



Terms of Reference (ToRs)

Thematic evaluation on UNDP's Contribution to Democratic Governance in Somalia: In the Areas of Constitutionalism, Parliamentarism and Federalism and Reconciliation during The Implementation of Country Program Document 2018-2020

1. Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) to contract two International Consultants to conduct an independent *Evaluation of UNDP support towards enhanced governance in Somalia in the areas of constitutionalism, parliamentarism and federalism and reconciliation*. Governance is one of the six key signature solutions under UNDP and is defined as “the exercise of economic, political, and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels. It comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences”. In the context of UNDP Somalia and for purposes of this evaluation, the definition of governance is covered by the operations of the UNDP Inclusive Politics Portfolio and its contribution to building democratic governance. The references for the evaluation will be the UNDP Country Programme Document (2018-2020) Outcome 1: Deepening federalism and state-building, supporting conflict resolution and reconciliation, and preparing for universal elections. However, the projects covered in this theme under the Inclusive Politics Portfolio will be Parliamentary Support Project (PSP), Constitutional Review Support Projects (CRSP) and Reconciliation and Federalization Support Project (REFS) in Somalia. In particular, the evaluation will assess how the projects contributed to building democratic governance in Somalia, in line with the projects’ requirements, UN programme documents and different policy papers agreed between the UN, donors and the Somali government.

2. Background

The United Nations system in Somalia has been supporting the government’s efforts in effective implementation of the National Development Plan (NDP), which is aligned with the corporate Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), in collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders in Somalia. Following the NDP, the government’s inclusive politics agenda comprises democratization, finalizing the constitution, decentralization, and implementing the federalization process. The relevant three UNDP projects were developed in response to and in alignment with the highest priorities of the NDP. They jointly contribute to the Inclusive Politics goal, i.e., Somalis, particularly women and youth, benefit from and participate in functional, inclusive, accountable, and transparent democratic systems across all levels of government and governmental institutions.”. The projects concurrently support the priorities identified in the NDP Pillar Working Groups and the recently agreed Political Roadmap for Inclusive Politics. The projects also support Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16, recognizing the centrality of governance-informed development to ensure that societies’ aspirations for higher access and quality of public services are achieved through core government functions that are effective, responsive, and inclusive.

Reconciliation and Federalism Support Project (REFS)

The purpose of this project is to support the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) and the Federal Member States (FMS) to implement their chosen method of State Administration and Federalism process through need based political settlement, boundary delimitation and reconciliation process. The project aims to consolidate State formation efforts to build and harmonizes the emerging federal system in the FGS and the FMS, ensuring alignment with the objectives of the NDP. Ultimately the aim of the project is to support the government to establish administrative machinery that can begin to deliver improved services. The specific areas where the project provides technical assistance, financial, human resources and logistical support were set out in three outputs:

- Output 1. Reconciliation mechanisms established in support of Administrative Arrangements in the Federal context (regional outreach and inclusiveness, boundaries)
- Output 2. Federalism is Organised, Consistent and Coherent in all Federal Member States (organization, roles, responsibilities, powers) with the FGS
- Output 3. Federal administration is enabled to improve effectiveness and efficiency (operational support, small scale works to support infrastructure, transport, essential equipment)

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Reconciliation and Federalism Support Project	
Atlas Award ID 00116524	Output: 00114169	
Corporate outcome and output	The project contributes to the UN Strategic Framework Priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP2: Supporting institutions to improve Peace, Security, Justice, the Rule of Law and Safety of Somalis; and • SP3: Strengthening accountability and supporting institutions that protect. 	
Country	Somalia	
Region	FGS and FMSs (Five regional member states) Puntland, Southwest, Galmudug, Hirshabelle and Jubbaland	
Date project document signed	3 January 2019	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	01 Jan 2019	31 Dec 2021
Project budget	USD 10,911,342	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	01 Jan 2018-31 August 2021 USD 5,208,312.40	
Funding source	MPTF (Germany, Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland); GPCR-Funding Window and the PBSO;TRAC	
Implementing partner ^[1]	UNDP	

Constitution Review Support Project (CRSP)

