

Final Project Evaluation Terms of Reference
UNDP Country Office and Saudi Food and Drug Authority
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

1. Background and context

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) spans the vast majority of the Arabian Peninsula, with a land area of approximately 2,150,000 km² (830,000 sq mi). Saudi Arabia is the largest country in the Middle East, and the second-largest country in the Arab world with a rapidly growing population of 35,013,414 in 2020. In April 2016, the Saudi Vision 2030, an ambitious blueprint for development, was launched. The overall objective of this Vision is to transform the economy from its conventional reliance on oil and natural gas to a more diversified economy based on sustainable development. The National Transformation Programme 2020 (NTP2020) was launched in June 2016 across 24 governmental bodies, operating in the economic and development sectors.

The Saudi Food and Drug Authority (SFDA) is the leading regional regulatory authority for food, drugs and medical devices with professional and excellent services that contributes to the protection and advancement of the health in Saudi Arabia. The National Transformation Program NTP aims to develop governmental work and establish the needed infrastructure to achieve Vision 2030 ambition and requirement. SFDA has been identified as one of the main entities involved in the First Theme of Transform Healthcare.

Saudi Food and Drug Authority completed the implementation of its First Strategic Plan for 2007-2011 and its Second Strategic Plan for 2012-2016. The United Nations Development Programme provided technical assistance to SFDA and collaborated in achieving the strategic goals set in SFDA strategic plans 2018 -2022. The project is a national project benefiting the whole of the Kingdom in addition to contributing to the UNDP CF Outcome 1 (Improved knowledge-based equitable and sustainable development, underpinned by innovation and improved infrastructure) and CPD output 1.1 (National policies developed to promote economic diversification with a focus on increased employment of nationals)

On the basis of the outputs of SFDA Strategic Plans and UNDP Projects, as well as considering the UN and Saudi strategy and policy documents, the final evaluation will look into the progress of the following outputs:

1. Health Technology Assessment guidelines and improved capacities in assessment of the safety and effectiveness of new drugs and medical devices.
2. Improved quality assurance practices and developed patient safety policy documents and practice guidelines focusing on risk-based evaluation and safe use of technologies.
3. Capacities built in all relevant areas as per SFDA mandate.
4. Increased role of SFDA through regional and international collaborations and recognition.
5. Strengthened organisational culture and improved internal communication.
6. Improved external communication and raised awareness on SFDA roles and functions:

The total resources originally budgeted for this intervention have been significantly reduced due to COVID-related issues. The budget at the project inception was for US\$16,930,920. This has been reduced by US\$ 9,730,920 to become US\$ 7,200,000.

This reduction has, undoubtedly impacted the delivery of outputs and, as such, an evaluation is crucial to reflect those changes and their impact, should there be a next phase.

The Saudi Food and drug Authority is fully cognizant of the impact of such a drop in budgeting and will provide all the necessary assistance to the evaluator to highlight observations and provide recommendations on the way forward.

The mid-term evaluation, although planned for 2020, had to be postponed until the end of 2021 for COVID-related reasons. And since the project is ending in 2022 it has now become a final evaluation. The evaluation requires working with all heads of departments involved with the various outcomes as well as all consultants on the project and other relevant project and authority staff.

Basic Project information can also be included in table format as follows:

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project title:	Support SFDA Third Strategic Plan Implementation	
Atlas ID	SAU10/115227	
Corporate outcome and output	Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy	
Country	Saudi Arabia	
Region	RBAS	
Date project document signed	14 March 2019	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	1 April 2019	31 December 2022
Project budget	US\$ 7,200,000	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US\$ 6,584,590	
Funding source	Government	
Implementing party¹	Saudi Food and Drug Authority	

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

Evaluation purpose and objectives:

This final evaluation is conducted as part of a planned intervention aimed at re-positioning the project to help SFDA meet its mandate. In view of the pandemic, major changes have occurred, including but not limited to, very significant budgetary cuts. This evaluation thus becomes crucial to assess the impact of the pandemic and subsequent budget cuts have had on the delivery of outputs originally targeted in the project. The evaluation and ensuing recommendations will help build a new phase for the project serving SFDA to better deliver its intended task and learn lessons from previous activities. The decision will have to be taken by the Saudi Food and Drug Authority as Outputs are meant to provide support in the implementation of the third strategic Plan.

- The primary concern is to assess the achievement of objectives and measure the impact of COVID and the drastic budget cuts.
- The evaluation will suggest recommendations which will help build a new Strategic Plan phase.

