

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS FUND

**TERMS OF REFERENCE
FINAL EVALUATION OF SDG-F JOINT PROGRAMME ON**

Accelerating Viet Nam's Transition Toward Inclusive and Integrated Social Protection

2 National Consultants
(1 team leader, 1 team member)

8 March 2022

1. GENERAL CONTEXT

The Joint Programme “Accelerating Viet Nam’s Transition Toward Inclusive and Integrated Social Protection” funded by the Sustainable Development Goals Fund¹ (SDGF) was launched on 1 January 2020 with the original duration of 24 months until 31 December 2021 which then has been extended to May 2022. Four UN agencies (including ILO, UNICEF, UNFPA, and UNDP) are the participating UN organizations (PUNOs) of the JP. *(See the detailed JP document in the Annex.)*

The Joint Programme (JP) supports Viet Nam in accelerating its transition towards an inclusive and integrated social protection (SP) system by demonstrating the potential of an (i) integrated multi-tiered social protection system (MTS) using the life-cycle approach; (ii) extended social care services system; and (iii) innovative e-service delivery system. It aims to accelerate the achievement of the targets established under the Government of Viet Nam (GOVN) SP related Master Plans on social insurance, social assistance and digitalizing SP service delivery and M&E system. The focus is therefore on expanding the coverage, and improving efficiency of delivery, of social insurance (SI) and social assistance (SA) services to groups insufficiently covered or at risk of being left behind. The JP has been implemented under the framework of the One Strategic Plan (OSP) 2017-2021, which has been committed by the GOVN and UN agencies.

The JP outcomes are:

- An integrated gender-sensitive multi-tiered expansion strategy for accelerating SDG progress towards universal social protection coverage
- Inclusive social care system for the most vulnerable for accelerating SDG progress
- Integrated e-system for delivering SP services and real-time M&E for accelerating SDG progress.

The long-term impact of the UNJP’s integrated approach could include, by 2030, having 100 per cent of the 20 million children in Vietnam benefiting from social protection. This would also represent an expansion from 30 per cent to 45 per cent of the workforce participating in social insurance. Likewise, 100 per cent of women giving birth would be protected, as opposed to the 26 per cent who currently have access to paid maternity leave. The new multi-tiered social protection system would also increase old-age protection to 60 per cent of the elderly, as per the Government’s targets, up from around 30 per cent today. Finally, while the current social assistance benefit for PLWD reaches around one million people, the project will promote an expansion to an additional one million people plus an additional 200,000 caregivers. The long-term impact of the intervention could expand care services to 100 per cent of the elderly by 2030, which would be an additional 2 million PLWD.

In line with the SDGF guidance, the JP plans to commission an independent final evaluation of this JP. The JP is seeking for two (02) high-qualified national consultants to conduct the final evaluation. The JP Secretariat (ILO), with technical support from the UNRCO, UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP, assumes the role of guidance and oversight in the final evaluation.

2. OVERALL GOAL, SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND AUDIENCES

The **overall goal** of the evaluation is to promote accountability (of the UN, GOVN and CSO partners), organizational learning, stocktaking of achievements, performance, impacts, good practices, and lessons learnt and recommendations for future improvement and towards SDG acceleration.

¹ The Sustainable Development Goals Fund is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional Joint Programmes.

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of the JP in achieving its outcomes and outputs as originally planned in the JP document, specifically in the JP results framework, or subsequently officially revised; At the same time, assess the JP's responsiveness in coping with COVID-19's negative impacts;
2. Measure the impact of the JP on SDG acceleration;
3. Assess the sustainability of JP achieved results;
4. Assess the contribution of the JP to UN Development System Reform (e.g., improved collaboration and coherence of the UNCT, RC leadership, contribution to CF/UNDAF).
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices toward inclusive and integrated social protection with the focus on supporting JP target groups including (i) women, children, persons with disabilities, and older persons, and (ii) girls, youth, minorities, rural workers, and victims of violence (who would receive the JP's indirect influence); and
6. Provide actionable recommendations for the way forward.

Evaluation Scope

The JP evaluation cover the period is from May 2019 (when the JP design began) to March 2022 (when the JP evaluation is planned to take place) to cover the JP design phase to the JP implementation phase. The JP evaluation will assess contributions to all JP outcomes and outputs by all 4 PUNOs and examine the JP cross-cutting issues and with global UN programming principles (e.g. leaving no one behind LNOB, human rights, gender equality and women's empowerment, sustainability and resilience, shock-responsiveness, and accountability).

