Terms of Reference

Terminal Evaluation of the Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP) – June 2017 – December 2021

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Government of Ethiopia has over the last two decades shown great commitment to implement policies and programmes aimed at stimulating rapid development transformation largely by prioritizing investments to build and operate social and economic infrastructure, improving capacities within government to broaden access to basic social services such as education, health and water and sanitation, and prioritizing public investments in pro-poor economic sectors such as agriculture and food security. On top of the economic and social transformation, stride has been made in the governance side like ratifying largely progressive constitution, efforts to address inequalities, policies that promote gender equality, establishment of democratic institutions, etc.

The policy orientation and commitment has resulted in significant improvements in Ethiopia's human development indicators. In view of the county's context and bold development transformation vision, it has been found important to make deliberate efforts to further broaden space for citizen engagement and participation in the development process to create a sense of shared prosperity, strengthen social cohesion and sustain peace and stability.

Despite these positive developments, the country still faced several setbacks. Prior to 2018 the country had been characterized with instability and growing dissatisfaction of large groups of the population, primarily the youth segment with the Government. Widespread and protracted public protests and growing street and youth dissatisfaction forced the way for a series of reforms to be launched under PM Haliemariam Desalegn. Growing dissatisfaction and popular demands for change and reform ultimately resulted in a change in government in February 2018. Therefore 2018 marked a pivotal year in the history of Ethiopia with a wide-ranging introduction of transformational reforms in the political, democracy and socio-economic landscape all launched.

With the election of Dr. Abiy Ahmed as the new PM by the ruling Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) coalition, a raft of Proclamations followed including promising announcements to open up the political space, free political dissidents and engage in comprehensive institutional reforms of the public sector, including announcements to privatize public enterprises. In his inaugural speech, the new PM highlighted the need for what he termed as 'an inclusive political process' with the opposition playing a more active role. The PM urged all Ethiopians to put their differences aside as they worked together to forge a solid democratization process. He identified civil rights and freedom of movement and organization, the right to political participation and

1

representation and the right to freedom of expression as key in this process. He also reaffirmed his government's commitment to ensure the full participation of women in public life and his personal commitment to advancing the equality agenda forward.

However, what has emerged recently is that the country has entered into a serious problem of political instability and armed conflicts in various regions of the country. Most notably the conflicts in the Tigray, Amhara and Afar region following the Law Enforcement Operation of the Government in Tigray region in November 2020 has resulted in the displacement of millions of people, and has also created a humanitarian, social and economic crisis. However, despite these conflicts and unrest in various parts of the country, the nation conducted fair and peaceful national election with the highest turnout of voters during 2021.

The GoE-UNDP Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP), a five-year multi-stakeholder's programme (June 2017 to December 2021), has as a main objective of supporting the country sustain efforts towards enhancing institutional capacities and frameworks for strengthening good governance and deepening democratic participation in accordance with the Constitution and International Human Rights Conventions to which Ethiopia is a signatory. Progress in these areas is critical and believed to enable the country to deliver on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II).

The programme on governance and democratic participation was designed based on progress made and lessons learned from the former Democratic Participation Programme (DIP) and other interventions to support initiatives aimed at addressing governance bottlenecks, issues of inclusivity, transparency and accountability, and to nurture the development of a more responsive system of governance and peaceful coexistence. The launch in 2017 was against a very different back drop where there were significant risks attached to a governance programme being launched at a time where the enabling environment was fairly restricted. But the changes ushered in 2018 demonstrate that provision of democratic governance support needs to be adaptive to changes in the political landscape in order to capitalize on emerging opportunities.

GDPP was designed to deliver on the following five inter-related and complementary outputs:

1) Political processes of federal and regional state legislative bodies are more inclusive and effectively delivering on their constitutional mandates;

2) Federal and regional state systems of governance are more accountable, transparent and are delivering public services in more inclusive and responsive ways;

3) Citizens are more empowered to voice their concern and actively participate in decision-making processes at all levels of the development, governance and political processes and systems;

4) Systems and mechanisms for promoting social cohesion, managing diversity, preventing and managing conflicts, fostering dialogues and building peace are further strengthened at national and sub-national levels; and

5) Access to justice enhanced and human rights promoted and protected across Ethiopia.

