported (the formulation of projects, stakeholder engagements and gender-related actions, etc.) development of nature-based solutions that aims to address human wildlife conflicts and wildlife crimes. UNDP's interventions have helped scale up policy implementation and systems by supporting improvement of national coordination mechanisms, such as the sustainable development advisory council and Parliamentary standing committee on natural resources.

The challenges noted included delays in recruitment of key project staff, postponement of project development efforts and severe slow project implementation pace (esp. in areas where physical contact was the main delivery mechanism) which led to little financial utilization in some interventions. Since mid-March 2020, all Benguela Current Commission (BCC) Parties have initiated state of emergency responses

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://covid19.who.int/region/afro/country/na>

due to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic. This has resulted in the countries applying lockdown measures such as travel restrictions and reduced numbers of people during physical gatherings. Due to this impact and initial delays faced particularly by the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) III Project, the implementing partner has requested project extension. BCC is a tripartite agreement which requires the project to engage the three governments namely: Namibia, Angola and South Africa, to jointly reach consensus on project inputs. Typically, this is achieved through physical meetings of established structures such as working groups, committee meetings etc. Covid-19 has imposed travel restrictions; therefore, meetings or gatherings could not be executed as initially envisaged, which has also impacted financial delivery. Most interventions being supported under these areas include working directly with rural communities with no or limited access to virtual platforms; hence, most activities were put on hold.

With regards to **Inclusive governance**, UNDP, and United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) supported the review of the National Universal Periodic Review (UPR) report to develop the 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle Namibia's National UPR report. Also, UNDP supported the National Planning Commission with the development of the National SDG Communication Strategy with an emphasis on citizens engagement using the SDG online hub. There has been continuous support to the Namibia Statistics Agency for enhanced data collection and reporting for decision making. A noticeable good working relation was established among UN agencies and the Namibia government to produce the socio-economic impact assessment of the COVID 19 to highlight some of the assessments of the socio-economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Namibian society. Challenges experienced are that of virtual engagements as most offices did not have the capacity to operate virtually.

Good governance including data management, gender equality and sustainability are deliberately planned to be addressed across the three pathways of the CPD, which define an integrated approach to strengthen decentralized structures and local governance systems and enhance citizen engagement in decision making to address inclusive growth strategies. To address information and data gaps, and strengthen accountability, innovative solutions will be explored for disaggregated data generation and analysis including on disability, through rights-based approach throughout the entire CPD period. The focus of the programme has been the poor women and youth, the marginalised, and persons living with disability, especially in the biodiversity rich/sensitive, disaster-prone areas where improvement for resilience to shocks, access to employment, water and clean energy are significantly required.

In the past year, the Accelerator Lab has introduced some of the "UNDP Next Generation" thinking into the programme strategy and presented disruptive innovations.

Against the above background, a mid-term evaluation of the CPD implementation needs to be conducted, as per objectives presented in Section 2.

## **2. Evaluation purpose, scope, and objectives**

### **2.1. Evaluation purpose**

The Namibia CPD 2019-2023 has entered the mid-point of its implementation in 2021. This milestone calls for a mid-term evaluation (MTE) to take stock of achievements, progress, and challenges, as well as to inform management's course corrections as warranted and to ensure the CPD makes the intended impact

and contributes to the overall development results at the country level. In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Namibia, the CPD MTE is being conducted to assess the impact of UNDP's development assistance across the major thematic and cross-cutting areas of UNPAF and the national development priorities. It is a response to the changing programme context and the need for UNDP to assess the continuing relevance of its programme with greater focus on its Development mandate in context of the changing development landscape and new risks posed by COVID-19.

In addition, and consistent with UNDP policy guidance, all outcomes to which UNDP is contributing through aligned activities and planned outputs must be monitored. The mid-term evaluation is an opportunity to examine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, appropriateness, and sustainability of the CPD in supporting Namibia's development agenda as defined in the NDP 5. The MTE will provide an accountability tool as well to evaluation progress and adjust direction if needed. The MTE will also assess the progress against the key indicators and the projects and programmes developed under the current CPD.