The JP evaluation will take into account emerging issues related to serious droughts, typhoons, and the COVID-19 pandemic in both the evaluation contents (e.g. the PUNOs' responsiveness, adaptation and reprioritization) and operation (e.g. methods for managing stakeholder participation and inclusiveness in the COVID context).

The JP evaluation also assess the contribution and accountabilities of the JP key partners (including MOLISA and the Viet Nam Women's Union) and other partners (e.g., including government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members, and other implementing partners) toward the JP implementation against the responsibilities identified in the JP document, specifically in JP design and approval, implementation, monitoring and reporting as well as in facilitating multi-stakeholder coordination and mechanism.

It is foreseen that this evaluation will take place from March to June 2022. The evaluation will be conducted in Hanoi and other JP provinces if necessary and possible (due to COVID) with maximum 2 field trips.

The primary audiences of this evaluation are the PUNOs who designed and implemented the programme. The report will benefit from key government partners' views as well as provide valuable recommendations for the policy making and future programmes.

2. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The JP evaluation will apply the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The JP evaluation with its evaluation report aims to answer multiple questions primarily identified as follows:

Relevance: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention are consistent with national needs and priorities, the country's international and regional commitments, and achieving

the SDGs

- a) How has the JP contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase (including on SDGs, leaving no one behind, human rights, sustainable development, environment, disability, and gender equity)
- b) To what extent the JP is consistent with the One Strategic Plan 2017-2021 strategic areas and outcomes?
- c) To what extent the UN comparative advantages and unique mandates (that other stakeholders would not/cannot have) are relevant with the JP objectives and outcomes and help strengthen the UN position, credibility, and reliability of the UN as a partner for the GOVN and other actors in the JP areas?
- d) How resilient, responsive and strategic the JP was in addressing emerging and emergency needs? For example, in assessing the COVID-19 impacts and in reprioritizing/adapting its support to provide timely support to the country and to ensure the achievement of the JP outcomes.

Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved

- a) To what extent did the JP attain the development outputs and outcomes described in the JP document? The evaluation should also note how the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed.
- b) What good practices, success stories, innovations, lessons learnt, and replicable experiences/key factors have been identified for the success of this JP? Please describe and document them.
- c) To what extent has the HP contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of national development plans, policies, OSP, etc.)
- d) To what extent did the JP help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement of development issues and policies?
- e) How effective was the GOVN's roles in contributing to JP design and approval, implementation, monitoring and reporting as well as in facilitating multi-stakeholder coordination and mechanism and mobilizing resources for smooth and efficient JP implementation?

Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results

- a) To what extent was the JP management model (governance and implementation arrangements; monitoring and reporting tools; and accountability, financial management, and public disclosure models) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- b) To what extent were the JP outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to achieve better results when compared to singly-agency interventions? What efficiency gains/losses were there as a result?
- c) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
- d) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?

Impact: Positive and negative effects of the intervention on the development outcomes and SDG acceleration

- a) To what extent and in what ways did the JP contribute to SDG acceleration?
- b) To what extent and in what ways did the JP contribute to the targeted cross-cutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, disability (also see below), and public private partnerships (PPPs) at the local and national levels?

- c) What impact did the matching funds have in the design, implementation and results of the JP?
- d) To what extent did the JP have an impact on the targeted beneficiaries? Were all targeted beneficiaries reached? Which were left out?
- e) What unexpected/unintended effects did the JP have, if any?

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

- a) Which mechanisms already existed, and which have been put in place by the JP to ensure results and impact, i.e. policy, policy coordination mechanisms, partnerships, networks?
- b) To what extent has the capacity of beneficiaries (institutional and/or individual) been strengthened such that they are resilient and sustainable to external shocks and/or do not need support in the long term?
- c) To what extent will the JP be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels?

As persons with disabilities are among the most vulnerable and marginalized groups across countries and considering the critical role that social protection can play in supporting their inclusion. This JP has identified them as a target group. In line with the Leaving No One Behind principle and the obligations stemming from the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, the JP should ensure that persons with disabilities within targeted population can access the program without discrimination. The evaluation will therefore also assess to what extent:

- The JP design, implementation, and monitoring have been inclusive of persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, data disaggregation); and
- The JP effectively contributed to the socio-economic inclusion of persons with disabilities by providing income security, coverage of health care, and disability-related costs across the life cycle.

See the detailed guiding questions on Persons with Disabilities and evaluation criteria in Annex I.

3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The overall approach is participatory and theory-based (using the JP theory of change).

The JP evaluation will be conducted in an inclusive manner and promote national ownership through the meaningful engagement of relevant national partners throughout the evaluation process. The JP evaluation is independent and adhere to and implement UNEG Norms and Standards.

