



## DEMOCRACY STRENGTHENING IN ZAMBIA (DSZ) PROJECT 2020-2022

### TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

**For the procurement of a team of ICs (International Consultant and a counterpart National Consultant) to conduct the Midterm Evaluation**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Project Title:</b>            | <b>DEMOCRACY STRENGTHENING IN ZAMBIA (DSZ) PROJECT 2020-2022</b>                |
| <b>Scope of Advertisement:</b>   | Open International  |
| <b>Type of Contract:</b>         | Individual Consultant   |
| <b>Post Type:</b>                | International Consultant – on site<br>National Consultant                       |
| <b>Duty Station:</b>             | <b>Lusaka, Zambia</b>   |
| <b>Expected Areas of Travel:</b> | A representative sample of the 116 project districts in 10 provinces of Zambia. |
| <b>Languages:</b>                | English   |
| <b>Duration of Contract:</b>     | 45 working days   |
| <b>Start Date</b>                | 20 November 2021  |

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Democracy Strengthening in Zambia is a 3-year Project being implemented by the United Nations Development Programme with financial support of the European Union, France, Germany, Ireland, Sweden, United Kingdom and USAID. The project is being implemented in partnership and collaboration with government of Zambia and civil society. Government implementing partners include the Electoral Commission of Zambia, Zambia Police Service, Human Rights Commission, Judiciary and Ministry of Justice. As regards Civil Society, the project has awarded grants to 18 civil society organizations to conduct voter and civic education to citizens across the 10 provinces of Zambia.



The project is into its second year of implementation and as outline in the project workplan is required to undertake a midterm evaluation to assess its performance and progress towards attainment of its goal and objectives. In this regard these ToRs have been prepared to facilitate the procurement of a consultant/s to conduct the midterm evaluation of the Democracy Strengthening in Zambia Project.

## **2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION**

Based on the recommendations of the Needs Assessment Mission (NAM) conducted by the United Nations in 2018 including the need for increased voter education, overall institutional strengthening for the Electoral Commission of Zambia (ECZ) and other national institutions with an electoral mandate, and promoting peace ahead of the 2021 elections, UNDP established the Democracy Strengthening in Zambia (DSZ) Project. The latter is a three-year multi-donor project which is aligned and supportive of Zambia's Sustainable Development Partnership Framework, UNDP Strategic Plan and Country Programme and the 7th National Development Plan 2017-2021 (7th NDP). The Government of Zambia, through the 7NDP pledges to "promote transparency, accountability, citizen participation as well as strengthen governance institutions".

The DSZ project consists of two interlinked result areas:

1. Electoral institutions and processes strengthened; and
2. Programming for peace in support of the Zambia 2021 electoral cycle.

These two result areas are expected to achieve the following results:

- i. Inclusive and participatory decision-making,
- ii. Responsive and accountable institutions,
- iii. Improved access to information,
- iv. Enhanced technical and organizational capacities of national electoral stakeholders,
- v. Integrity in the work of credible and legitimate institutions, and
- vi. Improved conflict prevention and mitigation mechanisms.

In line with the recommendations resulting from past evaluations of electoral assistance by UNDP and the 2018 NAM, the DSZ project aims, inter alia, at providing support to long-term and sustainable institutional strengthening of the Electoral Commission of Zambia (ECZ) and other beneficiaries<sup>1</sup> before, during and after the 2021 general election.

The project has since inception in 2020 supported the Electoral Commission of Zambia and other government agencies and departments with the electoral mandate, with technical and

---

<sup>1</sup> These include: Judiciary, Ministries of Home Affairs and Justice, Zambian Police Service, Human Rights Commission, political parties, the media, civil society organization, faith-based organizations.



financial support to enhance their effectiveness in delivering their constitutional obligations in delivering and facilitating democratic governance and a more inclusive society. Specifically, the project has provided ECZ with financial resources to undertake pre and post August 2021 General elections activities. Additionally, among other government institutions with the electoral mandate, the project in the run up to the 2021 General elections has supported Zambia Police Service with technical and financial support to ensure peaceful and violence free elections.

Furthermore, the project in the period under review as part of its implementation strategy, engaged and collaborated with civil society organizations to enhance the democratic culture and governance in Zambia. The project provided 18 civil society organizations with financial grants to undertake voter and civic education to targeted segments of Zambia's population namely; Women, Youth, People with disabilities, People in Lawful Custody, and voters in hard-to-reach areas. The project also provided financial and technical support to media organizations in training on safety of journalists and responsible journalism.