The implementation of the GDPP commenced in July 2017 based on the initial visioning and workplan of the programme. The programme was implemented through the National Execution (NEX) modality

supporting x11 Implementing Partners towards enhancing the democratization process and good governance in the country. The Mid Term Review in 2020 which formed part of the monitoring of the implementation of the programme revealed that the programme is relevant with the value addition to enhance democratic transformation and political participation. GDPP has reconfirmed as a strong enabling platform for the supporting the realization of the transformational democratization agenda through the various achievements recorded by the participating Democratic Institutions. Moreover, the new governance arrangements and policy priorities have been reinforced and include emphasizing Human Rights, Rule of Law, accountability, peace and stability.

GDPP has also enabled the democratic and accountability institutions to strengthen their mandate through direct and clear investments associated with institutional and human capacity development. Building on these positive developments, the dramatic shifts witnessed in the political and governance space and the resulting policy priorities expressed by the political leadership have prompted the Government of Ethiopia and UNDP to 'refocus' the GDPP and 'reposition' it to more effectively address transformational and transitional needs. UNDP in close coordination with the GoE engaged in a 'repositioning' exercise of the programme following the changes in the political landscape and the shift of policy priorities of the Government. The Repositioning Paper, which was launched in December 2018 allowed all Institutions contributing to the programme and UNDP to reconfirm relevance of the programme to the current policy priorities and to ensure identified activities are addressing transformational issues. The results framework of the programme had undergone a review and expansion with new sub-outputs included.

The repositioning of the programme in 2018/2019 saw GDPP take actions to target the support towards helping to create an enabling environment for citizens and media engagement in the political and governance reforms. The results yielded with the support of the programme included the development of the civic engagement policy framework, the new media law and also approval of the Inter-Governmental Relations Policy.

An independent mid-term review of the programme was undertaken in 2020 to assess if GDPP remained relevant and responsive to the needs of the country as well as to draw lessons that might be needed to inform any necessary adjustments to the Programme in the remaining cycle of the programme.

The MTR which was finalized in August 2020 with the validation and dissemination of the findings and recommendations that were presented to the GDPP Programme Management Board (PMB) judged that the programme was broadly on track. Moreover, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) provided valuable evidence and suggestions about how to enhance the impact of the programmme which indicated the value of allowing more time for the programmatic interventions to mature and thus be capable of providing solid evidence that GDPP support was yielding positive results. The implication was that to end GDPP as scheduled in December 2021 would be a lost opportunity in the context of institutional development.

3

Among the ten recommendations of the MTR, the one which boldly came out was the need for 'revisiting the thematic focus and institutional scope of the GDPP'. The recommendations of the MTR together with the Management Responses (MRs) were presented and discussed at the GDPP Programme Management Board (PMB) held in November 2020. The PMB instructed UNDP to prepare an Options Paper that would look the issues associated with the proposed narrowing down of the thematic focus and institutional scope of GDPP as the means to better maximize results.

That Options Paper was presented and discussed in the June 2021 PMB meeting. The Board made the decision that the institutional scope and thematic focus of GDPP should be narrowed and that would result in the number of Implementing Partners being reduced from 11 to 6. Similarly, the thematic focus of the programme was agreed to be narrowed by focusing on social cohesion & reconciliation; stronger institutions of representation (legislatures); more effective, efficient, transparent & inclusive public administration; ethics & integrity; and civic & media space. The proposed thematic focus would be further discussed and analyzed during a design phase of a new GDPP II. A six-month cost extension bridging period (January – June 2022) was also approved by PMB during which time working closely with the 6 remaining Implementing Partners HoPR, HoF, EHRC, FEACC, EMA and EIO work should be undertaken to devise a new iteration of democratic governance support which would go-live in July 2022.