In general, the methodology of this evaluation includes triangulation and mixed method of quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Followings are standards and considerations for data analysis and data collection:

- Data Analysis

- Provide credible answers to the evaluation questions;
- Ensure that the information collected is valid, reliable and sufficient to meet the evaluation purposes, scope and approach and that the analysis is logically coherent and complete (and not speculative or opinion-based);
- Use a mixed method, employing the most appropriate qualitative and quantitative approaches, data types and methods of data analysis;
- Ensure triangulation of the various data sources to ensure maximum validity, reliability of data and promote use;
- Apply participatory and utilization-focused approach to involve key stakeholders and boost ownership of the evaluation should be adopted;

- Ensure a Leave No One Behind lens, particularly gender equality and human rights;
- Ensure the linkage with the SDGs.

- **Data Collection:** The JP evaluation will draw on a variety of data collection methods including, but not limited to, the followings:

- Document review focusing on JP documents, progress reviews, mid-year and annual reports, strategy papers, national plans and policies and related programme and project documents. These should include reports on the progress against national and international commitments.
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organisations, UNCT members, and implementing partners.
- Focus Group discussions involving groups and sub-groups of stakeholders, decision-makers.
- Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, photo stories, etc.

An **evaluation matrix** will be prepared during the inception phase to present the links between data collection methods, evaluation questions, sources, etc. Additionally, a rapid evaluability assessment will be undertaken during the inception phase to determine the availability of documentation, the quality of the JP results framework and indicators, and gaps in information; this will inform the evaluation approach.

In addition, the precise data collection methods should be identified following:

- Analysis of availability of existing evaluative evidence and administrative data
- Logistical constraints (travel, costs, time, etc)
- Ethical considerations (especially when evaluating sensitive topics such as GBV or in sensitive settings such as post-conflict settings)

During the inception phase, the evaluation team will propose a detailed evaluation methodology. The methodology should propose innovative options for data collection methods (including remote data collection if necessary) considering the COVID-19 pandemic and related coping measures which may not allow a smooth data collection process.

4. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Evaluation Team is responsible for submitting the following deliverables (in both English and Vietnamese) to the commissioner and the managers of the evaluation:

Inception Report This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the JP. This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers. The report will follow the outline stated in Annex II.

Draft Final Report The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 30 to 40 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group and the quality assurance member.

Final Evaluation Report: The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an

executive summary of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group and the quality assurance member. This report will follow the template in Annex III.

Each report needs to be accompanied by an **Audit Trail** to list all comments to its draft versions and to show how the comments are addressed by the Evaluation Team.

5. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSABILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There will be 3 main actors involved in the implementation of the JP evaluation:

Evaluation Reference Group: The Evaluation Reference Group is composed of the JP Management Committee and representatives from key GOVN implementing partners and will:

- Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets the required quality standards;
- Facilitate the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation;
- Provide inputs and participating in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference;
- Facilitate the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;
- Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products;
- Endorse the action plan following the submission of the final evaluation report;
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation.

Evaluation managers: The JP Secretariat (ILO) and the programme coordinator as evaluation managers will have the following functions:

- Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation TOR;
- Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group;
- Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data;
- Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation;
- Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
- Provide comments to the JP evaluation's key deliverables including the inception report, draft reports, and the final report.
- Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation.

Quality Assurance Member: The Joint SDG Fund Secretariat will play the role of quality assurance who review and provide advice on the quality the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on draft TOR, inception report, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement

Evaluation commissioner: The Resident Coordinator Office (led by the RCO Head with support from the RCO Data Officer) as commissioner of the final evaluation will have the following functions:

- Lead the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of a final evaluation (design,

- implementation and dissemination);
- Convene the evaluation reference group;
- Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR;
- Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team by making sure the lead agency undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluation team;
- Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the MDG-F Secretariat);
- Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation managers and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process;
- Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team.

Evaluation team: The evaluation team composed by two national consultants will conduct the evaluation study by fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed

9. EVALUATION PROCESS: TIMELINE

The JP evaluation will be conducted in five main stages with key activities, deliverables, responsible entities, and timelines as follows:

(Note: The timeline will be probably adjusted due to COVID-19 and when the Evaluation Team is recruited.)