The project in collaboration with the JTF spearheaded the development and operationalization two of flagship digital tools namely; EWERS and iverify Zambia, designed to mitigate electoral violence and prevent disinformation/misinformation respectively. Therefore, the midterm evaluation is instituted to give an opportunity to the UNDP management, government, implementation partners and donors to take stock of the work done in the first half of the project implementation period with a view to identify opportunities to enhance its performance and outcomes in the second half of implementation.

### **3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE MIDTERM EVALUATION**

The Midterm Evaluation (ME) will assess implementation of the project progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and Country Program Document, and assess early signs of project success, or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The ME will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The ME will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the UNDP evaluation policy ([DP/ 2019/29](#)) and the established criteria of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines issued by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Project ME is designed to assess the performance of a project in achieving its intended results and contribution to outcomes and associated theories of change. The ME is expected to yield useful information on project implementation arrangements and the achievement of outputs and draw linkages between a project's outputs and its contribution to CPD outcomes. The primary purpose of a ME is therefore to make improvements; to continue or scale up an initiative; to assess sustainability and replicability in other settings; to demonstrate accountability for results; or to consider alternatives. Additional evaluation criteria can be assessed, as applicable. Specifically, the ME must assess the following:



- **Implementation Strategy** – Seek to assess the project priorities and results contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), are consistent with the UNDP Strategic Plan and are aligned with United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (‘Cooperation Framework’). Programmes and projects are based on clear analysis backed by evidence and theories of change. The latter justify why the defined approach is most appropriate and will most likely achieve, or contribute to, desired development results along with partner contributions. The role of UNDP vis-à-vis partners is deliberately considered. New opportunities and changes in the development context are regularly reassessed, with any relevant adjustments made as appropriate.
- **Implementation and adaptive management** – seek to identify challenges and propose additional measures to support more efficient and effective implementation. The following aspects of project implementation and adaptive management will be assessed: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.
- **Risks to sustainability** – seeks to assess the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The assessment of sustainability at the ME stage considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The ME should validate the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Reports, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date.
- **Relevance-** Assess the Programming objectives and results to check consistency with national needs and priorities, as well as with feedback obtained through engaging excluded and/or marginalized groups as relevant. Programming strategies consider interconnections between development challenges and results. A gender analysis is integrated to fully consider the different needs, roles, and access to/control over resources of women and men; appropriate measures are taken to address these when relevant. Programmes and projects regularly capture, and review knowledge and lessons learned to inform design, adapt, and change plans and actions as appropriate, and plan for scaling up
- **Effectiveness** – Seek to assess that Project design and implementation are informed by relevant knowledge, evaluation and lessons learned to develop strategy and inform course corrections. Targeted groups are systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded. Results consistently respond to gender analysis and are accurately rated by the gender marker. Managers use monitoring data for making decisions that maximize achievement of desired results. South-South and triangular cooperation are used, when relevant, and captured in the results framework. Required implementing partner assessments have been conducted, and the implementation modality is consistent with the results.



- **Efficiency** – Seek to assess project budgets are justifiable and valid, and project design and implementation includes measures to ensure efficient use of resources. The size and scope of project are consistent with resources available and resource mobilization efforts. Plans include consideration of scaling up and links with other relevant initiatives to achieve greater impact. Procurement planning is done early and regularly reviewed. Monitoring and management include analysis of and actions to improve efficiency in delivering desired outputs with the required quality and timeliness, such as country office support to national implementation modalities. Costs are fully recovered.
- **Gender equity** - ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts or benefits of project are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioural changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to democracy and governance change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making. All project activities apply the core principles of Leave No One Behind, Human Rights, Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, Sustainability and Resilience and Accountability. Social and environmental sustainability are systematically integrated. Potential harm to people and the environment is avoided wherever possible, and otherwise minimized, mitigated, and managed.
- **Country ownership of projects and programmes** - examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the UNDP and donor’s investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes.
- **Innovativeness in results areas** - focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and the extent to which the project interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards enhancing the democratic culture and governance systems in Zambia.
- **Replication and scalability** – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other in the context.
- **Unexpected results, both positive and negative** - identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (UNDP, Donors, governments, stakeholders, civil society, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.

#### 4.0 MIDTERM EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The ME team, consisting of an International Consultant and a counterpart National Consultant, must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The latter to provide the local content while the former will be the Lead Consultant to ensure the deliverables are realized.

