Terms of Reference for the Outcome Evaluation of Achieving the MDGs and Reducing Human Poverty Programme

Introduction

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) will undertake outcome evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the Second Country Cooperation Framework (CCF II) and the 2005-2009 Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), bringing together evidences from the completed reviews and project evaluations under its four (4) thematic areas, namely, achieving the MDGs and reducing human poverty, fostering democratic governance, energy and environment for sustainable development, and crisis prevention and recovery.

The results of this outcome evaluation present an opportunity to assess the UNDP contributions as well as the gaps in the implementation of the CCF II and CPAP. The results will further inform the next round of CCA-UNDAF 2010-2014 and the formulation of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD).

Background

The Philippines faces the fundamental challenges in economic and political governance. For the past decades, it endeavors to improve its performance in basic human development and security, per capita gross national product, and achieve sustained economic growth to meet the challenges of the MDGs. Socioeconomic development is uneven and poverty is characterized by wide disparities across regions and population groups. In 2003, about one in four Philippine families and 30% of the population were deemed poor and, in 2006, the Gini coefficient of per capita income (a commonly used measure of income inequality) was slightly over 45%, among the highest in Southeast Asia. The pace of poverty reduction has been slow with 32% of the population were poor based on the 2006 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES). Given the total population of 84 million Filipinos in 2006, there were 27 million deemed poor, or one of every three Filipinos failed to meet the official poverty line.

Despite the improved economic performance for the past two (2) years and the rapid urbanization, poverty remains largely a rural phenomenon with two of every three poor persons in the country found in the rural areas and are dependent predominantly on agricultural employment and incomes.

In terms of the Human Development Index (HDI), the Philippines ranked 90th among 177 countries, according to the 2007/2008 Human Development Report (HDR). The report shows that the HDI value of the Philippines is 0.771, up from the 2006 level of 0.763, when it ranked 84. Countries belonging in the same category (medium human development) like Jordan, Suriname, Turkey, Dominican Republic, and Belize, have improved faster in the rankings. The HDI is a regular feature of the HDR and since 1990,

the HDI rankings provided a way at looking beyond GDP towards a broader definition of well-being.

The Philippines Midterm Progress Report on the MDGs shows that the Philippines has made considerable progress in poverty reduction, nutrition, gender equality, reducing child mortality, combating HIV and AIDS, malaria and other diseases and access to safe drinking water and sanitary toilet facility. However, the country needs to increase its effort to achieve a high degree of success on MDG targets concerning universal access to education, maternal mortality, and access to reproductive health services.

Given these circumstances, the Philippines is committed to achieve sustained economic growth and strongly recognizes that sustained growth is a condition for poverty reduction. The President's 10-point pro-poor agenda and the 2004-2010 Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) emphasized the need to prioritize and respond to the basic needs of the poor and vulnerable by addressing urgent concerns on poverty, economic growth, fiscal crisis, governance reforms, and the peace situation.

UNDP Priority Areas of Support

UNDP's support to the Government of the Philippines to reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs has mainly been channeled through two country programme frameworks, namely the Second Country Cooperation Framework (CCF II) and the current Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP).

- *Second Country Cooperation Framework (CCF II)*

During the implementation of the CCF II covering the period 2002 to 2004, the Country Programme used the portfolio approach, whereby projects and activities contributed to achieving outcomes identified by national institutions, validated and systematically clustered by a multi-sectoral portfolio steering committee. CCF II has successfully built on and even strengthened partnerships with national government agencies, local government units (LGUs), civil society organizations (CSOs), private sector, media, academia, international development partners and other stakeholders.

The progress and achievements made from 2002 to 2004, with UNDP assistance, in the areas of poverty, governance, environment, and peace and development, as well as in medium-term planning processes responded to key national development challenges. The extensive MDG advocacy campaign led by the UN, which UNDP actively participated in, resulted to the mainstreaming of MDGs in the national planning processes and eventually, put MDGs at the center of the country's development challenges. In the area of poverty reduction, assisting the poorest of the poor through capacity-building interventions such as microfinance, social security for the informal sector, and management of ancestral domains proved to have concrete results in terms of providing access to opportunities for improving incomes and promoting the rights of these groups.