Therefore, this independent terminal evaluation of the programme will also help to inform the likely design and content of the new iteration of democratic governance support capitalizing on the achievements, lessons and best practices of GDPP.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

This terminal evaluation will be a formative evaluation exercise, with a dual purpose of learning and accountability. This terminal evaluation will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The evaluation is expected to provide concrete evidence on the relevance, effectiveness, adaptability, results/impact, efficiency and sustainability of processes & operationalization of the programme. This evaluation will also assess and analyze the appropriateness, weaknesses and strength of the programme's design, scope, and implementation strategies/arrangements for achieving programme results and also the sustainability of program outcomes.

Evidence and lessons from the terminal evaluation will feed into the design of the new iteration of democratic governance support.

The findings, judgements and recommendations from this terminal evaluation must be based on concrete, verifiable & credible evidence that will support UNDP for shaping its strategic thinking in a design of a new programme of governance support. The evidence should enable to identify the key priorities of the Programme in supporting Ethiopia in the area of inclusive governance.

3.   EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

This terminal evaluation will cover the whole implementation period of the programme (from July 2017 to December 2021). The evaluation will cover all the eleven Implementing Partners with field visits to the selected IPs (at least 50%) by prioritizing IPs that have regional branches or regional

counterparts. For selecting the sample IPs that will be visited during field data collection, the complexity of operations, level of achievements of targets, criticality of the role/mandate of the IP towards the reform process and volume of interventions are considered as criteria for stratification.

Assessment on all the five outputs, and corresponding sub-outputs as well as indications/contributions towards achievement of intended outcomes of the programme will be in the scope of the terminal evaluation. The evaluation will emphasize the operational/implementation mechanisms and arrangements practiced at the programme level and in the respective Implementing Partners (IPs) and their relevance, effectiveness & efficiency, perceptions towards the programme/how UNDP operates, the ownership/commitment level by the IPs, etc. The analyses in the evaluation need to be gender focused/sensitive with sex disaggregation of results to clearly reflect on different factors affecting or affected by gender dynamics. In addition, the evidence of efforts to enhance social inclusion by for example engagement with citizens or Civil Society will need to be brought out clearly in the evaluation.

This terminal evaluation will have the specific objectives of:

- Review validity of programme assumptions and the theory of change of the programme to map the results pathways and also assess cause - effect relationships for highlighting, based on lessons learned, how should the theory of change and results' pathways of a second programme cycle of GDPP be defined.

- Assess the design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the programme interventions.

- Identify implementation issues and challenges/bottlenecks which constrain programme and financial delivery.

- Provide evidence whether the programme has been able to accomplish the intended results/outputs and identify attributed factors.

- Identify lessons learned, best practices & recommendations, and document knowledge basis from the programme design & implementation, based on evidence and reliable information, so as to improve a design, scope, and implementation strategies/arrangements of a new iteration of democratic governance support which will be formulated in early 2022.

- Identify strengths and weaknesses of the programme in the application of rights-based approaches, gender mainstreaming and social inclusion plus clearly identify recommendations to be applied in any future iteration of democratic governance support.

- Review risk assessment & mitigation measures taken for ensuring progress on implementing the programme's interventions. Also comment on their effectiveness and identify lessons learned about the adaptability/flexibility exhibited by the Programme.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation is expected to apply the internationally accepted evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. It will also assess adaptability, responsiveness, coherence and women equality and gender mainstreaming. Aligning to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation may need to include and address the following key evaluation questions, among others:

Relevance:

- To what extent the objectives and operations of the GDPP programme were consistent with the need of beneficiaries of the partner democratic intuitions, need of implementing partners, current country need, and donors' policies and expectations?
- To what extent were the interventions aligned with the needs of other key stakeholders particularly government and other actors in the sectors relevant to governance, democratic participation, and transparency?
- Were the approaches and strategies/arrangements used relevant to achieve intended sub-outputs, outputs and outcomes of the programme/intervention? To what extent the thematic focus and institutional scope of the programme were appropriate to achieve intended results?
- To what extent did the interventions respond to the needs of vulnerable groups and women?
- To what extent the programme was aligned to the SDGs, GTP II, Home-grown Economic Reform Programme, Ten Years Development Perspective Plan, UNDAF (now superseded by the UNSDCF but the evaluation will focus on the UNDAF), the New Horizon of Hope in Africa, and other relevant national policies?
- To what extent were programme's interventions coherent with UNDP's policies, strategies and normative guidance?
- To what extent were the key stakeholders of the programme including downstream stakeholders engaged in the design, implementation and monitoring of the programme? To what extent is the national ownership and leadership on the planning, implementation and monitoring of the programme?
- Did the assumptions and the Theory of Change hold true? If not, why?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent did this programme achieve its planned sub-outputs, outputs, immediate outcomes, and objectives?
- What were the main expected and unexpected results of the programme?
- To what extent did the strategic revision for repositioning of the programme led to achievement (or lack of achievement) of the sub-outputs, outputs, and objectives of the programme?
- What were the major factors influenced implementation and operations of the programme for achievement or non-achievement of results? What was the quality of implementation of the programme?
- What were the unintended results of the changes in political landscape and the reforms underway in the country to the programme implementation and achievement of results?
- What are lessons learned and good practices to take up for future in designing and implementing a new second phase of the programme?

Efficiency:

- Did the Project's implementation mechanisms -including institutional arrangements, partnership, support services, etc., permit utilization of resources in efficient way, and also delivery of services and achievement of results in timely manner?

- Was the programme resources efficiently used? Was the cost per output/sub-output used in the most cost-effective way or were there areas where savings ought to be made to reduce costs?
- To what extent were project management practices and tools adequate to timely and effectively implement the programme?
- Are project resources adequate and available on time to implement the activities as planned?

Impact:

- What were the long-term effects/outcomes of the programme on the target beneficiaries/institutions and citizens? To what extent were the programme objectives met? What are indications of success?
- Did the interventions of the programme bring about any unintended (both negative or positive) effects on the target beneficiaries/institutions, citizens and/or operational environment?
- What were the gender-specific impacts, especially regarding women's empowerment?
- How could the programme be improved in its design, implementation and monitoring to have long-term effect/impact?

Sustainability:

- To what extent are the results and positive changes from the programme implementation up to this point in time likely to continue after end of the current phase of the programme?
- To what extent did the shift in the governance landscape and political arena of the country would affect continuity and sustainability of results achieved?
- To what extent were the implementing partners showed ownership of the programme, results, and lessons learned and their ability to continue with the programme with limited or without intervention from UNDP?
- To what extent the programme established and maintained effective partnership with development partners, government, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), etc.?
- To what extent were the participation and ownership of the programme by the IPs and other key stakeholders for ensuring sustainability of achieved results & lessons learned after end of the current programme?

Gender:
- To what extent have gender considerations mainstreamed and had been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in women participation in the forest conservation and development activities? To what extent women benefitted from this project?

Human rights:

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged & marginalized groups benefited from the work of this programme?

The above listed evaluation questions are not to be considered as exhaustive to address the evaluation purpose and objectives in comprehensive manner. So, the evaluation questions will be further

discussed and elaborated in collaboration with the evaluation team, stakeholders (implementing partners) and UNDP during the inception phase to refine and accept.

5. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this terminal evaluation will be designed by the selected evaluation team/consultant in consultation with UNDP during the inception phase. However, the Terminal Evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts/Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), and other stakeholders.

The methodology to be designed by the Evaluation Team will include but not limited to the following:

- Participatory mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) of data gathering and analysis.
- The Evaluation Team may also need to triangulate information from different sources and methods so as to ensure reliability and validity of data and findings.
- In the inception phase, the selected Evaluation Team will develop an elaborated evaluation matrix that clearly links the evaluation questions with data sources and collection methods. The proposed methods for data collection and analysis should be discussed and agreed by UNDP and other stakeholders before their application throughout the evaluation processes.

The mixed methods that will be applying for the evaluation should ensure that women and men from different stakeholders' groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used. Furthermore, the proposed methods should also clearly outline how Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) principles have been integrated and addressed in the design, planning and implementation, as well as what results have been achieved so far.