The midterm evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme will allow UNDP to engage key stakeholders to discuss achievements, lessons learned, and adjustments required in response to an evolving development landscape and changing national priorities. The exercise will allow UNDP to make any mid-course adjustments to the strategic direction of the country programme, as well as allocate resources as appropriate, ensuring it is aligned to national priorities and responsive to national demands. Even more importantly, the exercise will allow the CO to align its programme more strategically behind the emerging imperatives of the new UNDP Strategic Plan currently under discussion and the UN Socio Economic Recovery Plan in support to the national recovery agenda.

### 2.1. Objectives of the MTE

The objective of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the progress in achieving the results of the country programme, its relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of strategies considering the development priorities of Namibia as well as assess the newly established portfolios. Considering the COVID 19 impacts which led to reprogramming and repurposing of funds, UNDP now contributes to the health pillar which was not foreseen. Therefore, the MTE should assess the designed programme in this evolving development context.

Specifically, the evaluation will assess:

1. The Theory of Change (TOC), solution pathway formulated, assess achievements made towards it, and aim to reconstruct the TOC given the emerging development challenges.
2. The relevance and strategic positioning of the UNDP ensuring its integrator role in support of Namibia's poverty reduction and objectives for the achievement of the SDGs as articulated in the National Development Plan in the context of the UNDS reform and in line with the delivery as articulated in the UNPAF.
3. Evaluate the three CPD outcomes on the extent to which progress been made towards outcome and the UNDP's 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.

4. The frameworks and strategies that UNDP has devised for its support on Inclusive Growth and SDGs; Democratic Governance and Environment, and Sustainable Development, including partnership strategies, and whether they are well conceived for achieving the planned objectives.
5. Assess progress against 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.
6. The relevance of the programme in delivery strategies in the context of the SDGs and the African Agenda 2063, through an integrator approach, promoting greater innovation and engagement of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders especially at local level considering regional and cross-borders dimension.
7. The extent to which the programmes have integrated gender and human rights approaches in implementation for inclusivity in line with the concept of leaving no one behind. Identify opportunities to strengthen gender and human right dynamics.
8. Provide forward-looking recommendations. a revised Results and Resources Framework that could possibly inform the next cycle of the country programme, considering the broad corporate direction and mandate on socio-economic recovery following the COVID-19 crisis. This will inform the next programming cycle.
9. Conduct a light assessment of the existing organizational structure of the CO to ascertain whether it is well-suited to delivering the results in line with the aspiration of the CPD and revised resource mobilization strategy.
  - Assess whether the structure is working in line with the original objectives of the optimization after the completion of the first two and half years of operation.
  - Assess the appropriateness of reporting lines and structure of UNDP field offices based on programmatic footprints and priorities in view of broadening their roles to local programme implementation support.
  - Assess how the business processes and systems in the office provide it with the agility to respond to a crisis, such as the COVID19 pandemic.

## 2.2. Scope of the MTE

The mid-term evaluation will cover programme activities from 2019 to 2021 funded by all sources, including core and non-core UNDP resources, donor funds, and government funds. The geographic coverage will include all activities under the three pillars of the CO engagement. This will also cover the extent to which the programme strategy addresses several points of reference, namely, national priorities,

as expressed in the 5<sup>th</sup> National Development Plan (2017-2023) and individual ministerial strategic objectives; the United Nations Partnership Assistance Framework (UNPAF); the UNDS Reform; and the delinking of the Resident Coordinator function; and the extent that the UNDP-supported interventions (outputs) have contributed to the attainment of UNPAF key results or outcomes. The task will also involve an evaluation of gender-related results achieved under the country programme. Furthermore, MTE will assess how the principles of “leaving no-one behind” has been enhanced. The evaluation should cover the UNDP quality standards for programming<sup>10</sup> including risk identification and risk mitigation measures in the context of COVID-19.

Given the severe socio-economic impacts of COVID-19, this MTE presents an opportunity to evaluate and redefine the strategic focus of UNDP Namibia (in terms of the scope and focus of the CPD and corresponding projects/programme portfolios; [a. Diversified employment, pro-poor income and sustainable livelihoods for women, youth, persons with disabilities and marginalized population (SIGG), b. Sustainable environmental management and enhanced resilience (SEMER), and c. Improved governance for accountable, responsive institutions and civic engagement (GRICE)], which identifies specific development challenges that UNDP should address and the interventions to support it). It also presents an opportunity to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of UNDP’s contribution to the country’s development, which includes an assessment of the progress-to-date.