##### **Responsibilities of the International consultant**



The International Consultant (IC) will be the Team Leader and assume a leading role in the evaluation process and coordinate the work of all other team members. The specific roles and responsibilities include:

- Ensure the quality of the evaluation process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products.
- Lead the conceptualization and design of the ME and produce the inception report.
- Review documents and define the ME scope, methodology and work plan.
- Conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner and communicate with the Evaluation team on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered.
- Oversee the data collection and analysis, producing the draft & final evaluation reports and support the stakeholder workshop.

The National Consultant will be expected to collaborate with the International Consultant (Team Leader), and to be responsible for the overall assistance to the Team Leader including collection and analysis of all relevant data from field and preparation of all consultations and meetings with selected different stakeholders. The National Consultant will contribute fundamentally to the work of the Team Leader, providing practical advice and context in the drafting and finalizing the inception and final ME reports.

#### **Responsibilities of the national consultant**

The National Consultant will be responsible for performing the following tasks under the guidance of the International Consultant:

- Review documents and provide substantive support to defining the ME scope, methodology and work plan.
- Contribute to the production of the inception report and finalization of the ME design and methodology.
- Data collection as per the approved inception report and allocation of responsibilities as agreed with the team leader.
- Data analysis and drafting parts of the ME report as agreed on the with the International Consultant.
- Assist the International Consultant in finalizing the inception and ME report and PowerPoint presentation for stakeholder workshop.

The two consultants shall be engaged jointly to commence the ME working as per planned schedule to be accomplished by **30<sup>th</sup> December 2021**.

The ME team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents,





stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The ME is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>2</sup> ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, government counterparts, Civil Society Organisations the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders including responsible parties and beneficiaries.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful ME. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Within the COVID restrictions, the ME team is expected to conduct field missions to the representative sample of project implementation districts in the country where the ME team should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification, to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection (government data/records, field observation visits, co-financing expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to; assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred). It is important to interact and interrogate the beneficiaries and districts including verification of palpable achievements of the project.

The specific design and methodology for the ME should emerge from consultations between the ME team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the ME purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time, data and COVID restrictions. The ME team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the ME report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the ME must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders, and the ME team.

The final ME report should describe the full ME approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the ME team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others:

---

<sup>2</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.



language barriers, inaccessible project sites, limitations due to COVID-19 pandemic, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the ME report.

## **5.0 DETAILED SCOPE OF THE ME**

The ME team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the ME team to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the UNDP and partners investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to the project investment.

### **5.1 Project Strategy**

#### **5.1.1 Project design:**

- i) Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- ii) Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- iii) Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- iv) Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, considered during project design processes?
- v) Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- vi) If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

#### **5.1.2 Results Framework/Log frame:**

- i) Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.





- ii) Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- iii) Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e., income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- iv) Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.
- v) Ensure that the indicators (gender-disaggregated) are SMART, aligned with UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation handbook and guidelines.

## 5.2 Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- i) Was the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed and reviewed during project initiation?
- ii) Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- iii) How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project??
- iv) Verify the impact that the project has achieved. Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- v) Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate, and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- vi) Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- vii) What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- viii) To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- ix) How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- x) How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- xi) To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- xii) Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- xiii) To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- xiv) Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project applies adaptive management?
- xv) What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?



### 5.3 Progress Towards Results

#### 5.3.1 Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

- i) By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- ii) Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

| Project Strategy            | Indicator <sup>3</sup> | Baseline Level <sup>4</sup> | Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> APR (self-reported) | Midterm Target <sup>5</sup> | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>6</sup> | Achievement Rating <sup>7</sup> | Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Fund Level Impact 1:</b> | Indicator 1:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
|                             | Indicator 2:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
| <b>Fund Level Impact 2:</b> | Indicator 1:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
|                             | Indicator 2:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
| <b>Outcome</b>              | Indicator 1:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
|                             | Indicator 2:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
| <b>Output 1:</b>            | Indicator 1:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
|                             | Indicator 2:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
| <b>Output 2:</b>            | Indicator 1:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
|                             | Indicator 2:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
| <b>Output 3:</b>            | Indicator 1:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
|                             | Indicator 2:           |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |
| <b>Etc.</b>                 |                        |                             |  |                             |                       |   |                                 |  |

#### Indicator Assessment Key

|                 |                                  |                                   |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards

<sup>4</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>5</sup> If available

<sup>6</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>7</sup> Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU



### **5.3.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective**

- i) Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

## **5.4 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

### **5.4.1 Management Arrangements:**

- i) Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Funding proposal and project document. Have changes been made and have these been approved by the project board and donors? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- ii) Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- iii) Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

### **5.4.2 Work Planning:**

- i) Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- ii) Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- iii) Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

### **5.4.3 Financing**

- i) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- ii) Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective, and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- iii) Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- iv) Discuss whether donor finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the financing agreements have been fulfilled, as applicable.
- v) If finance is not materialising as planned, discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.
- vi) Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

### **5.4.5 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:**

- i) Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they



efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- ii) Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, 7NDP and other national reporting systems?
- iii) Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

#### 5.4.6 Stakeholder Engagement:

- i) Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- ii) Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- iii) Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- iv) Is a grievance mechanism in place? If so, assess its effectiveness

#### 5.4.7 Reporting:

- i) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- ii) Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and reporting requirements (i.e., how have they addressed poorly rated APRs, if applicable?)
- iii) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners, and internalized by partners.