The identified evaluation team also needs to expand clearly and in detail the criteria and approach to be used to select representative sample Implementing Partners and stakeholders that will be consulted for data collection at regional and branch offices levels.

Generally, the quantitative and qualitative data to be used for this terminal evaluation will be collected from both secondary and primary sources. The desk level review of available relevant documents at different levels will be main source of secondary data and information for the evaluation. The Evaluation Team during the desk level review should be able to develop Indicators' Summary Matrix as key deliverable of the desk review.

The primary data from representative sample institutions and individuals will be collected through qualitative and quantitative interviews. The data generating through qualitative and quantitative interviews with the help of customized qualitative interview tools and structured quantitative survey questionnaires will be the sources of primary data. The focus group discussions and key informant interviews/individual in-depth interviews that will be conducted with knowledgeable informants from the Implementing Institutions (including regional counterparts or branch offices), UNDP, Development Partners (DPs), and other stakeholders are the prime qualitative methods to be employed for primary qualitative data collection. The structured quantitative survey that will be carried out with randomly sampled individuals from the Implementing Institutions and/or beneficiaries is the quantitative tool to be used for primary quantitative data gathering. The feasibility of conducting mini-structured quantitative survey will be discussed and agreed during the Inception Phase.

It is critical to include respondent end-users in order to ensure effective triangulation of data and receive feedback from citizens/users of the services on their quality, adaptability, responsiveness and

on how they are advancing a normative agenda in the country. The evaluation team's own observation with the help of observation checklists will also complement the data that will be collected through focus group discussions and key informant interviews/individual in-depth interviews, and also be used for data triangulation. In fact, the evaluation team is expected to propose, during the inception phase, how many qualitative interviews of each type will be conducted by considering the reliability and validity of findings, and also cost and time requirements.

The evaluators should also follow participatory and consultative approaches throughout the evaluation processes so as to ensure active engagement of the Evaluation Manager/Focal Person, Programme Manager, Democratic Governance & Peacebuilding (DGP) Unit, Implementing Partners, Development Partners, Programme's beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders. The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNDP evaluation guidelines, norms and policies/procedures.

The evaluation team will be responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Hybrid approaches which combines both physical and virtual meetings for consultations and interviews could be considered in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Due to the COVID-19 situation the international consultant is expected to work from home/virtually through phone or virtual communication platforms and sending out questionnaires, whereas the local consultants will engage in field work and field level data collection in regional and branch offices. The International consultant will serve as Team leader for the Terminal Evaluation.

6. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)

The evaluation team will be accountable for producing and delivering the following products/deliverables. The key deliverables for this terminal evaluation are as described below; with the milestones to be specified in the section for timeframe for the evaluation.

- **Evaluation Inception Report**—Evaluators are responsible for preparing an Inception Report (10 – 15 pages - not counting annexes) with guidance from the Evaluation Focal Person, Programme Manager, and Partnership Development and Results Management (PDRM) Unit. An inception report will be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise.

  An inception report should detail how the team intends to conduct the evaluation with an emphasis on methodological and planning aspects. The clear and detail **evaluation matrix** which details the evaluation questions is one of the deliverables as part of the inception report. An inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designated team members with the lead responsibility for each task or product. An inception phase, which concludes with an inception report, is believed to give an opportunity to DGP Unit/UNDP and the Evaluators for verification and shared understanding of the evaluation and also clarifying any misunderstanding about the evaluation approach, methodology and processes. **An inception report/package** is the product to be delivered by the evaluators. The Inception Report will be presented to the UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) for review and endorsement.

- **Debriefing on preliminary findings or Aide-memoire –** once the inception phase is completed with endorsement of the Inception Report/Package, the evaluators will embark on data collection and analysis exercise **-** this covers data collection and analysis activities, including

9

field work. The evaluation team will conclude the data collection and preliminary analysis phase with a presentation of the early findings of the evaluation to DGPU, PDRM Unit, ERG and other stakeholders during the data collection exit debriefing session. The debriefing session will be conducted immediately upon completion of the data collection; and the **preliminary report/raw data** is the product that the Evaluation Team should deliver to UNDP.