The objective of the project was to support an effective, transparent, and accountable constitutional review process through strengthening inclusive political processes at all levels to develop a new social contract that meets the needs of Somali women and men, reflects political realities and is of good technical quality to foster equitable and sustainable development and peace. With this overarching objective in mind, the Project revolved around four entry points for integrated support to constitution-making under the overarching framework of fostering inclusive processes, namely (1) for the

coordination of the constitutional review process in line with the national vision, particularly by accompanying and advising the work of the Federal Ministry of Constitutional Affairs (MOCA), Joint Oversight Committee of the Federal Parliament of Somalia (OC) and Independent Constitutional Review and Implementation Commission (ICRIC), and the FMS, (2) support for an extensive civic education process, (3) support for the public consultation and outreach activities of all actors involved in the constitutional review process, (4) technical support for the drafting of the constitutional text. This approach sought to complement the constitutional work of elected representatives, government officials and technical experts with broad based public participation. The Project's outputs are:

- **Output 1:** Effective participation on the constitutional review process resolves key contentious issues on all levels.
- **Output 2:** General population knowledge on the constitutional review process is enhanced.
- **Output 3:** Key actors implement outreach strategy and civil society engagement in the constitutional review and implementation process.

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Constitution Review Support Project (CRSP-II)	
Atlas Award ID 00099032	Output: 00108659	
Corporate outcome and output	The project contributes to the UN Strategic Framework Priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP1: Somalis, particularly women and youth, benefit from and participate in functional, inclusive, accountable, and transparent democratic systems across all levels of government and governmental institutions. • SP2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development. 	
Country	Somalia	
Region	FGS, FMSs. ICRIC Parliamentary Oversight Committee)	
Date project document signed	27 February 2018	
Project dates	Start	Planned end 30 June 2021
	1 Jan 2018	
Project budget	12,735,114.68	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	01 Jan 2018-31 August 2021 USD 12,515,803.16	
Funding source	MPTF (Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark), FCDO and UNDP	
Implementing partner ^[1]	UNDP	

Parliamentary Support Project (PSP)

The objective of the project is to foster Inclusive Politics through the strengthening of the effectiveness and accountability of Somalia's parliamentary institutions to be more responsive to the needs of Somali men and women in promoting participation in political processes, contributing to national peacebuilding, state building and development goals. To reach that overarching objective, UNDP proposed an integrated approach with objectives to a) Strengthen the Federal Parliaments House of the Peoples and Upper House's capacities and structures to become effective and representative institutions that promote transparency, inclusion and participation in political processes

to progress state-building, peacebuilding, federalism and national development priorities, b) Strengthen the Somaliland and Puntland Parliaments as well as the Emerging State Assemblies' capacities and structures: c) Strengthen the vibrant civil society to engage and participate to the parliamentary work d) foster the implementation of SDG 16 in strengthening the capacities for dialogue, research and analysis on inclusive politics in Somalia. The Project's outputs are:

- **Output 1:** House of the Peoples and Upper House capacities and structures become effective and representative institutions that promote transparency, inclusion, and participation in political processes.
- **Output 2:** The new federal network of legislatures and assemblies is strengthened
- **Output 3:** Capacities and structures of the Emerging State Assemblies are strengthened in support of peacebuilding, state building, federalism, and development
- **Output 4:** Capacities and structures of Somaliland and Puntland Parliaments are strengthened in support of peacebuilding, state building, federalism, and development
- **Output 5:** Various assemblies engage with and respond to needs of civil society, including the marginalized groups
- **Output 6:** Implementation of SDG 16 in Somalia is enhanced through strengthened capacities for dialogue, research, and analysis.

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Building Inclusive and Accountable Parliaments for a Peaceful Somalia (PSP-II)	
Atlas Award ID 00099031	Output: 00102267	
Corporate outcome and output	The project contributes to the UN Strategic Framework Priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP2: Citizen Expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance • SP2.1: Parliaments, constitution making bodies and electoral institutions enabled to perform core functions for improved accountability, participation and representation, incl. for peaceful transitions 	
Country	Somalia	
Region	FGS and FMSs and Somaliland	
Date project document signed	28 February 2018	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	01 Jan 2018	31 Dec 2021
Project budget		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	01 Jan 2018-31 August 2021 USD 6,133,921.68	
Funding source	MPTF (Switzerland and Norway) and UNDP	
Implementing partner ^[1]	UNDP	