#### 5.4.8 Communications:

- i) Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- ii) Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- iii) For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as SDGs.

### 5.5 Sustainability

Validate whether the risks identified in the Funding proposal, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are



appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

#### 5.5.1 Financial risks to sustainability:

What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the project/donor support assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

#### 5.5.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

#### 5.5.3 Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

#### 5.5.4 Environmental risks to sustainability:

Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

### **5.6 Country Ownership**

- i) To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- ii) How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- iii) To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- iv) Is the project, as implemented, responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, or other goals?
- v) Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?



## 5.7 Gender equity

- i) Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- ii) Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- iii) Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- iv) Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- v) How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- vi) Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- vii) To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- viii) Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?
- ix) How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

## 5.8 Innovativeness in results areas

What are the lessons learned to enrich learning and knowledge generation in terms of how the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional finance" for democratic governance in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

## 5.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- i) What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within and external.
- ii) Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- iii) What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
- iv) Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change?<sup>8</sup>

## 5.10 Replication and Scalability

- i) What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- ii) Assess the effectiveness of exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints? Is there a need for recalibration?
- iii) What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?

---

<sup>8</sup> See Section '9.4 Major Changes and Restructuring' in the [GCF Programming Manual](#)





- iv) Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- v) What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

### 5.11 Conclusions & Recommendations

The ME team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary.

The ME team should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

### 5.12 Ratings

The ME team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an Midterm *Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Midterm Evaluation report. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. ME Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *Democracy Strengthening in Zambia Project 2020-2022***

| Measure                         | ME Rating <sup>9</sup>                           | Achievement Description |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Project Strategy</b>         | N/A  |                         |
| <b>Progress Towards Results</b> | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |                         |
|                                 | Result 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)  |                         |

<sup>9</sup> Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings; 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings; 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings; 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings; 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings; 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings, Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

Ratings for Sustainability: 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability; 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability; 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability; Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability



|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | Result 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
|   | Result 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
|   | Etc.  |  |
| <b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b> | (rate 6 pt. scale)                              |  |
| <b>Sustainability</b>                                   | (rate 4 pt. scale)                              |  |

## 6.0 TIMEFRAME (DURATION OF WORK)

The total duration of the ME will be 45 working days over a period of 8 weeks. A National Consultant will complement the Lead/International Consultant for a period of 45 working days over the same period. The tentative ME timeframe is as follows:

| ACTIVITY  | NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS | TIME PERIOD                       |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>I. Desk Review and Inception Report</b>  |                        |                                   |
| <b>Document review and preparation of ME Inception Report + Submission of ME Inception Report</b> | 5 days                 | 20-25 <sup>th</sup> November 2021 |
| <b>Comments, discussion (if needed) and approval of ME Inception Report</b>                       | 2 days                 |                                   |
| <b>II. Physical Mission and Data Collection</b>   |                        |                                   |
| <b>ME physical mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews</b>                                      | 10 days                |                                   |
| <b>Presentation of initial findings- last day of the ME physical mission</b>                      | 1 day                  |                                   |
| <b>III. Report Writing</b>  |                        |                                   |
| <b>Preparation + Submission of draft ME report #1</b>   | 7 days                 |                                   |
| <b>Circulation of draft ME report #1 for comments by Commissioning Unit</b>                       | 5 days                 |                                   |
| <b>Consolidation of comments by Commissioning Unit into audit trail</b>                           | 3 days                 |                                   |



|  |        |  |
|--|--------|--|
| <b>Incorporation of comments on draft ME report by IC + Submission of final ME report + completed Audit Trail by IC</b><br><br>(report length should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes) | 7 days |  |
| <b>Stakeholder Validation Workshop (can be virtual/ in person depending on the prevailing covid situation). This will also aid Management response.</b>                                      | 1 day  |  |
| <b>Submission of Final Report incorporating Stakeholders comments</b>  | 5 days |  |