- **Draft evaluation report—** the evaluation team will analyse the data collected during the desk review and field work, and also conduct additional consultations with stakeholders for filling data gaps and triangulation to eventually draft an evaluation report. The draft evaluation report will present the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations of the evidence-based evaluation. Findings should be evidence-based and relevant to answer the evaluation questions and meet the evaluation objectives.

  Data will need to be disaggregated by sex & other relevant characteristics; and also, the evaluation findings and conclusions will require to highlight differences in results by Implementing Partners. There should be a logical flow from findings to conclusions and from conclusions to recommendations & lessons learned. Recommendations will be limited in number, actionable and targeted to the relevant users. The proposed specific recommendations will form the basis of the management responses to the evaluation. The management responses will clearly indicate the responses of the management on the recommendations and also what actions to be taken in defined timer period. The recommendations which will come out from the evaluation should enable UNDP to differently design, implement and monitor a second phase of the current programme.

  The draft evaluation report will be reviewed by DGPU/UNDP, Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), Independent Evaluation Quality Assurance Team, and other stakeholders (as deem necessary) to provide comments to address factual errors as well as improve the quality of the evaluation so as to ensure independency, credibility and usability. The evaluation team will incorporate inputs, obtaining from independent review of the draft report as well as a validation session, into a final evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. **The draft evaluation report** is the product that the evaluation team submits to DGP Unit/UNDP just following the data analysis and interpretation of analytical results.

- **Validation Workshop –** a validation workshop with UNDP, Implementing Partners, Development Partners and other pertinent stakeholders will be conducted for discussing and verifying the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. In the session, inputs will be solicited to fill data gaps, capture perspectives, as well as refine findings and recommendations. The Evaluation Team Leader will be responsible to lead the session, while UNDP be responsible for all logistical arrangements. **The proceedings of the validation workshop** will be the product to be delivered.

- **Final evaluation report –** the evaluation team should properly and adequately address the comments provided on the draft evaluation report at different stages to produce the final evaluation report. **The final evaluation report** that the evaluation team submits to DGPU/UNDP should meet the required quality criteria for ensuring independency, credibility and usability. It should include clear, crisp findings and recommendations that will assist UNDP in the programme formulation for a new iteration of democratic governance support.

7. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Three highly qualified and experienced evaluators will be hired to undertake the terminal evaluation. The members of the evaluation team will be one international and two nationals' evaluators. The international consultant will serve as the evaluation team leader as he/she will be able to bring an international perspective, and the two National evaluators will be seasoned national experts. . The team should include women and men of mixed cultural backgrounds and with very good knowledge of the Ethiopian's socio-cultural context and governance landscape. The members of the evaluation team should also not have been involved in the design or implementation of the subject of evaluation (GDPP) or have any other conflict of interest. Further, they will act impartially and respect the code of conduct throughout the evaluation profession.

The team competencies need to be multi-disciplinary - including members who together have an appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge including: designing evaluation, quantitative/statistical & qualitative analyses, governance & political analysis, and capacity development & gender analysis, among others. Experience with evaluating governance & political participation projects/programmes is a must. The following specific competencies are expected from the evaluation team:

- All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills, evaluation experience & familiarity with the country context.
- The Team Leader will have proven technical expertise in one of the technical areas specified above and demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations. Preference will be given to individuals with democratic governance experiences in Africa. She/he will also have expertise in designing methodology, data collection tools and undertaking systematic qualitative and quantitative analyses. She/he will also have leadership and communication skills, including a track record of excellent writing and presentation skills.
- The primary responsibilities of the Team Leader incudes: defining the evaluation approach and methodology; guiding and managing the team during the evaluation process; leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team in meetings with implementing partners, ERG, and other relevant stakeholders; drafting and revising, as required, the inception package, and evaluation report in line with comments from the evaluation focal person, PDRM Hub, DGP Unit/UNDP, and Evaluation Quality Assessment Support Service (EQAS).
- The team members will bring together a complementary combination of the technical expertise required and have a track record of written work on similar assignments.
- Team members will contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; conduct field work; participate in team meetings and meetings with Implementing Partners (IPs), Development Partners (DPs) and other stakeholders; and contribute to the analysis & drafting and revision of the evaluation products in her/his technical area(s).