Political dynamic and impact on the projects. Somalia is emerging from one of the world's most complex and protracted conflicts. Over the past decade, the peacebuilding and state-building process navigated through significant obstacles, maintaining a cautious positive trajectory. Nonetheless, the continued absence of an agreed revised Federal Constitution is a structural deficiency. Political

developments in 2020 and 2021 jeopardized Somalia's progress towards peace and reconciliation and failure to reach a political agreement on the implementation of the electoral process, hampered progress on all other key national priorities, including constitutional review, justice and security sector reform, the degradation of Al-Shabab, stabilization, institution building, reconciliation, economic and financial reforms, provision of services etc. These challenges have undermined the consolidation of a foundation for a future peaceful Somalia as the key contentious issues have been left unresolved. Political tensions from 2020 continued through the first two quarters of 2021 including the short armed clashes in Mogadishu. Against this backdrop The National Consultative Council met in May 2021 and agreed on measures to hold indirect elections, following the 17 September Electoral model and associated Roadmap for Completing State-Building of Somalia, which gives a potential positive trajectory for the successor programmes.

Political developments and dynamic between the FGS and the FMS significantly impacted implementation of all three projects to support establishment of the inclusive governance. However, despite all the challenges REFS has been instrumental in current political environment and supported important reconciliation processes and high-level political discussions resulted in the agreements that paved the way to unblock political impasse. In addition, REFS managed to strengthen the institutional and technical capacities of national and regional counterparts to discharge their mandates effectively and efficiently on reconciliation and federalization in Somalia. REFS also facilitated communal reconciliation efforts leading to the resolution of inter- and intra-clan conflicts. Civil Society Initiative was launched, initiating a dialogue to harness the potential role of civil society by informing and strengthening the social contract in Somalia. The Project also helped relevant government institutions on peaceful boundary delimitation between FMSes. CRSP was heavily impacted by the political dynamic between the FGS and the FMS and particularly by the decision of Puntland and Jubaland not to participate in the constitutional review process in 2020, due to unsettled disputes with the FGS. Still, the project managed to provide support to the constitutional review bodies and some FMS that resulted in the drafting of the 3rd version of the Constitution. However, after the President of Somalia issued the decree on 24 December 2021 directing that the constitutional review process is postponed until formation of the 11th Parliament and noting the ongoing political dynamic between the FGS and the FMS, UNDP, UNSOM and the donors made a decision to close the project on 30 June 2021. Finally, PSP was very effective in supporting particularly CRSP to achieve the results since the PSP directly supported the Joint Oversight Committee of the Federal Parliament to facilitate the constitutional review process, together with MOCA and ICRIC. However, the project has never managed to mobilize the needed resources for the implementation of the activities and has been heavily dependent on the internal UNDP resources. In addition, political disputes between the FGS and the FMS and dynamic between the Speakers of the UH and HOP impacted the project's operations. Still, the PSP managed to achieve some important results such as enabling Somali Federal Parliament to adopt priority legislations to deepen state building, federalism, democratic processes, and the quest for debt relief, such as Electoral Law, Public Financial Management Bill, Revenue Bill, Petroleum Bill, Health Professional Bill, Amendment of the Public Procurement and Concessions Bill etc. Also, the project-built capacity of 361 new MPs of Federal Member State Parliaments in Puntland, Galmudug, Hirsh belle, Southwest and Jubaland to enable them to fulfill parliamentary tasks. Finally, the project organized the Annual Somali Women MPs Conference that resulted in advancing of gender agenda to improve status of Somali women.

COVID-19. Outbreak of the pandemic additionally impacted implementation of the projects, particularly in the first two quarters of 2020. As an example, the Islamic Bank for the Development made a decision to reprogramme resources previously committed to the implementation of the PSP, to strengthen government's capacity to combat COVID. The representatives of the government for a few months operated through alternative work arrangements before they restarted working from their offices. Still the projects managed to support the national counterparts through provision of the technology to ensure their continuous communication with partners and citizens.

UNDP intends to hire two individual consultants to undertake an evaluation of the projects. One consultant will be focused on REFS and one of CRSP and PSP. However, the consultants will work collaboratively and come up with joint analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. The objective of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the projects so far (results, achievements, constraints) to the establishment of the inclusive governance in the areas of constitutionalism, parliamentarism and federalism and reconciliation, to provide information on the effectiveness, relevance and value added of the support delivered to the national counterparts since 2018, and to receive recommendations for the design of a follow up projects for the period 2022-2025. The evaluation will also provide project donors with an assessment of the use of their resources.