### 3. Evaluation criteria and key questions.

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

- 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 resources and CO Governance structure to fulfil the expected size and scope of the results that could be delivered with 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 is the CO’s capacity to deliver on the intended results?
- iii To what extent has the CPD implementation succeeded in contributing to the achievement of the SDGs?
- iv What results has UNDP achieved in promoting gender equality? To what extent is UNDP’s selected method of implementation/partnership modalities suitable to the country and the development context?

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

#### Relevance

---

<sup>10</sup> The quality standards are outlined in the Evaluation guidelines, page 13-14, box 14

- To what extent is the country programme relevant to the evolving context and the national development agenda? To what extent does the CO have capacities to deliver on the intended results?
- To what extent is the CPD aligned with the national development needs and priorities. Should adjustments in CPD implementation be considered in line with the SDGs?
- Given the COVID 19 pandemic, has there been a change in national priorities and context? And 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 the current governance structure of the Country Office appropriate in view to promote unified approach of its programmatic engagement strategy to enhance clarity on accountability, expectations and minimize duplication of efforts.
- To what extent have the intervention logic / theory of change and the underlying assumptions of the country programme integrated gender equality and other cross-cutting issues?

### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent is the current CPD on track to achieve planned results (intended and unintended, positive, or negative including gender equality, disability issues, women's empowerment, and other cross-cutting issues) in country programme result framework? What were the key contributing factors for achieving or not achieving the intended results?
- What has been UNDP's contribution to CPD outcomes, and capacity to influence change against established outcome indicators?
- What strategic and programmatic revisions should UNDP consider in achieving the intended results given the current situation of COVID 19?
- 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?

### **Efficiency**

- To what extent has the CO been able to utilize the core resources to levy external funding to support the achievement of the SDGs?
- Given the reprogramming and repurposing of funds in the era of COVID-19, to what extent has 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 programmes are managed efficiently and effectively?
- To what extent and how has UNDP mobilized and used its resources (human, time, technical and financial) and improved inter-agency synergies to achieve its planned results in the current CPD cycle?

### **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?
- Does the CO have the capacity to sustain its operations in terms of financial and programmatic implementation based on the resource projection and governance structure?

- To what extent has the UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the programme benefits for women, men, and other vulnerable groups?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies in place to sustain the outcome-level results?

#### **Human rights**

- How well does the design of the CPD address the needs of the most vulnerable groups in the country?
- To what extent has the poor, persons with disabilities, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged / 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 that there is gender equality, empowerment of women, promotion of human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?

#### **Partnerships**

- 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 Namibia, to promote long-term sustainability and durability of results?
- How can the partnership and communication of the country office be enhanced for enlarging resource base through strengthening partnership and communications with the government and development partners?

### **4. Methodology**

The evaluation will adopt a participatory and inclusive approach, giving voice to different stakeholders involved in the implementation of the CPD as either Implementing Partners, beneficiaries, partners, or other stakeholders. The evaluation team should evaluate 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 MTE 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. It is expected that the consultants will use an appropriate range of gender disaggregated data collection methods and analysis, including cross-borders and regional recurrent and emerging challenges taking into account the gender dimension, to come up with findings, conclusions and recommendations for the questions mentioned above. The Methodologies for addressing gender-specific issues as well as inclusion of the SDGs should be submitted in the inception report.

#### **4.1. Desk review (home based)**

The MTE team is expected to evaluate all available documents, such as the project documents and evaluation reports, Progress quarterly reports, ROARs, Partnership surveys, donor reports, APRs/PIRs, as well as national policy documents and reports, and other documents that the team considers useful for the MTE and use the information for analysis.

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

The evaluation team should develop online/ virtual 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.

#### 4.3. Project and portfolio analysis (virtually)

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

#### 4.4. Others

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. Currently, travel to and within Namibia has been restricted until 15 July 2021. Since it will not be 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.). No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be exposed to any harm and hence 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 undertake the evaluation and in person interviews in country if it is safe to do so.

The work of the MTE Consultant will be guided by the Norms and Standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group. Team members will be requested to sign the Code of Conduct prior to engaging in the evaluation exercise.

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

The evaluation team should submit the following deliverables:

- Evaluation inception report including a workplan and evaluation schedule
- Presentation of key evaluation findings
- Draft evaluation report for comment

- Audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed.
- final report (addressing comments, questions, and clarifications); and
- Presentations and other knowledge products

*In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.*

*Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete it, due to circumstances beyond his/her control.*

## **6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies.**

The evaluation team will consist of one international consultant- as a team leader and one national consultant as a team member. The team composition should be gender inclusive. In this regard, UNDP is looking to engage two consultants, with experience in programme and projects evaluations to support the evaluation process remotely.