## 7.0 ME DELIVERABLES

| # | Deliverable                   | Description   | Timing                         | Responsibilities  |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|
| 1 | <b>ME Inception Report</b>    | Proposed evaluation methodology, sample size, and data collection tools and strategies, work plan and structure of the IE report, and options for site visits   | 20 <sup>th</sup> November 2021 | IC submits to Commissioning Unit and project management   |
| 2 | <b>Presentation</b>           | A power point presentation of Initial Findings and limitations of the IE, highlighting successes, challenges, and value of interventions to facilitate feedback for main report writing and help identify recommendations | November 2021                  | IC presents to Project Management, project stakeholders and Commissioning Unit                                    |
| 3 | <b>Draft IE Report #1</b>     | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes  | December 2021                  | IC sends 1 <sup>st</sup> draft to Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point |
| 4 | <b>Draft ME Report #2</b>     | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report  | December 2021                  | IC sends 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft report to Commissioning Unit   |
| 5 | <b>Concluding Stakeholder</b> | Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key   | December 2021                  | Led by IC with support of Project Team and Commissioning Unit   |



|  |                            |  |               |   |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|---|
|  | <b>validation Workshop</b> | actions in response to the report. Stake holders include UNDP, Donors, ECZ, ZPS, Civil society, etc. |               |   |
|  | Final ME Report*           | incorporating Stakeholders feedback from the validation workshop                                     | December 2021 | IC sends Final report to Commissioning Unit |

\*The final ME report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders. The international and national consultants will be jointly responsible for entire evaluation processes and submission of the above-mentioned deliverables.

## 8.0 ME ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this ME resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s ME is the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Zambia. During this assignment, the ME team will report to the Monitoring and Evaluation Focal Point in Commissioning Unit who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the ME team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the ME team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 9.0 TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the ME - one Team Leader (International with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National team expert, from the country of the project with expertise in the relevant area. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

## 10.0 EVALUATOR ETHICS

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct (see ToR Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). The evaluation team 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 evaluation team 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 without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## 11.0 PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

| # | Deliverable                                       | Description   | % payment |
|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | <b>ME Inception Report</b>                        | Proposed evaluation methodology, sample size, and data collection tools and strategies, work plan and structure of the IE report, and options for site visits   | 20%       |
| 2 | <b>Presentation</b>                               | A power point presentation of Initial Findings and limitations of the IE, highlighting successes, challenges, and value of interventions to facilitate feedback for main report writing and help identify recommendations | 10%       |
| 3 | <b>Draft IE Report #1</b>                         | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes  | 20%       |
| 4 | <b>Draft ME Report #2</b>                         | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report  | 10%       |
| 5 | <b>Concluding Stakeholder validation Workshop</b> | Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key actions in response to the report. Stake holders include UNDP, Donors, ECZ, ZPS, Civil society, etc.                    | 10%       |



|  |                  |  |     |
|--|------------------|--|-----|
|  | Final ME Report* | incorporating Stakeholders feedback from the validation workshop | 30% |
|--|------------------|--|-----|

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30 %<sup>10</sup>:

- i) The final ME report includes all requirements outlined in the ME TOR and is in accordance with the ME guidance.
- ii) The final ME report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e., text has not been cut & pasted from other ME reports).
- iii) The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
- iv) RTA & M&E Focal point approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)

## 12.0 APPLICATION PROCESS

Please submit the following documents:

1. **a Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP.
2. **a Personal CV or P11**, indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and three (3) professional references.
3. **a Brief description** (max. ½ page) of why you consider your team as the most suitable for the assignment, and a **methodology** (max. 1 page) for how your team will approach and complete the assignment.
4. **a Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price in USD, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided in the letter of confirmation of interest, annex 2.

For the International Consultant:

- Flight ticket: reimbursement upon arrival in Zambia on the basis of the prevailing price for an economy class ticket on the most direct routes. In case the Individual contractor wishes to upgrade his travel to business or first class, he shall do so at his own expense.

<sup>10</sup> The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the IE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the IE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

[https://popp.undp.org/ layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP\\_POPP\\_DOCUMENT\\_LIBRARY/Public/PSU\\_Individual%20Contract\\_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default](https://popp.undp.org/ layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default)





- Covid test and other travel requirements: reimbursement upon arrival in Zambia.
- The Contractor is responsible for arranging and meeting the cost of their vaccinations and medical/life insurance, and insurance certificate to be provided to UNDP before travelling to the countryside.

For both consultants:

- \*if the number of all field visits are not known in advance: All trips outside the duty station and required by the Terms of Reference will be covered by UNDP and the IC will receive a per diem which shall not exceed the corresponding United Nations daily subsistence allowance rate. Hence these field visits trip should not appear in the financial proposal.