3. Evaluation Purpose

The three projects that form part of the governance thematic evaluation are listed below:

1. Constitution Review Support Project (CRSP)
2. Parliamentary Support Project (PSP)
3. Reconciliation and Federalism Support Project (REFS) for Somalia

The overall objective of the thematic evaluation is to assess the contribution of UNDP towards improving governance in the areas of constitutionalism, parliamentarism, federalism and reconciliation during the period of 2018-2021. The evaluation will further investigate how Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) was emphasized and mainstreamed in this thematic area at this time.

The evaluation is aiming to consolidate lessons learnt and identify challenges, gaps and propose actionable recommendation for future programming related to governance and peacebuilding to the Somali counterparts at FGS and FMS levels, UNDP, UNSOM/PAMG and the donors as the key stakeholders of this evaluation.

4. Scope

The evaluation will determine the extent to which the activities and outputs of the three projects mentioned above have contributed to inclusive democratic governance and changes in the governance environment. In addition, the evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and the results of the strategy.

The evaluation will also examine if the implementation methodology has been in line with the policy documents agreed between the UN, donors, and the Somali institutions, drawing upon the project's results framework as well as other monitoring data collected on the project outputs and outcomes.

The evaluation will be conducted at Federal, FMS and community levels (focusing on the processes and outcomes) with representatives of the national counterparts of the three projects, civil society organizations and citizens. It will include a review of the projects designed to achieve the theme and assumptions made at the beginning of the development process and assess the projects' management including the implementation strategies.

5. Evaluation criteria and key questions

The following key questions will guide the end of projects' evaluation:

i) Relevance/Coherence

- To what extent has UNDP contributed to governance, peace building and state building results at the policy and implementation level?
- To what extent did UNDP operationalize governance and peace building concerns in its programme/ project designs (results frameworks, theories of change) and identify indicators for projects to ensure “quality-at-entry” of governance interventions?
- Did the projects and implementation method continue to be relevant to the UNDP and Somalia’s governance and peace building priorities?
- Facing the pandemic, have the projects been adapted to the new reality?
- To what extent did UNDP’s engagement contribute to the UN integrated approach to inclusive politics/inclusive governance, including UNDP’s role in the development context in country and its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners?
- Were the interests of beneficiaries considered during the project designs and implementation process (notably women, youth, persons with disabilities etc.)?
- Are the results and/or progress towards results aligned and contributing to Inclusive Democratic Governance? If not, what should have been done to ensure this is achieved?
- Has UNDP been influential in country policy debates and dialogues on Inclusive Democratic Governance and has it influenced country policies on governance reforms and human rights protection?
- To what extent is UNDP’s support relevant to the achievement of the SDGs in the country?

ii) Effectiveness

- How effective has UNDP been in implementing governance to institutional change?
- To what extent have UNDP’s projects and other interventions contributed to promoting governance that benefits women, youth, and other groups?
- What evidence is there that UNDP’s support has contributed towards an improvement in country’s capacity, including institutional strengthening?
- Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving Inclusive Democratic Governance effectiveness and integrity in the country?
- were the monitoring systems adequately capturing data on democratic governance results at an appropriate outcome level?

iii) Efficiency

- 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 democratic governance?
- Are UNDP’s approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?
- Have the outputs been achieved, and did they contribute to the democratic governance theme at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient? If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outcomes has been made as measured by the outcome

indicators presented in the results framework?

iv) Sustainability

- What measures, including national counterparts' capacity building have been taken to ensure the sustainability of the achievements of democratic governance?
- To what extent are the projects embedded in a larger coherent strategy directed at enhancing democratic governance?
- How do the experiences and lessons learned from projects at the country level feed into UNDP's analytical framework, policy making and programme design?
- What markers or evidence is there to show that the results achieved so far will be sustained beyond the programme period?
- Are there national plans/ reforms to promote inclusive democratic governance in place or likely to be developed, approved, and implemented in the next few years? And beyond the programme period?

v) Impact

- Evaluate the extent to which the projects generated positive or negative, intended, and unintended effects that have implications to the Inclusive democratic governance goals of the country?

vi) Gender equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the projects?
- Are the gender markers assigned to the projects realistic?
- To what extent did the interventions promote positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Did any unintended effects emerge for women, men, or vulnerable groups?

vii) Disability

- Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
- What proportion of the beneficiaries of a programme were persons with disabilities?
- What barriers did persons with disabilities face?