11

The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its Team Leader and guidance from the Evaluation Focal Person, ERG, PDRM Hub, and DGP Unit/UNDP.

In conducting and evaluating the qualification and competencies of the candidates for this terminal review/evaluation, the applicants are supposed to present evidence (like resumes, work samples, references) that will be expected to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience.

8. EVALUATION ETHICS

This terminal evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'[1]; and the Evaluation Team is expected to be abided with those ethical considerations in the guidelines. Moreover, while conducting the evaluation, the Evaluation Team should carefully consider any harm that may result from an evaluation and take steps to reduce it. Everyone who participates in the evaluation should do so willingly (informed consent). Attention should also be made in order to keep the confidentiality and safety of the participants.

The evaluation ethical considerations and critical issues must be addressed both during the design and implementation of the evaluation. The evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers may include: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

9. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The organization and management structure for the evaluation and lines of authority of all parties involving in the evaluation process are as outlined below:

9.1 UNDP Ethiopia

The **Management of UNDP Ethiopia DGP[2] Unit** will take responsibility to:

- Assign an Evaluation Manager/Evaluation Focal Person who coordinates the evaluation, safeguards independence, provides routine support throughout the evaluation process;
- Approve the final ToR, inception and evaluation reports;
- Ensure the independence/impartiality and credibility of the evaluation at all stages;
- Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and the evaluation subject, its performance and results with the Evaluation Manager/Evaluation Focal Person and the evaluation team;
- Ensure that the team has access to all documentation and information necessary to the terminal evaluation;
- Facilitate the team's contacts with Implementing Partners and other stakeholders;
- Set-up meetings, and field visits to the evaluation team;
- Provide logistics support during the fieldwork and validation sessions;
- Organise security briefings for the evaluation team and provide any materials as required;

---

[1] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/ search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.

[2] Democratic Governance & Peacebuilding Unit UNDP Ethiopia

- Liaise between the evaluation team and UNDP;
- Organise and participate in debriefings and validation sessions;
- Oversee dissemination and follow-up processes - including the preparation of management responses to the evaluation recommendations;
- In the context of COVID-19 which impacts on face-to-face meetings etc. UNDP will provide briefing to the evaluation team particularly if field missions are needed to ensure full compliance with GoE regulations
- Avail the necessary reference documents, provide logistical support (we need to be specific on this)

9.2 Evaluation Focal Person and Partnership Development & Results Management (PDRM)

The Evaluation Focal Person and PDRMU to coordinate and lead quality assurance process of the evaluation; and will be responsible to:
- Manage the evaluation process through all phases including drafting this ToR;
- Ensure quality assurance mechanisms are operational;
- Consolidate and share comments on draft ToR, Inception Package, and Evaluation Reports with the Evaluation Team;
- Ensure the expected use of quality assurance mechanisms (checklists, quality support, etc.);

9.3 Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team will have responsibilities to:

- Carry out desk review and field data collection and also triangulation and analysis of primary & secondary data collected through desk review and field visits at both federal and regional levels;
- Draft inception report (containing the methodology and detail action-plan for the evaluation) and share it with the DGPU/UNDP for comments;
- Finalize inception report with incorporation of relevant comments from DGP Unit/UNDP, ERG, and Independent Quality Assurance Support Service;
- Conduct field visit/research/analysis (interviews, observation, triangulation, etc.);
- Ensure that all aspects of the ToR are fulfilled;
- After approval from Evaluation Manager/Evaluation Focal Person to submit/present preliminary findings to the DGP Unit/UNDP;
- Draft evaluation reports (using template for reporting, typographic styles and UN spelling) and submit draft reports to DGPU/UNDP for review and comments;
- Present the inception report, and also key findings/results, recommendations and lessons learned in various platforms including validation sessions for soliciting inputs;
- Finalize evaluation report on the basis of comments received from different levels and submit to DGPU/UNDP;