- *Country Programme Action Plan (2005-2009)*

The consultative process leading to the preparation of the CPAP began through the Common Country Assessment-United Nations Development Assistance Framework (CCA-UNDAF) process. Through the CCA and the UNDAF, partners developed a common appreciation and understanding of the development challenges of the Philippines and the underlying root causes of the country's problems. This facilitated the preparation of the Country Programme Document (CPD) and eventually CPAP.

In line with UNDAF priorities, the country programme responds to the following goals: achieving the MDGs and reducing human poverty, including response to HIV/AIDS; fostering democratic governance; promoting energy and environment for sustainable development; and implementing crisis prevention and recovery. The Country Programme supports the empowerment of the poorest and most vulnerable by promoting and protecting their rights and creating an enabling environment to realize their full participation. Gender equality and a rights-based approach to development are cross-cutting themes. Overall, the Country Programme strategy focuses on policy reforms, institution and capacity building and area-based community development, through strategic partnerships with key stakeholders. UNDP will ensure that policies, programmes, projects and approaches are gender –responsive, rights-based, results-oriented, and participatory.

In 2006, a CPAP review was undertaken and the process serves as the opportunity to assess the progress of the implementation of the CPAP in the context of the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the six (6) drivers of development in UNDP's Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF), the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP); and the intended outcomes of the CPAP and the UNDAF.

The results of the review highlighted cross-portfolio and portfolio-specific issues and recommendations as well as key areas of convergence and integration guided by the principles of Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, six (6) drivers of development, and the UN High Level Panel Report on System Wide Coherence (i.e. Delivering as One).

In general, the review confirmed that the CPAP had achieved progress in contributing towards the country programme outcome, UNDAF outcome (CPAP-UNDAF cycles end in 2009) and the national goals as stated in the Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) 2004-2010. Outputs so far achieved are aligned to the outcomes and national goals. However, the review pointed out that to be more effective, the programme should at this stage be more focused rather than "diffused" in its activities and services. The review cited the need for the programme to focus on "niche" activities and to engage in strategic partnerships to achieve better impact in the long run. "How the programme delivers its services", specifically through lowering of transaction costs, increased efficiency, best sourcing, gender mainstreaming, human rights and convergence were also cited as areas for improvement.

The outputs from the programmes are needed to be used strategically to "situate" UNDP at higher level outcomes for policy advocacy and "niche' activities so that the "added value" and competitive advantage of UNDP could be maximized. The review cited the need for substantial improvements around the six (6) development drivers for effectiveness, national ownerships, reduced transaction costs, strategic partnerships, capacity building, and mainstreaming of gender and human rights and the need for increased accountability through clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of UNDP, NEDA and the implementing agencies (and PMOs). Given the "integrative" nature of UNDP work, the coordination role of NEDA would be very important.

In terms of the Achieving the MDGs and Reducing Human Poverty Programme, the review highlights the following portfolio-specific recommendations and policy decisions:

1. The programme must focus on pro-poor policy agenda and localization of MDGs. Human Development Reports (HDRs) will be continuously utilized as advocacy tool for policy reforms.
2. The programme must focus on promoting more advocacies on MDGs (i.e. systematic and effective use of MDG progress reports and assessments, policy study on financing the MDGs, and debt-for-MDGs study for advocacy to policymakers/legislators, to foster policy development and reforms).
3. It must also ensure effective localization of MDGs by mainstreaming MDGs into local budget, local ordinances, local targets, effective and programme delivery with strong engagement of the grassroots (area of convergence with Governance).
4. There is a need to define mutual accountabilities gearing towards full utilization of MDG report and HDRs for policy analysis and action.
5. The portfolio must also support the establishment of timely and more accurate poverty data through strengthening of concerned government agencies' capacity for data gathering, analysis and monitoring.