6. Methodology

The thematic evaluation will be conducted by the two independent evaluators contracted by UNDP under an individual consultancy contract. The Evaluation reference group including the projects stakeholders (executive, supplier, and beneficiary) shall guide and oversee the overall direction of the consultancy. The evaluators are expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data through but not limited to the following methods

- Desk study and review of all relevant projects' documentation including project documents, annual work- plans, project progress reports, project monitoring reports (from third party monitors) annual project reports, minutes of project board meetings, reports of consultancies and events.
- In depth interviews to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology.

- Considering the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, virtual focus group discussions with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders will be conducted.
- Interviews with relevant key informants (see annexed list of relevant institutions).

7. Expected products (deliverables) - process

The following deliverables are expected, including the process:

1. **Evaluation inception report.** The inception report should be reviewed by the evaluation manager, UNDP and the reference group and will have separate sections related to REFS and CRSP/PSP and one joint thematic section related to democratic governance hence, the consultants will work collaboratively, to prepare an integrated inception report.
2. **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, the evaluators will provide a debriefing to the same stakeholders, focusing on the main results and recommendations of the evaluation
3. **Draft evaluation report.** The evaluation manager, the reference group, UNDP, and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluators within one week, addressing the content required and quality criteria. NOTE: The evaluation report will have separate sections related to REFS and CRSP/PSP and one joint thematic section related to democratic governance. Hence, the consultants will work collaboratively, to prepare a draft of the evaluation report.
4. **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluators in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluators to show how they have addressed comments.
5. **Final evaluation report.** The evaluators will send the final evaluation report to the evaluation manager, the reference group, UNDP, UNSOM (PAMG) team and the key national counterparts after having received the consolidated comments on the draft report. The international consultants will be overall responsible for the preparation of the final report. NOTE: The evaluation report will have separate sections related to REFS and CRSP/PSP and one joint thematic section related to democratic governance. Hence, the consultants will work collaboratively, to prepare an integrated evaluation report.
6. **Presentations to** the evaluation manager, the reference group, UNDP, and UNSOM (PAMG), donors and other key stakeholders.

Evaluation Products (Deliverables)

The key deliverables are summarized in the table below:

Deliverables	Content		Estimated Duration to Complete (days)	Target Due Dates	Review and approvals Required	% of total professional fee
	REFS (reconciliation and federalism) Evaluation Consultant	CRSP/PSP (constitutionalism and parliamentarism) Evaluation Consultant				
Inception Report	Prepare the inception report related to REFS Jointly with the CRSP/PSP consultant to prepare the joint thematic section related to democratic governance	Prepare the inception report related to CRSP and PSP Jointly with the REFS consultant to prepare the joint thematic section related to democratic governance	5	20 October 2021	Evaluation Reference Group	20%
<p>Description: The evaluators should prepare the inception report based on an understanding of the ToRs, initial meetings with the UNDP programme unit and the desk review. Inception report should include the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated. 2. Evaluation objective, purpose, and scope. 3. Evaluation criteria and questions. The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits. 4. Evaluability analysis. Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology. 5. Cross-cutting issues. Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analyzed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate. 6. Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources, and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments, and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations. 						

	<p>7. Evaluation matrix. This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.</p> <p>8. A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).</p> <p>9. Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting field offices or sites</p> <p>10. Outline of the draft/final report as detailed in the guidelines and ensuring quality and usability (outlined below). The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in section 6.</p> <p><u>The inception report will have separate sections related to REFS and CRSP/PSP and one joint thematic section related to democratic governance. Hence, the consultants will work collaboratively, to prepare an integrated inception report.</u></p>					
Data Collection and Analysis	<p>Collect data related to REFS</p> <p>Jointly with the CRSP/PSP consultant to collect data on democratic governance</p>	<p>Collect data related to CRSP/PSP</p> <p>Jointly with the REFS consultant to collect data on democratic governance</p>	10	5 November 2021	Evaluation Reference Group	30%
	<p>Description: Field data collection and all interviews, recording and analysis will be delivered to UNDP and remain the property of UNDP. The data from the field will be collected to the furthest extent possible through digital devices & remote surveys, virtual consultations conducted through video communication and audio conferencing and other IT collaboration tools to be used in a situation of remote work environment. Thus, UNDP will facilitate the online meetings with stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Besides project specific data, the consultants will collaboratively prepare tools, in coordination with UNDP IP Portfolio, to collect data on democratic governance</u></p>					
A Draft Evaluation Report	<p>Prepare a draft evaluation report related to REFS</p> <p>Jointly with the CRSP/PSP consultant to prepare the joint thematic section related to democratic governance</p>	<p>Prepare a draft evaluation report related to CRSP/PSP</p> <p>Jointly with the REFS consultant to prepare the joint thematic section related to democratic governance</p>	5	20 November 2021	Evaluation Reference Group	20%
	<p>Description: A draft report informing all key stakeholders and describing the findings and recommendations for future intervention strategies, lessons learned and best practices.</p> <p><u>The draft report will have separate sections related to REFS and CRSP/PSP and one joint thematic section related to democratic governance. Hence, the consultants will work collaboratively, to prepare an integrated draft evaluation report.</u></p>					