¹ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

Scope of the evaluation:

- The final evaluation will look into the progress of the following outputs:
 1. Health Technology Assessment guidelines and improved capacities in assessment of the safety and effectiveness of new drugs and medical devices.
 2. Improved quality assurance practices and developed patient safety policy documents and practice guidelines focusing on risk-based evaluation and safe use of technologies.
 3. Capacities built in all relevant areas as per SFDA mandate.
 4. Increased role of SFDA through regional and international collaborations and recognition.
 5. Strengthened organisational culture and improved internal communication.
 6. Improved external communication and raised awareness on SFDA roles and functions:
- This evaluation will cover all activities held during the span of the project between (1 April 2019- 31st of Dec 2022) and highlight issues and recommendations in all aspects (technical, financial, management, structural and operational), including the effective use of resources and delivery outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

Issues relate directly to the questions of the evaluation must be answered so that users will have the information they need for pending decisions or action. An issue may concern the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, or sustainability of the intervention. In addition, UNDP evaluations must address how the intervention sought to **mainstream gender in development efforts**, considered disability issues and applied the rights-based approach.

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

Referencing and adopting from Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria ((a) relevance/ coherence; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability (and/or other criteria used)), the evaluation will answer the following questions:

Project evaluation sample questions:

Relevance/ Coherence

- To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, country programme outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and the SDGs?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the design?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved, considering men, women, and vulnerable groups?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?
- Are the project objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame? Do they clearly address women, men and vulnerable groups?

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, male and female staff, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- ?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- To what extent will targeted men, women and vulnerable people benefit from the project interventions in the long-term?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent are lessons learned documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability in order to support female and male project beneficiaries as well as marginalized groups?

Evaluation questions on cross-cutting issues

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women, men and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Gender equality

All evaluation criteria and evaluation questions applied need to be checked to see if there are any further gender dimensions attached to them, in addition to the stated gender equality questions.

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker assigned to this project representative of reality?

Disability

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

Guiding evaluation questions will be further refined in the inception report by the evaluation team and agreed with UNDP evaluation stakeholders.

4. Methodology

The evaluation should employ a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and male and female direct beneficiaries. Methodological tools and approaches may include:

- **Document review.** This would include a review of all relevant documentation, inter alia
 - Project document (contribution agreement).
 - Theory of change and results framework.
 - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
 - Annual workplans.
 - Activity designs.
 - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
 - Results-oriented monitoring report.
 - Highlights of project board meetings.
 - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- **Interviews and meetings** with key stakeholders (men and women) such as key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, United Nations country team (UNCT) members and implementing partners:
 - **Semi-structured interviews**, based on questions designed for different stakeholders based on evaluation questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.
 - Key informant and **focus group discussions** with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
 - All interviews with men and women should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including male and female participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires to other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.
- **Gender and human rights lens.** All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders, and the evaluator.

5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, UNDP expects a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length).**² A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within one week of submission of the draft, as outlined in these guidelines. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** (if required).
- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.

Standard templates that need to be followed are provided in the Annexes section. It is expected that the evaluator will follow the UNDP evaluation guidelines and UNEG quality check list and ensure all the quality criteria are met in the evaluation report.

In line with UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactory completed due to impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid. Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her/their control.

6. Evaluation required competencies

The evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant. The consultant shall be responsible for carrying out and performing all the duties and responsibilities as defined in the implementation arrangements section and required by the evaluation.

- **Required qualifications:** Advanced degree in the relevant discipline, minimum 10 years experience in evaluations, preferably in the field of biological science, nutrition and food technology, pharmaceuticals and chemistry. Knowledge of Saudi, region or similar context, a plus.
- **Technical competencies:** Team leadership skills and experience, technical knowledge in UNDP thematic areas, with specifics depending on the focus of the evaluation, data analysis and report writing etc.

- **Technical knowledge and experience:** Gender and disability inclusion competencies preferable. Technical knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such equality, disability issues, rights-based approach, and capacity development.
- **Language skills required:** Fluent English, knowledge of Arabic considered an asset

Evidence to be presented:

- resume
- work samples
- references

To support claims of knowledge, skills and experience.

Explicit statement of evaluators' independence from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing, or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation should be provided.³

7. Evaluation ethics

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.³

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant 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 consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

8. Implementation arrangements

The section describes the specific roles and responsibilities of all involved in this evaluation:

1. Evaluation commissioner: The Resident Representative who will approve the inception report and the final evaluation report.
2. Evaluation manager: Lead the evaluation process and participate in all of its stages - evaluability assessment, preparation, implementation, management and use. Ensure quality assurance and manage the ERC portal
3. Evaluator:
 - a. Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the TOR
 - b. Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix and a gender responsive methodology, in line with the TOR, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines
 - c. Conduct data collection and field visits according to the TOR and inception report
 - d. Produce draft reports adhering to UNDP evaluation templates, UNDP Evaluation guidelines including the required quality criteria and brief the evaluation manager, programme/ project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations

e. Consider gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues, check if all and respective evaluation questions are answered, and relevant data, disaggregated by sex, is presented, analysed and interpreted. The evaluator needs to ensure that all the evaluation sections are gender responsive.

f. Finalize the evaluation report, incorporating comments and questions from the feedback/ audit trail. Record own feedback in the audit trail including those of the members of the team, the evaluation manager, the commissioning programme unit, and key stakeholders.