**For both consultants:**

If unforeseen trips outside the duty station not required by the Terms of Reference are requested by UNDP, and after written agreement, these trips will be covered by UNDP and the IC will receive a per diem which shall not exceed the corresponding United Nations daily subsistence allowance rate.

**Notes :**

1. The information in the breakdown of the offered professional fee provided by the Offeror will be used as the basis for determining best value for money, and as reference for any amendments of the contract.
2. The professional fee will be paid on successful completion of the assignment's deliverables.
3. The agreed contract amount will remain fixed regardless of any factors causing an increase in the cost of any of the components in the breakdown that are not directly attributable to UNDP.

**13.0 QUALIFICATIONS**

Both the International and National Consultant must meet the prescribed qualification outlined herein. The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Academic Qualifications:



Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in Political Science, Public Administration, Governance and Human Rights/Law, Development Studies, or any other closely related field.

Experience:

- i) Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in Democracy and Governance, Human Rights.
- ii) Minimum of 5 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on democracy and governance, human rights, and elections institutional strengthening.
- iii) Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.
- iv) Familiarity and Good understanding of Zambia's electoral and political system, and the role of the various actors in the administration of elections.
- v) Extensive knowledge of the political and governance systems in in the region and Zambia in particular.
- vi) Excellent writing skills in English, especially in the preparation of official assessments and reports.
- vii) Experience of conducting Project evaluations within the United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Competencies:

- i) Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies:
- ii) Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- iii) Competence in adaptive management, as applied to political and governance focal areas,
- iv) Experience of conducting similar assessments on elections or political related issues in Zambia or the region, ideally involving the electoral management body, legislature, judiciary and/or political parties.
- v) Experience working with elections systems in the Zambia and the Africa region Zambia;
- vi) Demonstrated understanding of issues related to elections management, democracy and governance, Human rights research, evaluation, and analysis.
- vii) Excellent communication skills;
- viii) Demonstrable analytical skills;
- ix) Good understanding of gender and social inclusion issues.

Language and other skills:

Proficiency in both spoken and written English

Compliance of the UN Core Values:

- i) Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards,



- ii) Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
- iii) Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability,
- iv) Treats all people fairly without favoritism,
- v) Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

## 14.0 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL

Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical proposal will be weighted at 70% and the financial proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. Only those applications which are technically qualified (obtained a minimum of 70% of notation after technical evaluation) will be considered for financial evaluation. The application receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

### Selection Criteria

| Criteria   | Criteria Description  | Score  |
|--|---|--|
| <i>Minimum criteria to be eligible for the consultancy</i> |   | <b>70</b>  |
| 1. Academic and Professional Qualifications:               |   |  |
| <b>Relevance of Education/<br/>Degree</b>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in Political Science, Public Administration, Governance and Human Rights/Law, Development Studies, or any other closely related field.</li> </ul>   | 5 points for International and 5 points for national?  |
| <b>Years of Relevant Experience</b>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in Democracy and Governance, Human Rights.</li> <li>• Minimum of 5 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on democracy and governance, human rights, and elections institutional strengthening.</li> <li>• Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.</li> </ul>   | 10 points for international and 5 points for national  |
| <b>Language</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong written communication skills, including full command of written English is required. Please provide with evidence of written publications and similar written assignments.</li> </ul>   | 5 points for international and 5 points for national   |
| <b>Adequacy of Competencies for the Assignment</b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience of conducting similar assessments on elections or political related issues in Zambia or the region, ideally involving the electoral management body, legislature, judiciary and/or political parties</li> <li>• Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies:</li> <li>• Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;</li> <li>• Experience working with elections systems in the Zambia and the Africa region Zambia;</li> </ul> | 10 points for international and 10 points for national |



| Criteria   | Criteria Description   | Score  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to elections management, democracy and governance, Human rights research, evaluation, and analysis.</li> <li>• Good understanding of gender and social inclusion issues</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>2. Brief Description of Approach to Assignment</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Proposed methodology, approach, and workplan (relevance, logic, rigor, practicality, creativity, realism of work plan etc).</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity and relevance of the proposed methodology, to the local context and to achieve the deliverables of the ToR.</li> <li>• Realistic and complete work plan which reflects clear and comprehensive understanding of the scope of work in the ToR.</li> <li>• Clarity about how gender considerations will be factored into the evaluation.</li> <li>• Clarity on the quality assurance process that will be in place for this assignment</li> </ul> | 15 points for the team as they will be expected to submit one methodology. |
| <b>Total</b>   |  | <b>70</b>  |

### Financial Criteria (total score: 30 points)

Applicants who score at least 49 points in the technical evaluation will be eligible for the assessment of their financial evaluation. Please note that financial evaluation will account for 30% of the weighed score as indicated in the table below.