Final Evaluation Report	Draft final evaluation report related to REFS	Draft final evaluation report related to CRSP/PSP	15	10 December 2021	Evaluation Reference Group	30%
	Jointly with the CRSP/PSP consultant to draft the joint thematic section related to democratic governance	Jointly with the REFS consultant to draft the joint thematic section related to democratic governance				
<p>Description: Final evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders. The content and structure of the final analytical report will outline findings, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of the evaluation and will meet the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. The report should include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title and opening pages should provide the following basic information: (i) name of the evaluation intervention; (ii) time frame of the evaluation and date of the report; (iii) Somalia as country of the evaluation intervention; (iv) names and organizations of evaluators; (v) name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.; (vi) acknowledgements. 2. Project and evaluation information details on second page (as one page) A: Project Information i) Project title ii) Atlas ID iii) Corporate outcome and output iv) country v) Region vi) Date project document signed vii) Project dates (start/ planned end date), viii) project budget, ix) Project expenditure at the time of evaluation x) Funding source, xi) Implementing partner, xii) B: Evaluation Information xiii) Evaluation type (Thematic evaluation), xiv) Final/ midterm review/ other xv) Period under evaluation (start/ end), xvi) Evaluators name, xvii) Evaluator email address, xviii) Evaluation dates (start/ completion). 3. Table of contents, including boxes, figures, tables, and annexes with page references. 4. List of acronyms and abbreviations. 5. Executive summary (four-page maximum): A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should: i) Briefly describe the intervention of the thematic evaluation ii) Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses, iii) Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods, iv) Summarize principal findings, conclusions and recommendations, v) Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings. 6. Introduction should include i) Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did, ii) Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results, iii) Identify the intervention of the evaluation the project, iv) Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users. 7. Description of the intervention should provide the basis for report users to understand the logic 						

	<p>and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should: i) Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit and the problem or issue it seeks to address, ii) Explain the expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies and the key assumptions underlying the strategy, ii) Link the intervention to national priorities, UNSF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, iii) Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation, iv) Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles, v) Identify relevant cross-cutting issues addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind, vi) Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component, vii) Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets, viii) Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes, ix) Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).</p> <p>8. Evaluation scope and objectives. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives, and main questions, i) Evaluation scope. The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed, ii) Evaluation objectives. The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions, iii) Evaluation criteria. The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the criteria used in the evaluation, iv) Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.</p> <p>9. Evaluation approach and methods. The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods, and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. The</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report. The description on methodology should include discussion of i) Evaluation approach and ii) Data sources: the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions, iii) Sample and sampling frame. If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results, iv) Data-collection procedures and instruments: methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness, v) Performance standards:48 the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales), vi) Stakeholder participation in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results, vii) Ethical considerations: the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.), viii) Background information on evaluators: the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation, ix) Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.</p> <p>10. Data analysis. The report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.</p> <p>11. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.</p> <p>12. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.</p> <p>13. Recommendations. The report should provide practical, actionable, and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.</p> <p>14. Lessons learned. The report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.</p> <p>15. Report annexes. Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report should include i) TORs for the evaluation, ii) Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate, iii) List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited, if any, iv) List of supporting documents reviewed, v) Project or programme results model or results framework, vi) Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators, vii) Code of conduct signed by evaluators.</p> <p><u>The final evaluation report will have separate sections related to REFS and CRSP/PSP and one joint thematic section related to democratic governance. Hence, the consultants will work collaboratively, to prepare an integrated final evaluation report.</u></p>				
		35			

8. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The independent thematic evaluation will be conducted by a team of two independent international evaluation consultants. As stated, one consultant will be specifically focused on REFS (reconciliation and federalism) and one on CRSP and PSP (constitutionalism and parliamentarism). However, the consultants are expected to work collaboratively to jointly address thematic topics related to democratic governance and draft an integrated evaluation report, as stated.