9.4 Implementing Partners and other Stakeholders

The Implementing Partners, Development Partners, and other stakeholders will avail themselves to meet with the evaluation team and provide relevant documents, data and information. They are also expected to share their experiences and perceptions about GDPP performance and ideas for possible

modifications to be considered in the design of any future iteration of democratic governance support to help achieve the purpose and objectives of this terminal evaluation.

10. TIMEFRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation is expected to take place between November 2021 and January 2022. Estimated number of days is expected to be **45 days**, spreading over a period of **two months**. The evaluation will take the following phases: preparation; inception; data collection & analysis; report writing; dissemination and follow-up. The main tasks with responsible body/ies, and tentative milestones are as detailed in the below table:

Ser No.	Activity/Deliverable	Timeline	Responsible Party
1	Inception Phase (inception meetings; designing evaluation (methodology, evaluation matrix, data collection instruments); preparation of inception report – with detail action-plan for the evaluation; and also review and endorsement of inception report/package)	One week	Evaluation Team and UNDP
2	Conducting a terminal evaluation (data collection, analysis, triangulation, and draft report preparation)	Three weeks	Evaluation Team
3	Submission of draft Evaluation Report and review of draft report and provide comments	Two weeks	Evaluation Team & UNDP
4	Validation workshop and addressing comments and producing final Draft Evaluation Report	One week	Evaluation Team and UNDP
5	Submitting final draft report which incorporates feedback provided by client/UNDP	One week	Evaluation Team
6	UNDP will ensure dissemination and follow-up (including use of evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learned in designing a new iteration of democratic governance support; this may include UNDP producing learning & knowledge products; and organizing learning events; etc.;)	Eight weeks	UNDP

The graphic illustration of the main phases/tasks and milestones of the planned terminal evaluation are as outlined in the below Gantt Chart

Phase/Task	November 2021			December 2021				January 2022				February 2022				March 2022	
	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4	Week1	Week2
Inception Phase	■	■	■														
Conducting the terminal evaluation				■	■	■	■										
Submission and review of draft report						■	■										
Validation workshop								■									
Addressing comments and submission of final report									■	■							
Review and endorsement of final report											■						
Dissemination and follow-up												■	■	■	■	■	■

11. ANNEXES

In this section additional information which provide details about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators will be annexed (such as Programme document, Intervention Results Framework & Theory of Change; ProDoc; UNDAF; GDPP APRs; revised R&R Framework (2019); 2020 MTR; PMB Board Papers – Repositioning 2018 & Options Paper 2021; and so on). In addition, evaluation matrix and evaluation reporting format are pasted below.

Evaluation Matrix:

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

Evaluation Reporting Format:

UNDP's Standard Outline for an Evaluation Report should be used for compiling an Evaluation Report. In brief the minimum contents of an evaluation report include:

1. Title and opening pages with details of the project/programme/outcome and of the

evaluation team.

2. Project and evaluation Information details: project title, Atlas number, budgets and project

dates and other key information.

3. Table of contents.

4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.

5. Executive summary: a stand-alone section of maximum four pages including the quality

standards and assurance ratings.

6. Introduction and overview. What is being evaluated and why?

7. Description of the intervention being evaluated. Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and evaluability analysis result, assess the merits of the evaluation

methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results.

8. Evaluation scope and objectives. The report should provide a clear explanation of the

evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

9. Evaluation approach and methods. The evaluation report should describe in detail the

selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis.

10. Data analysis. The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected

to answer the evaluation questions.

11. Findings and conclusions. Evaluation findings should be based on an analysis of the data

collected and conclusions should be drawn from these findings.

12. Recommendations. The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, feasible

recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or

decisions to make.

13. Lessons learned. As appropriate and as requested in the TOR, the report should include

discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation of the intervention.