### **6.1 International consultant (Team Leader)**

Working days: 20 days (home based)

S/he will be responsible to lead the whole MTE of the CPD and ensure overall quality and timely submission of the deliverables. Specifically, Major roles and responsibilities:

- Overall lead and manage the MTE of the CPD in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines.
- Evaluate all relevant documents and finalize the evaluation methods, scope and data collection and analysis instruments;
- Guide the team member in designing the data collection tools and data gathering processes and in drafting the report;
- Lead consultations with key stakeholders and relevant international development partners including donors;
- Contribute to and ensure overall quality of all deliverables, including the final report, ensuring the triangulation of the findings, and obtain strong evidence for the analysis of information from multiple sources;
- Lead the sharing of key findings of the evaluation to the concerned stakeholders;
- Incorporate the comments and feedback of the stakeholders in the draft report to finalize it and submit the final report to UNDP within stipulated timeline.

Qualification and Competencies:

At least a master's degree in economics, public/business administration, political science, governance, international relations or any other relevant fields with extensive working experience in the international development sectors, including on gender equality and social inclusion.

Required competences:

- Minimum 7 years of solid experience in bilateral project and programme evaluation, and proven accomplishments in undertaken evaluations for international organisations, preferably including UNDP
- Experience of designing and/or conducting Outcome/CPD/UNPAF evaluations/evaluations
- Knowledge and demonstrated experience of designing and/or evaluating UNDP CO Business Model and providing solid recommendations for adjustment
- Experience in managing development programmes cross-category programmes with focus on governance, environment, Sustainable Development Goals, poverty, gender equality and related cross-cutting development issues
- Experience in managing and/or advising on large scale development programmes and portfolios
- Knowledge of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods
- Knowledge of the regional and national political, cultural, and economic context
- Excellent inter-personal, teamwork and communication skills.
- Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis and demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender-mainstreaming
- Flexibility in remote working arrangements and experience of conducting stakeholder interviews and collecting data remotely
- Openness to change, ability to receive and integrate feedback
- Excellent analytical and report writing, presentation and editing skills in English

## 6.2 National consultant (Team member)

Working days: 15 days (home based)

Major roles and responsibilities:

The consultant will be responsible for evaluating documents, collecting data and information (remotely) from different sources, analysing the progress, issues, and challenges, providing inputs in drafting the report with guidance of the Team Leader. Specifically, the team members will have the following roles and responsibilities:

- Gathering and reviewing of relevant documents.
- Provide inputs to the team leader in designing the MTE including methodologies and data collection instruments;
- Development of thematic/outcome papers contributing to the larger mid-term evaluation.
- Conduct interviews with the selected respondents, partners, and stakeholders.
- Facilitate stakeholders' discussions and focus groups to collect, collate and synthesize information (virtually);
- Analyse the data and support the Team Leader in preparing a draft report;
- Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the report and sharing it with stakeholders.

**Qualification and Competencies:**

At least Master's degrees in environmental management, development studies, evaluation theory or a related field with working experience of minimum five years in development sector, including on gender equality and social inclusion.

**Required competencies:**

- Minimum 5 years demonstrated experience of evaluating development project and programme, monitoring or social research with international organizations. Experience with UN/ UNDP is desirable.
- Experience of working with development programmes with focus on governance, environment, Sustainable Development Goals, poverty, gender equality and related cross-cutting development issues
- Strong knowledge of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods
- Knowledge of national political, cultural, and economic contexts
- Excellent inter-personal, teamwork and communication skills.
- Experience of conducting stakeholder interviews and collecting data
- Experience and knowledge of gender sensitive research or monitoring, evaluation and analysis
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender-mainstreaming
- Excellent reading and writing skills in English, and preferably also two or more local languages.
- Experience in implementing evaluations remotely.

**7. Evaluation Ethics**

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations Annex 5. Evaluators 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 outcomes and programmes under evaluation. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant are included in Annex.