| Phase | Activities | Deliverables | Responsibility | Completion Time |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1. <u>Preparation (Three months before JP closure)</u> | | | | |
| | 1.1. Development of Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) | - Evaluation TOR (and TOR for hiring Evaluation Team based on the approved evaluation TOR) | - Commissioner RCO to draft and finalize the TOR - Eval. Managers, Reference Group, and MPTF Secretariat to review, comment on the TOR | January – 3rd week of March |
| | 1.2. Preparatory desk work | - Initial collection of relevant documents and data (e.g. quarterly and annual financial and results reporting) | - Evaluation Managers | |
| | 1.3. Recruitment the Evaluation Team | - Evaluation Team selected | - RCO in coordination with Evaluation Managers (in consultation with MPTF Secretariat) to organize the recruitment (including to form Recruitment Panels) | |
| 2. <u>Inception</u> | | | | |
| | 2.1. Brief and support the Evaluation Team | - Briefings with the Evaluators (with Evaluation Managers, RCO, and JSP Reference Group if necessary) and sharing of all documents to be reviewed | - Evaluation Managers to organize - Evaluation Team to participate | 3 rd week of March – 1 st week of April |
| | 2.2. Development of Inception Report | - Inception Report | - Evaluation Team to prepare - Evaluation Managers and MPTF Secretariat to review - RCO to review and endorse | |
| 3. <u>Data collection and Reporting</u> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | 3.1. Data collection and analysis | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Team to implement - Evaluation Managers to facilitate evaluation activities, assist the Evaluation Team in gaining access to stakeholders and additional information, and arrange meetings and logistics | 1st week of April – 1st week of May |
| | 3.2. Development of Draft Evaluation Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft Report - PPP Presentation on key preliminary findings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Team to implement | |
| | 3.3. Review and Validation of Draft Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation on preliminary findings to the Reference Group - Revised Draft Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Team: to present key preliminary findings to the reference group, address comments and revise draft report - Reference Group and MPRF Secretariat: to comment on the draft report and participate in the meeting on presentation on preliminary findings - Evaluation Managers to: conduct a pro forma quality check; manage the validation process by circulating the draft for comment to relevant key stakeholders, ensuring all comments and responses are properly recorded, using an audit trail; send comments to the Evaluation Team for draft revision; make sure all comments are addressed by the Evaluation Team; and organize a meeting on presentation on preliminary findings | |
| | 3.4. Finalization of Evaluation Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final Evaluation Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Team to implement - RCO in consultation with Evaluation Managers to approve the final report | |
| 4. <u>Use the results</u> | | | | |
| | 4.1. Preparation of follow-up actions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Follow-up actions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JP Steering Committee: (with Evaluation Managers and RCO support) to prepare a Follow-up Action Plan | 1st week of May – End of June |
| | 4.2. Dissemination of Evaluation Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communication and Dissemination Plan - Dissemination of the Evaluation Report (e.g. in the JP final donor meeting planned in the 2nd week of May) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steering Committee to implement with support by the UN Communication Team | |

9. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

The Evaluation Reference Group and any other stakeholders relevant for the JP will jointly design and implement a complete communication and dissemination plan to share the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim to advocate for sustainability, replicability, scaling up or to share good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

10. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the SDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the SDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

11. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The composition and selection of the JP Evaluation Team follow the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The Commissioner (RCO) opts to select 2 national evaluators (1 team leader and 1 team member) to conduct the evaluation. The selected team should have past experience with carrying out similar evaluations and collective knowledge of the national context in the JP areas. The evaluators should be impartial, i.e. not have been (and not expected to be) involved in the design or implementation of the JP.

Both the evaluation Team Leader (TL) and Team Member (TM) will equally share responsibilities in data collection and analysis. The TL will lead the entire evaluation process, develop a workplan including task division for the whole exercise (in agreement with the TM). The TL will be responsible for conducting the evaluation process in a timely manner, communicating with the Evaluation Managers on a regular basis, and highlighting progress made/challenges encountered. The TL will be responsible for producing the inception, draft, and final evaluation reports, with inputs from the TM.

Qualification of Evaluation Team:

- Advanced University Degree (Masters or PhD) in political science, public administration, development studies, law, human rights or other relevant fields;
- Minimum ten years of relevant professional experience;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- In-depth knowledge and strong research record of Viet Nam socio-economic development, particularly on the Vietnamese social protection systems and vulnerable/LNOB groups;
- Technical competence in undertaking complex evaluations which involve use of mixed methods;
- Strong data collection and analysis skills;
- Process management skills such as facilitation skills and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders;
- Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies;
- Knowledge of UN role, UN reform process and UN programming at the country level, particularly UN Joint Programme;
- Strong experience and knowledge of the UN programming principles including leaving no one behind LNOB, human rights, gender equality and women's empowerment, disability inclusion, sustainability and resilience, and accountability; and
- Fluency in English, excellent oral, written, communication and reporting skills.
- Experience in conducting evaluation of a UN Joint Programme especially the one of the similar country context is considered a strong asset;

In addition to the above qualifications, the TL needs to possess the followings:

- A strong record in designing and leading evaluations;
- Demonstrated managerial competence and experience in organizing, leading and coordinating evaluation teams at the international level;

The RCO and Evaluation Managers will facilitate to form a Recruitment Panel with participation of relevant stakeholders.