9. Evaluation ethics

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'.¹ The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultants must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected.

The information, knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners. The evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflict of interest and interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly or substantively as an employee or consultant in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programmes. In this regard each of the consultant is mandatory to sign a code of conduct and an agreement before they start working with UNDP.

10. Institutional Arrangements

The Evaluation Consultants will report to the Evaluation reference group composed of project teams or members of other UNDP programme and projects and UNSOM PAMG, who will support the evaluation and give comments and direction at key stages in the evaluation process. An evaluation reference group ensures transparency in the evaluation process and strengthens the credibility of the evaluation results.

The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist in UNDP Programme Oversight and Quality Assurance (POQA) will act as Evaluation Manager. He will be responsible for the oversight of the whole evaluation process and will provide technical guidance and ensure the independence of the evaluation process, and that policy is followed.

11. Duration of the work

¹ Access at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

The evaluation is expected to start in September 2021 for an estimated duration of 35 working days. During this period the consultants will carry out desk reviews, field work including focus group discussions, interviews, consultations, and report writing.

12. Duty Station

The consultancy will be home-based. Consultants shall set-up a schedule to engage with the project team through video conferencing or other remote communication tools. If travelling is requested, UNDP will bear the costs, following UNDP Rules and Procedures.

13. Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractors

Evaluation Consultant – constitutionalism and parliamentarism (one position)

Academic Qualifications:

Master's degree in governance, political science, international relations, international development, social sciences, or other related field combined with capacity building work and institutional needs assessment.

Experience:

- At least 10 years of professional experience in areas of Results-Based Programme Evaluation and Quality Assurance. A strong record in designing and leading assessments/evaluations.
- Proven experience in conducting evaluations at programme and/or outcome levels preferably in the field of constitutionalism and parliamentarism or related fields with international organizations or UNDP.
- Technical expertise, including working experience in developing countries, in the field of governance, with the special focus on legal drafting, constitutionalism, parliamentary oversight and similar fields
- Extensive conceptual and methodological skills and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research/ evaluation methods.
- Experience in gender analysis and mainstreaming in evaluation or research activities
- Excellent analytical and drafting skills; and IT literate, especially in Microsoft Package
- Experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation.
- Fluent (written and verbal) in English. Working knowledge in Somali is an added advantage, but not a requirement.

Evaluation Consultant – federalism and reconciliation (one position)

Academic Qualifications:

Master's degree in governance, political science, international relations, international

development, social sciences, or other related field combined with capacity building work and institutional needs assessment.

Experience:

- At least 10 years of professional experience in areas of Results-Based Programme Evaluation and Quality Assurance. A strong record in designing and leading assessments/evaluations.
- Proven experience in conducting evaluations at programme and/or outcome levels preferably in the field of reconciliation and federalism or related fields with international organizations or UNDP.
- Technical expertise, including working experience in developing countries, in the field of governance, with the special focus on community reconciliation, federalist governance structure and similar fields
- Extensive conceptual and methodological skills and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research/ evaluation methods.
- Experience in gender analysis and mainstreaming in evaluation or research activities
- Excellent analytical and drafting skills; and IT literate, especially in Microsoft Package
- Experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation.
- Fluent in English. Working knowledge in Somalia is an added advantage, and Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English.

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UNs values and ethical standards.
- Demonstrates professional competence and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines, and achieving results.
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of the UN/UNDP
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability with a demonstrated ability to work in a multidisciplinary team

Functional Competencies:

- Ability to work under pressure in a stressful environment and adapt to a rapidly changing and challenging work environment.
- Familiarity with the UN System and mandates,
- Ability to work with minimal supervision, taking own initiative and control to implement tasks
- Knowledge of issues concerning institutional/capacity assessment and organization development,
- Thorough knowledge of results-based management and strategic planning processes.
- Excellent communication skills (written and spoken English); good presentation skills (good public speaker); Excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to communicate with policy makers and counterparts.
- Ability to deal with multi-stakeholder groups.