All technically qualified proposals will be scored based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30 points) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals receive points according to the following formula:

$$p = y (\mu/z)$$

where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
- $\mu$  = price of the lowest priced proposal

z = price of the proposal being evaluated.

### Recommended presentation of technical and financial proposals

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the IC Standard Bid Document (SBD). The financial proposals should be ALL inclusive.



## 15.0 CONFIDENTIALITY

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

## 16.0 ANNEX A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

1. Funding Proposal
2. Donor Funding Agreements
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Risk log
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
7. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit report
9. Mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals, and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e., Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
15. Project site location maps

## ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report<sup>11</sup>

Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)

- Title of UNDP-DSZ project
- UNDP PIMS# project ID#
- ME time frame and date of report
- Region and countries included in the project
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- ME team members

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

<sup>11</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).



## Project Information Table

### Executive Summary (2-3 pages)

- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary
- ME Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendations Summary Table

### Introduction (2-3 pages)

- Purpose of the ME and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the ME, ME approach and data collection methods, limitations
- Structure of the ME report

### Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)

- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

### Findings (12-14 pages)

#### 4.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design
- Results Framework/Log frame

#### 4.2 Relevance

#### 4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency

#### 4.4 Progress Towards Results

- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

#### 4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Financing
- Coherence in delivery with CPD and SNDP
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications





#### 4.6 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

#### 4.7 Country Ownership

#### 4.8 Innovativeness in results areas

#### 4.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative

#### 4.10 Replication and Scalability

#### 4.11 Gender Equity

### Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)

#### Conclusions

- 5.1**
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the ME's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses, and results of the project

#### Recommendations

- 5.2**
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

#### Annexes

- ME ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- ME evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed ME final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft ME report



**ANNEX C: ME EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)**

| Evaluative Questions  | Indicators   | Sources   | Methodology              |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| <p>Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</p>  |  |   |                          |
| <p>Do the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level?<br/>To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?</p>             | <p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives.<br/><br/>Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities<br/><br/>Addressing gaps in capacity framework.</p> | <p>National policies, Project Document</p>                            | <p>Document analysis</p> |
| <p>How relevant the project's intended outcomes?<br/>How relevant is the involvement of different partners in the Project implementation given the institutional and policy framework for governance and democracy sectors in Zambia?</p> | <p>Degree to which the project supports national governance and democracy development objectives</p>   | <p>Project documents</p>  | <p>Document analysis</p> |
| <p>Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?</p>  | <p>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies, and strategies</p>   | <p>Government of the Republic of Zambia, UNDP, Project Management</p> | <p>Interviews</p>        |



|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Are counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?</p> <p>Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust?</p> <p>And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Zambia?</p> <p>To what extent is the project in line with UNDP operational programs</p> | <p>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <p>Coherence UNDP operational programming</p> | <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>UNDP Programming statements</p> | <p>Interviews</p> <p>Document analysis</p>                    |
| <p>Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</p>   |  |  |   |
| <p>What expected outputs have been achieved thus far?</p>   | <p>Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators</p>   | <p>APRs interviews</p>   | <p>Document analyses</p> <p>Site Visits</p> <p>Interviews</p> |
| <p>To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</p> <p>What have the products, such as studies, policy recommendations, dissemination campaigns, etc., affected [keeping in mind that this is a midterm review and several if not many products are still in the implementation or planning process]</p>   |  |  |   |



|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in the field of governance and democracy in the project partner institutions and districts?</p> <p>How is the Project addressing the polarization among the various political actors?</p> <p>How is the Project contributing to avoiding fragmentation across policies and cross-cutting mandates?</p> <p>What other partners can be involved in the Project in a meaningful way to streamline the issue and bypass or address the institutional and policy fragmentation in the governance and democracy sector?</p> |  | <p>Project outcomes</p> <p>Norms, policies debated, adopted</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Stakeholders' interviews</p> |
| <p>How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies of governance and democracy issues in the project districts?</p> <p>How has the project incorporated gender issues as the relate to governance and democracy in the project districts?</p>  | <p>Involvement of (direct and indirect) beneficiaries in project development and implementation</p> <p>Incorporation of gender dimension</p> <p>Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.).</p> | <p>Project outputs and outcomes</p>                             | <p>Interviews</p> <p>Site visits</p>                     |