The OSP Evaluation Team will work under the direct supervision of the Evaluation Managers. All key deliverables will be validated and approved by the Commissioner (RCO). The evaluation team members must be committed to respecting deadlines of delivery outputs with the agreed timeframe and must be able to work with a multidisciplinary team and in a multicultural environment.

12. BUDGET

Estimated Cost for 2022 JP Evaluation

(Actual budget will be the lumpsum proposed by selected firm bidder)

| Description | Units | Cost per Unit (US\$) | Total Amount (US\$) |
|---|---------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Evaluation Team | | | 18,750 |
| National Evaluation Expert (Team Leader) | 40 days | 250 | 10,000 |
| National Evaluation Expert (Team Member) | 35 days | 250 | 8,750 |
| Meetings (on inception report, final report, communication plan, etc.) | | | 2,000 |
| Field trips (max 2 field trips) | 2 | 1,000 | 2,000 |
| Dissemination | | | 2,000 |
| Grand Total | | | 24,750 |

30% of the total consultancy fee shall be paid upon receipt and acceptance of the inception report, with 70% paid upon receipt and acceptance of the Final Evaluation Report.

13. ANNEXES

ANNEX I: GUIDING QUESTIONS ON PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

To what extent did the program target persons with disabilities?

- Not specifically targeted
- One of the groups of direct beneficiaries targeted
- main target group for the program

To what extent did the design and implementation of activities of the joint program supported include disability-related accessibility and non-discrimination requirement?

- No requirements
- General reference
- Specific requirements

To what extent have persons with disabilities, in particular children and women with disabilities, been consulted through their representative organizations?

- Not invited
- Invited
- Specific outreach

To what extent did support to data collection and analysis, registries, and information system feature disability?

- No reference to disability
- Disability included via Washington group short set or similar but no analysis
- Disability included via Washington group short set or similar
 - ✓ Part of general analysis
 - ✓ With specific analysis

To which extent did the program contribute to support inclusion of persons with disabilities via:

- Ensuring basic income security
- Coverage of health care costs, including rehabilitation and assistive devices
- Coverage of disability-related costs, including community support services
- Facilitate access to inclusive early childhood development, education, and work/livelihood

ANNEX II: DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

The Evaluation Team needs to collect the followings documents from the Evaluation Managers and other sources as reference materials for the evaluation:

Joint SDG Fund Context

- SDG Fund TOR and Guidance for JP Formulation
- SDG Fund M&E Strategy
- Communications and Advocacy Strategy
- Knowledge Management Strategy

Programme-Specific Documents

- JP document and its annexes (annual WP and budget, theory of change, integrated M&E research framework, performance monitoring framework, risk analysis matrix)
- Baseline and end line study (if any)
- Mid-term review report (if any)
- NSC and PMC minutes
- Exit strategy
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Financial information (MPTF)

Other in-country documents or information

- All assessments, reports and/or evaluations directly conducted/commissioned by the JP
- Relevant documents or reports on the SDGs, social protection, and LNOB at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of relevant international commitments in the country.

ANNEX III: INCEPTION REPORT OUTLINE

1. Introduction
2. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach
3. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research
4. Main substantive and financial achievements of the joint programme
5. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information, including an Evaluation Matrix
6. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including “field visits”

Sample evaluation matrix

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

ANNEX II: DRAFT & FINAL REPORT OUTLINE

1. **Cover Page:** Including JP title, thematic window, report date, name of the evaluator/s.
2. **Table of contents:** Including page references for all chapters & annexes.
3. **Acronyms page**
4. **Executive Summary:** No more than 2 pages. Summarize substantive elements of the report, including a brief description of the joint programme, purpose and objectives of the evaluation, evaluation methodological approach, key findings and conclusions, main recommendations.
5. **Introduction:** Explain why the evaluation is being conducted, including the following content:
 - Background: MDG-F, thematic window, joint programme.
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Methodology of the evaluation
 - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted.
6. **Description of the development interventions carried out:**
Detailed description of the development interventions undertaken: description and judgement on implementation of outputs delivered (or not) and outcomes attained as well as how the programme worked in comparison to the theory of change developed for the programme.
7. **Levels of Analysis:** Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered).
8. **Conclusions**
9. **Lessons Learned:** Define the scope of each lesson (joint programme, national policy, local intervention, etc.)
10. **Recommendations**
11. **Annexes**