**8. Management and Implementation arrangements**

The UNDP CO will select the consultants through an open and competitive bidding process and will be responsible for the management of the evaluators. The DRR will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the UNDP programme teams to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging interviews with key informants, etc.) and to interview the project teams at implementing partners. The CO Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The Focal point will arrange introductory meetings within the CO and establish initial contacts with partners and project staff. The consultants will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The CO management will develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Country office to the evaluation team and the CO will provide some logistical online support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with senior government official.

The evaluation team is required to address all comments from UNDP and stakeholders completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to UNDP for any comment that remain unaddressed. The evaluation will use a system of ratings standardizing assessments proposed by the evaluators in the inception report. Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.

### 9. Timeframe for the evaluation process.

The total duration of the MTE will be approximately 35 days over a period of 7 weeks starting 26 July 2021 and shall not exceed three months from when the consultant(s) are hired.

Table 1: An indicative breakout for activities and delivery:

Activity	Deliverable	Workday allocation
1. Review materials and develop a work plan	Inception report and evaluation matrix	5 days
2. Hold an Inception Meeting with UNDP Namibia Country Office		
3. Draft inception report		
4. Review documents	Draft evaluation report	26 days
5. Stakeholder consultations		
6. Data analysis		
7. Develop draft evaluation and lessons learned report for submission to CO	Stakeholder workshop presentation	
8. Present draft Evaluation and lessons learned Report at Validation Workshop		
9. Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders	Final evaluation report	4 days
	Evaluation Brief	
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>35 days</b>

\*The final MTE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

### 10. Use of MTE results

The findings of this MTE will be used to revise the CPD targets, resource mobilization and partnership and communication strategy and CO Governance structure in the changed socio-economic context post COVID-19 and use the lessons learned and way forward for future course of action of the UNDP. Therefore, the MTE report should provide critical findings and specific recommendations for future interventions.

### 11. Fees and payments

- Interested consultants should provide their requested fee rates when they submit their expressions of interest, in USD and local currency for the local consultant.

- The offer should be all inclusive, with all costs (professional fees, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred which should already be factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal.
- The UNDP Country Office will then negotiate and finalize contracts.
- Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by the UNDP Country Office of planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTE Inception Report  
30% upon submission of the draft MTE report  
60% upon finalization of the MTE report

## 12. Duty Station

The consultant is expected to have his/her workstation from where to operate while carrying out the assignment. All communications will be done virtually. Most importantly, the consultant should maintain constant contact with UNDP as much as possible.

## 13. TOR Annexes<sup>11</sup>

### ANNEX 1: List of Programme/Projects to be evaluated

- Accelerator Lab
- Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) III,
- Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT),
- Enhancing Entrepreneurship Development Programme in Namibia
- Enhanced Water Security and Community Resilience in the Adjacent Cuvelai and Kunene Transboundary River Basins (CUVECOM)
- Fourth Biennial Update Report (BUR 4),
- Fourth National Communication (NC 4)
- Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG),
- Improving Hepatitis E Response
- Innovative and integrated Financing Architecture in Namibia
- Integrated Approach to Proactive Management of Human-wildlife Conflict and Wildlife Crime in Hotspot Landscapes in Namibia (HWC-WC),
- Promotion of Access to Services for People with Disabilities
- Scaling up community resilience to climate variability and climate change in Northern Namibia, with a special focus on women and children
- SDG Impact Facility
- Third Biennial Update Report (BUR 3)
- Solar for Health
- Strengthening Namibia food systems to recover from emergencies - Urban Agriculture
- Strengthening Namibia Pharmaceutical Supply Chains
- Sustainable Environmental Management and Enhanced Resilience to shocks and crises (SEMER);

---

<sup>11</sup> These documents will be provided after signing of the contract.

- Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (NAFOLA)

**ANNEX 2.** List of relevant documents to be reviewed<sup>12</sup>

<b>Documents to Review</b>	<b>Links to projects</b>
Country Programme document (CPD 2019 - 2023)	
UNPAF 2019 - 2023	
Results oriented Annual Report 2019 and 2020	
End of Project report for S4H	
Accelerator Lab report	
End of Project report for BUR4	
End of project FINAL REPORT for NC4 project	
Tourism Assessment Report	
Socio-economic impact Assessment	
Mid-term evaluation BCLME III	
BCLME III PIR 2019 & 2020	
SCORE PIR 2019	
SCORE Terminal Evaluations 2019	
NAFOLA PIR 2019	
NAFOLA Terminal Evaluations 2019	
UNPRPD Annual Report- Namibia Jan-Dec 2019	
UNPRPD Annual Report- Namibia Jan-Dec 2020	
SDG IF Concept and Reports	
CRRRF Concept	