4. Project manager:

a. Provide inputs/ advice to the evaluation manager and evaluation reference group on the detail and scope of the TOR for the evaluation and how the findings will be used

b. Ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations

c. Provide the evaluation manager with all required data (e.g. relevant monitoring data) and documentation (reports, minutes, reviews, studies, etc.), contacts/ stakeholder list etc.

d. Ensure that data and documentation in general, but in particular related to gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues, are made available to the evaluation manager

e. Provide comments and clarification on the TOR, inception report and draft evaluation reports

f. Respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP

g. Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders including the project board

h. Implement relevant key actions on evaluation recommendations

9. Time frame for the evaluation process

The consultancy should be conducted and completed within 30 days over 2.5 to 3 months.

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which the evaluator will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office (e.g. workplan, agreements, briefings, draft report, final report).

- Desk review.
- Briefings of evaluator.
- Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report.
 - In-country data collection and analysis (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires).
 - Preparing the draft report.
 - Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance).
 - Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report.

In addition, the evaluator may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge sharing and dissemination.

Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (outcome evaluation)

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and inception report				
Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	-	At the time of contract signing 3 April 2022	UNDP or remote	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluator	-	At the time of contract signing 3 April 2022	Via email	Evaluation manager
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Within two weeks of contract signing 3-17 April 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	Within two weeks of contract signing 17 April 2022		Evaluator
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report 24 April 2022	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	10 days	Within four weeks of contract signing 1-12 May 2022	In country With field visits	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day	12 May 2022	In country	Evaluator
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (4-5 pages)	10 days	Within two weeks of the completion of the field mission 15 May – 26 May 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
Draft report submission	-			Evaluator
Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report 9 June 2022	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day	Within one week of receipt of comments 16 June 2022	Remotely UNDP	UNDP, stakeholder and evaluator
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office	3 days	Within one week of final debriefing 23 June 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	Within one week of final debriefing 23 June 2022	Home- based	Evaluator
Estimated total days for the evaluation	30			

Excludes days estimated for UNDP's review

10. Application submission process and criteria for selection

As required by the procurement unit.

11. TOR annexes

- **Intervention results framework and theory of change.**
- **Key stakeholders and partners.**
- **Documents to be consulted.** A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
 - SFDA strategy
 - Monitoring plans and indicators.
 - Partnership arrangements (e.g., agreements of cooperation with Governments or partners).
 - Project Document and Budget Revisions.
 - Minutes of all meetings.
- **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix

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

- **Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.** Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.
- **Required format for the evaluation report.** The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports as mentioned in section 6 of the evaluation guidelines.
- **Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details (annex A)**
- **Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation.** UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations system'.⁵

Annex A

UNDP Evaluation dispute resolution process

Dispute settlement

Should you or a member of the evaluation team feel unduly pressured to change the findings or conclusions of an evaluation you have been contracted to undertake you are freely able to raise your

concerns with the management within UNDP.

Please send your concerns to the Deputy Director of the Region who will ensure a timely response.

Please also include the Independent Evaluation Office, in your correspondence

(evaluation.office@undp.org).

Reporting wrongdoing

UNDP takes all reports of alleged wrongdoing seriously. In accordance with the UNDP Legal Framework for Addressing Non-Compliance with UN Standards of Conduct, the Office of Audit and Investigation is the principal channel to receive allegations*.

Anyone with information regarding fraud against UNDP programmes or involving UNDP staff is strongly encouraged to report this information through the Investigations Hotline (+1-844-595-5206).

People reporting wrongdoing to the Investigations Hotline have the option to leave relevant contact

information or to remain anonymous. However, allegations of workplace harassment and abuse of authority cannot be reported anonymously.

When reporting to the Investigations Hotline, people are encouraged to be as specific as possible, including the basic details of who, what, where, when and how any of these incidents occurred. Specific information will allow OAI to properly investigate the alleged wrongdoing.

The investigations hotline, managed by an independent service provider on behalf of UNDP to protect confidentiality, can be directly accessed worldwide and free of charge in different ways:

ONLINE REFERRAL FORM (*You will be redirected to an independent third-party site.*)

PHONE - REVERSED CHARGES [Click here for worldwide numbers](#) (interpreters available 24 hours/day) Call +1-844-595-5206 in the USA

EMAIL directly to OAI at: reportmisconduct@undp.org

REGULAR MAIL

Deputy Director (Investigations)

Office of Audit and Investigations

United Nations Development Programme

One UN Plaza, DC1, 4th Floor

New York, NY 10017 USA

* <https://www.undp.org/accountability/audit/investigations>