|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | Effect of project aspects implemented at sites   |  |  |
| What is causing delays in implementation and delivery of outputs of the Project?  | Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of Interim and actual achievements                          | Findings in project documents, achievement indicators                                      | Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially)<br>Site visits observation |
| In what outputs? Where are the implementation 'bottlenecks'? How can these issues be solved? What changes need to be implemented? |  |  | Stakeholder interviews   |
| Partnerships for implementation   | Working relationship between PMU, UNDP, and other strategic partners as well as donors<br>Steering Committee functions | Findings in project documents (APRs, minutes of meetings)<br><br>Indications in interviews | Document analysis<br><br>Stakeholder interviews                              |
| In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?  | Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic                                  | ECZ, ZPS, Judiciary, DSZ Project team, UNDP, CSOs  | Interviews   |



|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project</p>   | <p>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach<br/>           Role of committees in guidance<br/>           Harness effectiveness by analyzing how project's results were met vis-à-vis intended outcomes or objectives</p> <p>Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results</p> | <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>  | <p>Document analysis</p>  |
| <p><b>Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and could adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</b></p> |   |  |   |
| <p>Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?</p>  | <p>Policies adopted / enacted<br/>           Policies implemented<br/>           Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn</p>  | <p>Policy documents contain sustainability factors (policy adopted, implemented)</p> <p>Budget arrangements (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes</p> | <p>Documentation analysis<br/>           Stakeholder interviews</p> |





|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
|   | <p>Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</p> | <p>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> | <p>Project documents</p>                                |
|   | <p>How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results?</p>   | <p>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</p>                                | <p>MOA, WARMA, ZMD, WFP, FAO, Project team, UNDP</p>    |
| <p>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long term project results?</p> |   |   |   |
| <p>Sustainability possibilities<br/>Does the Project have an exit strategy?<br/>What components should an exit strategy have for this project?</p>            | <p>In what way, may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future?</p>   | <p>See indicators in project document results framework and log frame</p>                           | <p>Project documents and reports</p>                    |
| <p>Social sustainability factors</p>  | <p>Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?</p>   | <p>Evidence that partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p>  | <p>ECZ, ZPS, Judiciary, DSZ Project team, UNDP, CSO</p> |



|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Political/financial sustainability</p> | <p>Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?</p> | <p>Evidence that practices will be sustained</p> | <p>ECZ, ZPS, Judiciary, DSZ Project team, UNDP, CSO</p> |
| <p>Replicability</p>                      | <p>Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?</p>  | <p>Evidence that practices will be sustained</p> | <p>ECZ, ZPS, Judiciary, DSZ Project team, UNDP, CSO</p> |



## ANNEX D: UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATORS/MTR EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

### Evaluators/Consultants:

- i) Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- ii) Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- iii) Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- iv) Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- v) Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact during the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- vi) Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings, and recommendations.
- vii) Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
- viii) Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- ix) Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.



## **ANNEX E: MIDTERM EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM**

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

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

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

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

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_ *Date* \_\_\_\_\_



## ANNEX E: MIDTERM EVALUATION RATING SCALE

### Rating scale for performance

| Rating                         | Explanation  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS)       | No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency          |
| Satisfactory (S)               | Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency       |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS)   | Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency    |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency |
| Unsatisfactory (U)             | Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency       |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)     | Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency      |

### Rating Scale for Sustainability

| Rating                   | Explanation  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Likely (L)               | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future                           |
| Moderately Likely (ML)   | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained   |
| Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| Unlikely (U)             | Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained   |
| Highly Unlikely (HU)     | Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure  |

### Progress Towards Results Rating Scale

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S)         | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.   |



|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS)   | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.                |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.                                  |
| Unsatisfactory (U)             | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.  |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)     | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

| <b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b> |  |
|---|--|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS)  | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S)  | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.   |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.   |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.  |
| Unsatisfactory (U)  | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.   |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.   |



## ANNEX F: ME Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the *Commissioning Unit and RTA* and included in the final document)

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**UNDP-NCE Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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



**ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the ME Team to show how the received comments on the draft ME report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final ME report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final ME report

**To the comments received on (date) from the ME of Democracy Strengthening in Zambia Project 2020-2022) (UNDP Project ID-xxxxxxx#)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and not by the person’s name, and track change comment number (“#” column):*

| <b>Author</b> | <b>#</b> | <b>Para No./ comment location</b> | <b>Comment/Feedback on the draft ME report</b> | <b>ME team response and actions taken</b> |
|---------------|----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
|               |          |                                   |  |   |
|               |          |                                   |  |   |
|               |          |                                   |  |   |
|               |          |                                   |  |   |