- Strong interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality assessment and research products in a timely manner

Standard templates that need to be followed are provided in the Annexes section. It is expected that the evaluators will follow the UNDP evaluation guidelines and ensure that all the required quality assessment criteria outlined in section 6 are addressed in the evaluation report.

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.

TOR Annexes

These provide links to supporting background documents and more detailed guidelines on evaluation in UNDP:

- ❖ Intervention results framework and theory of change.
- ❖ Key stakeholders and partners.
- ❖ Documents to be reviewed and consulted.
- ❖ Evaluation matrix template.
- ❖ Outline of the evaluation report format.
- ❖ Code of conduct forms.

All relevant documentation and literature will be given to the consultants in soft copy once the evaluation begins, including the following:

Project Documents

- ❖ Initial Project Document and revisions of project documents
- ❖ AWP for year 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021
- ❖ Annual Progress reports for year 2018, 2019 and 2020
- ❖ MPTF HQ progress reports for year 2018, 2019 and 2020
- ❖ Project monitoring reports including TPM reports, spot checks and Audit Reports
- ❖ Project board and donors meeting minutes
- ❖ MPTF HQ newsletters for year 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021
- ❖ UNCT annual reports
- ❖ UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2019.

List of stakeholders and relevant institutions

Constitution Review Support Project (CRSP)

- ❖ Ministry of Constitutional Affairs- MOCA federal and MOCA Federal Member States
- ❖ Independent Constitutional Review and Implementation Commission (ICRIC)
- ❖ UNDP
- ❖ UNSOM/PAMG
- ❖ DONORS

Parliamentary Support Project (PSP)

- ❖ UNDP
- ❖ UNSOM/PAMG
- ❖ Federal Parliament – Upper House, House of People
- ❖ Somaliland Parliament – House of Elders, House of Representatives
- ❖ Federal Member State Parliaments
- ❖ Parliamentary Constitutional Review Oversight Committee
- ❖ DONORS

Reconciliation and Federalism Support Project (REFS) for Somalia

- ❖ United Nations Development Program (UNDP).
- ❖ United Nations Assistance Mission Somalia (UNSOM) / Political Affairs and Mediation Group (PAMG)
- ❖ Ministry of Interior, Federal Affairs and Reconciliation of the Federal Government of Somalia (MoIFAR-FGS)
- ❖ Office of the Prime Minister of the Federal Government of Somalia (OPM-FGS)
- ❖ Independent commission for Boundaries and Federalism (ICBF) Minister of Interior, Federal Affairs and Reconciliation "
- ❖ Office of the President South West State of Somalia (OOP- SWS)
- ❖ Ministry of Constitution and Federal Affairs Jubaland State of Somalia (MoCFA-JSS)
- ❖ Office of the President Hirshabelle State of Somalia (OOP-HSS)
- ❖ Ministry of Interior Federalism and Democratization Puntland State of Somalia (MoIFAD-PLSS)
- ❖ Ministry of Interior, Federal Affairs and Reconciliation Galmudug State of Somalia (MoIFAR-GSS)
- ❖ Peace Building Fund
- ❖ Simad University
- ❖ Galkayo University
- ❖ African Network for Prevention and Protection Against Child Abuse and Neglect – Somalia Chapter (ANPPCAN-SOM)
- ❖ Mogadishu University
- ❖ Creative Alternative Now (CAN)
- ❖ Somali Youth Vison (SYV)

Documents produced by donors and counterparts

Federal Government of Somalia:

- ❖ The National Reconciliation Framework (NRF) and National Reconciliation Process (NRP)
- ❖ Somali National Development Plan (2017 – 2019)
- ❖ Any other relevant documents

UN System:

- ❖ UNDP Country Programme Document 2018-2020
- ❖ United Nations Strategic Framework (UNSF) 2017-2020

Prepared by:

Nasra Barre
M&E Officer, Inclusive Politics

Signature: _____

Reviewer 1:

Dragan Popovic
Portfolio Manager, Inclusive Politics

Signature: _____

Reviewer 2:

Garikai Mabeza
M& E Specialist, POQA

Signature: _____

Reviewer 3:

Gloria Kiondo
Head of POQA

Signature: _____

Approved by:

Doel Mukerjee
Deputy Resident Representative (P) OIC

Signature: _____