Objectives

The objectives of this outcome evaluation are:

1. To assess the progress that has been made towards the attainment of the outcome of the Achieving the MDGs and Reducing Human Poverty Programme (including contributing factors and constraints);
2. To assess the factors affecting the outcome in terms of its scope, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability to support the implementation of the strategies related to MDGs and poverty reduction as stated in the MTPDP;
3. To assess key UNDP contributions to the attainment of outcomes and identify key challenges, lessons learned, priority areas, and practical recommendations on potential UNDP focus for the next Country Programming Cycle; and
4. To assess UNDP partnership strategy in relation to the outcome.

Scope and Methodology

The outcome evaluation of the Achieving the MDGs and Reducing Human Poverty Programme is expected to analyze the progress towards achieving outcomes of the programme for the ongoing country programme and UNDP contribution to the attainment of the outcomes, including capacities, partnerships, and policy support. The evaluation is expected to provide documentation and analysis of the achievements against intended outcomes and linkages between activities, outputs, and outcomes.

Based on the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, outcome evaluation includes four categories of analysis:

1. Status of the outcome
2. Factors affecting the outcome
3. UNDP contributions to the outcome
4. UNDP partnership strategy

Based on these four categories, the outcome evaluation is expected to address the following issues:

Status of the outcome:

- Has the outcome been achieved or has progress been made towards its achievement?
- Was the outcome selected relevant given the country context and needs, and UNDP's niche?

Factors affecting the outcome:

- What factors (political, sociological, economic, etc.) have affected the outcome, either positively or negatively?
- How has these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?

UNDP contributions to the outcome through outputs:

- What were the key outputs produced by UNDP that contributed to the outcome (including outputs produced by "soft" and hard assistance)?
- Were the outputs produced by UNDP relevant to the outcome?
- What were the quantity, quality and timeliness of outputs? What factors impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs?
- How well did UNDP use its resources to produce target outputs?
- Were the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link outputs to outcome or is there a need to establish or improve these indicators?
- Did UNDP have an effect on the outcome directly through "soft" assistance (e.g. policy advice, dialogue, advocacy and brokerage) that may not have translated into clearly identifiable outputs or may have predated UNDP's full-fledged involvement in the outcome?

UNDP partnership strategy:

- What was the partnership strategy used by UNDP in pursuing the outcome and was it effective?
- Were partners, stakehokders, and/or beneficiaries of UNDP assistance involved in the design of UNDP interventions in the outcome area? If yes, what were the nature and extent of their participation? If no, why not?

Evaluation Process

An overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results and the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators.

During the outcome evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

1. Desk review of relevant documents (project documents, review reports –midterm and final, project evaluations);
2. Discussions with UNDP CO, particularly UNDP Senior Management Team and Programme Staff;
3. Interviews with key partners and stakeholders;
4. Field visits to selected project sites (if required);
5. Consultation meetings.

Evaluation Team

An Evaluation Team will be formed to undertake the outcome evaluation of the Achieving the MDGs and Reducing Human Poverty Programme. The Evaluation Team will comprise of three consultants: one (1) Team Leader, one (1) Team Specialist, and one (1) Team Assistant.

A. Team Leader

The **Team Leader** will take the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the evaluation reports to the UNDP Country Office. Specifically, the Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

1. Lead and manage the outcome evaluation;
2. Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
3. Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;

4. Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs, and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
5. Draft related parts of the evaluation reports; and
6. Finalize the outcome evaluation report.

Required skills and experience:

The Team Leader must have a demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice and in the evaluation of complex programmes in the field, particularly MDGs and poverty reduction programmes. He/she must have an advanced university degree and at least eight years of work experience in designing and evaluating projects. He/she must have sound knowledge of the UNDP outcome/project evaluation methodologies and UNDP's results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation). He/she must have strong analytical skills, excellent communications and writing skills, and excellent coordination and team working skills. He/she must be computer literate.

B. Team Specialist

The **Team Specialist** will provide the expertise in the core subject area of evaluation, and be responsible for drafting key parts of the report. The Team Specialist is expected to perform the following tasks:

1. Review relevant documents;
2. Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
3. Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs, and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
4. Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
5. Assist the Team Leader in finalizing documents through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

Required skills and experience:

He/she must have advanced university degrees and at least five years work experience in the areas of MDGs and poverty reduction. He/she should have sound knowledge and understanding of poverty situation and poverty reduction initiatives in the Philippines, and have extensive experience in conducting evaluation, particularly for UN or other international development agencies. He/she must have sound knowledge of the UNDP outcome/project evaluation methodologies and UNDP's results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation). He/she must have strong analytical skills, excellent communications and writing skills, and excellent coordination and team working skills. He/she must be computer literate.