<sup>12</sup> Links will be shared at approval

RRF 2020 Proposal and Reports	
All new Project Documents in the CPD period	

### **ANNEX 3.** List of key agencies, stakeholders, and partners for evaluation

#### **UN Agencies and International Partners**

- UNDP Senior Management (RR/DRR), Project Analyst, Portfolio Managers, Operation Managers,
- Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), International Labour Organization (ILO), and United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), FAO, WFP, UNESCO

#### **Government counterparts:**

1. Office of the President (OP)
2. Office of the Prime Minister (OPM)
3. Ministry of Finance (MoF)
4. Ministry of Industrialisation and Trade (MIT)
5. Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare (MGEPESW)
6. Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform (MAWLR)
7. Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism Namibia (MEFT)
8. National Planning Commission (NPC)
9. Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME)
10. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR)
11. Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MICT)
12. Ministry of Health and Social Services-Namibia (MoHSS)
13. Ministry of Sport, Youth and National Service (MYSNS)
14. MGEPESW: Disability Affairs
15. Namibia Statistics Agency (NSA)
16. Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC)

#### **Other Stakeholders:**

1. Environment Investment Fund of Namibia
2. Benguela Current Commission (BCC)
3. Namibia Energy Institute (NEI)
4. Bank of Namibia (BON),
5. Financial Intelligence Centre (FIC) is the Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU)
6. Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR)
7. AfDB
8. Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
9. German Development Bank (KfW)
10. World Wildlife Fund (WWF)

#### **Implementing Partners:**

1. Namibia Institute for Democracy (NID)
2. University of Namibia (UNAM)
3. Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST)
4. International University of Management (IUM)
5. Red Cross Society
6. Development Workshop Namibia (DW)
7. Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF)
8. Gobabeb Namib Research Institute (Gobabeb)

#### ANNEX 4. Inception Report Contents Outline<sup>13</sup>

#### ANNEX 5. Evaluation matrix template.

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub-questions	Data sources	Data collection methods/ tools	Indicators/ success standards	Methods for data analysis

#### ANNEX 6. Outline of the evaluation report format<sup>14</sup>

#### ANNEX 7. Evaluation Audit Trial Form

Chapter and section number	Paragraph number/ line number	Comments	Evaluation team responses and/ or actions taken

#### ANNEX 8. Code of Conduct Standard template

##### Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some

<sup>13</sup> as outlined in the Evaluation guidelines 2021.

[https://undp.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/UNDPNAMIBIA/Shared%20Documents/PROGRAMMES/CPD%20Namibia%202019%20-%202023/CPD%20Namibia%20Mid-Term%20Review%202021%20Documents%20to%20be%20reviewed/UNDP\\_Evaluation\\_Guidelines%202021.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=qs3tdv](https://undp.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/UNDPNAMIBIA/Shared%20Documents/PROGRAMMES/CPD%20Namibia%202019%20-%202023/CPD%20Namibia%20Mid-Term%20Review%202021%20Documents%20to%20be%20reviewed/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines%202021.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=qs3tdv)

<sup>14</sup> Template outline in the Evaluation guideline 2021,

[https://undp.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/UNDPNAMIBIA/Shared%20Documents/PROGRAMMES/CPD%20Namibia%202019%20-%202023/CPD%20Namibia%20Mid-Term%20Review%202021%20Documents%20to%20be%20reviewed/UNDP\\_Evaluation\\_Guidelines%202021.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=qs3tdv](https://undp.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/UNDPNAMIBIA/Shared%20Documents/PROGRAMMES/CPD%20Namibia%202019%20-%202023/CPD%20Namibia%20Mid-Term%20Review%202021%20Documents%20to%20be%20reviewed/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines%202021.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=qs3tdv)

stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTE Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**14. Preparation and Approval of TOR**

**Prepared by:**

**Name:** Maano Shimanda

**Monitoring & Evaluation Associate**

**Date:** August 04, 2021

**Signature:** Maano Shimanda

**Approved by:**

**Name:** Armstrong Alexis

**Deputy Resident Representative**

**Date:** August 04, 2021

**Signature:** Armstrong Alexis