C. Team Assistant

The **Team Assistant** will undertake data collection and analyses at the country-level, as well as provide administrative support to the work of the Team Leader and Team Specialist.

Required skills and experience:

He/she must have a university degree, Masters Degree an advantage, and with 2-3 years of experience in dealing with evaluation work. Knowledge of UNDP systems and evaluation methodologies is an asset. He/she must have excellent communication and writing skills as well as excellent coordination and team working skills. He/she must be computer literate.

Expected Output from the Evaluation

The expected output from this outcome evaluation is a comprehensive outcome evaluation report for the Achieving the MDGs and Reducing Human Poverty Programme. The outcome evaluation report should include the following contents based on the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- The Development Context
- Findings and Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned
- Annexes
- References

Management Arrangements

To facilitate the outcome evaluation process, UNDP Philippine Country Office (CO) will support the Evaluation Team in organizing dialogue and meetings with stakeholders, including key partners, UNDP Senior Management and Programme Staff. The CO will provide substantive and logistical support to the evaluation team, and make available to the team all relevant information regarding UNDP's activities in the country. The CO will ensure participatory evaluation process and comment on the draft outcome evaluation report.

Specific responsibilities of the entities involved are:

- *Country Office –* provide logistical support; facilitate meetings and interactions with relevant stakeholders; comment on the draft report; and follow-up on recommendations.

- *Evaluation Team –* ensure participatory evaluation process; facilitate the evaluation to develop work plan, detailed methodology, and scope of the evaluation; finalize the evaluation report and submit to UNDP.

- *Government counterpart and other partners/key stakeholders –* participate in meetings and presentation of findings; provide needed information and documents related to the outcome evaluation; and comment on the draft report.

Timeline for Evaluation

The Evaluation Team is expected to work on the outcome evaluation following the schedule below:

Activity	Timeframe	Responsible Party
Development of an inception report, including the outcome evaluation design, detailed methodology, scope, and work plan	May 1-2, 2008	Evaluation Team
Debriefing with UNDP CO on the inception report, and agreement on the outcome evaluation design, detailed methodology, scope, and work plan as well as finalization of the inception report and design (incorporating UNDP CO comments)	Within the week of May 5-9, 2008	Evaluation Team, UNDP CO
Desk review of existing relevant documents	May 10-16, 2008	Evaluation Team
Field visits and interviews with partners and key stakeholders	May 17-June 5, 2008	Evaluation Team
Drafting of the outcome evaluation report	June 6-13, 2008	Evaluation Team
Debriefing with UNDP CO and with partners for the firs draft of the report	June 14-20, 2008	Evaluation Team, UNDP, and partners
Finalization of the outcome evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)	June 21-27, 2008	Evaluation Team
Submission of the final outcome evaluation report	June 30, 2008	Evaluation Team

Selected Documents to be Studied by the Evaluation Team

The evaluation team should study and made reference to the following documents during the conduct of the outcome evaluation:

1. UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
2. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
3. UNDP Results-Based Management
4. United Nations Common Country Assessment (CCA) for the Philippines
5. United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the Philippines (2005-2009)
6. UNDP Second Country Cooperation Framework (CCF II) for the Philippines
7. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (2005-2009)
8. UNDP Strategic Results Framework
9. UNDP Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF) (2004-2007)
10. UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) for the Philippines (2001-2004)
11. UNDP Philippines Results Reporting documents (2005-2007)
12. UNDP project documents, project monitoring reports, project evaluation reports, and terminal reports
13. UNDP National Human Development Reports for the Philippines
14. Philippine MDG Progress Reports (2003, 2005, Mid-Term, sub-national)
15. Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (2004-2010) and other key national policies, strategies, and plans related to the outcome
16. Other documents and materials related to the outcome (e.g. government and donors)