

CPAP Outcome Evaluation Outcome 2 (State building)

(October – November 2008)

Terms of Reference

1. Context

The first Country Programme Action Plan for Afghanistan (2006-2008, extended 2009) was signed in December 2005 between the Government of Afghanistan and UNDP.

It includes eight outcomes covering the areas of Democratization, State building, Justice and Human Rights, Civil society, Policy dialogue, Gender, Livelihoods and Environment.

Three of them will be subject to Evaluation in 2008. The subject Evaluation Mission will take care of the following CPAP Outcome 2 (State Building):

• Outcome 2: The democratic state and government institutions strengthened at national and subnational levels to govern and ensure the delivery of quality public services, including security, with special attention to marginalised groups.

Output 2.1. Public sector capacity strengthened through the development of civil service at the central and sub-national levels, the establishment of accountability mechanisms and the enhancement of information management for better service delivery.

Output 2.2. Law and order institutions at national and sub-national levels strengthened and security of the population improved.

A full description of the context and the outcomes is given in Annex A.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

As the Country Programme nears its completion the opportunity exists to evaluate UNDP contribution and generate recommendations that will inform UNDP future programmes in Afghanistan.

The evaluation of the CPAP outcome/outputs has the following objectives:

- Evaluate the results achieved against outcome 2 to date, and likely to be achieved by end 2009;
- Provide inputs to the Assessment of Development Results exercise currently been carried out by the UNDP Evaluation Office;
- Provide information, recommendations and lessons learnt for the next Country Programme, for which drafting will start from November 2008.

The outcome will be evaluated by independent and external evaluator from October 2008, with desk review of materials from secondary sources, and field mission in Afghanistan in late October.

3. Scope and focus

The evaluation will address the following questions for the selected outcome and related outputs:

A. To what extent have the UNDP development interventions attained the intended results:

- To what extent have results been achieved to date?
- To what extent are results likely to be achieved by end 2009?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement/non-achievement of the results?
- To what extent have gender issues been addressed in UNDP programme/projects?
- Do the respective projects outputs significantly contribute to the achievement of the Country Programme outputs and outcome 2?

B. How UNDP development interventions have generated changes, and at which level, in the CPAP outcome areas:

- What happened as a result of UNDP programme, projects and soft assistance¹?
- How far these results are attributable to UNDP?
- How Government and public institutions have been affected?
- To what extent is the Afghan population, including marginalised groups, benefiting from these results?

C. Does the outcome address the national priorities?

- To what extent do the outcome/outputs address national priorities?
- Does the progress made by the projects and the achievement of the subject CPAP outcome significantly contribute to the related UNDAF outcome?
- Were the selection of projects and their outputs consistent with the intended CPAP outcome and outputs?

D. How efficient was the programme approach in the expected achievement of results:

- Was the most efficient process adopted?
- Was the partnership strategy efficient or not?
- Were the projects and soft assistance dedicated to the production of the outcome sufficient in terms of quality and quantity?
- Was there any duplication or lack of co-ordination between the outputs?

Terms of Reference – Page 2 /7

¹ Soft Assistance = Advocacy and Policy dialogue

 Do the outcome-2/outputs cross-fertilize with other outcomes, and in case, to what extent?

E. What are the chances that the accomplishments and results will be sustained in the future:

- How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the Government and public institutions?
- What is the level of commitment from the Government to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?
- Does the Government have the capacity to mobilise resources (human, financial) to pursue/secure the results in the future?
- How secure/volatile are the changes observed in the improvement of the situation/rights of the population, particularly the poor and vulnerable groups, and to what extent do they have the capacity to be perpetuated?

For each question, the "*How?*" and the "*Why/Why not?*" should be analysed and reported. A special attention should be given to the positive/negative changes affecting women and marginalised people.

4. Existing information sources

Detailed Information can be found in the country office Annual Results reports, the projects Annual Progress and/or Final reports, projects Evaluation reports, etc...

Relevant information may also be found in reports of other UN agencies, public or private institutions such as the National Human Development Reports, AREU reports, etc...

5. Evaluation process and methods

The evaluation should be based on a stakeholder approach, where all groups and individuals, who affect and/or are affected by the achievement of the outcome, are involved in the analysis. Moreover, the evaluation will take into consideration the social, political and economic context, which affects the overall performance of the outcome achievement; for example, the dramatically deteriorating security environment which occurred from mid 2005 onwards.

The evaluation will be carried out in an objective, sensitive and independent manner with varied and balanced considerations of both positive/negative aspects and areas in which significant improvement are required.

Data Collection

In terms of data collection, the evaluation team should use multiple methods that could include desk reviews, workshops, group and individual interviews, project/field visits and surveys. The appropriate set of methods would be determined in the Work Plan that the selected evaluator should submit at the beginning of the assignment.

Validation

The evaluation team should use a variety of methods to ensure that the data is valid, including triangulation. Precise methods of validation will be detailed in the Work Plan.

Stakeholder Participation

The involvement of a broad range of stakeholders should be applied. The identification of the stakeholders, including Government representatives of ministries/agencies, civil society

organizations, private sector representatives, UN Agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries, will take place with support of UNDP programme managers and respective country office units. Also, a Government member from key ministries/institutions will participate as evaluation team member for the Outcome 2.

Furthermore the development community at large, academics and the general public interested in or benefiting of UNDP interventions, in particular from specific areas of transition from emergency to rehabilitation and development, are specially required to participate.

Evaluation progress

The evaluation consists of the following stages/phases:

For each Outcome,

A. Preliminary phase: Evaluation Approach and Work Plan

The Evaluator should provide a detailed Evaluation Approach and Work Plan in response to the Terms of Reference. This document should detail the conceptual framework and the proposed methodology (data collection, validation, stakeholders' participation, presentations/workshops...).

B. Evaluation Phase: Evaluators assignment

- Work Plan: The evaluator will prepare a detailed work plan based on the desk review and submit it to UNDP at the end of first week of the contractual period. The plan will be approved by UNDP. If applicable, the Evaluation TOR shall be adapted.
- Desk Review: The evaluator will conduct desk reviews of available reports, project reviews and earlier evaluations prior to visiting Afghanistan. The evaluator may use most recent data obtained by other outcome evaluation (Outcome 5) for the common projects under Outcome 2 as well as state building and security related outputs/results. Given the security situation and overlap of the outcomes (5 and 2) it might be useful to take longer time for the desk review and data analysis. Initial remarks on the findings would be submitted to the ADR Mission as inputs.
- o *Bilateral meetings/consultations*: The preliminary findings from the desk review shall serve as point of departure for in-depth interviews/meetings/consultations with representatives of key stakeholders and selected implementing organizations.
- o Field Visits: Field visits will be planned and organised, if security situation permits, in close collaboration with the agencies concerned so as to get the optimal inputs from the stakeholders and also not duplicate existing or ongoing surveys and studies. Actual dates will be agreed in consultation with the relevant teams, security advisor and the Evaluation team. It is expected that the evaluation cover 3 regions or in case there are limitations in field visits, field data collected by a credible source from three regions are consulted.
- Draft Evaluation Report: The first draft report shall be ready for scrutiny at the end of the evaluation period in Afghanistan. This report shall be presented in stakeholders' meetings/workshops in Kabul prior to the evaluator's departure.
- Final Evaluation Report: Comments from the stakeholders' workshop as well as from individual stakeholders will be electronically sent to the evaluator. The Final Evaluation Report shall integrate the comments and observations, and shall be submitted to UNDP for approval.
 - The Evaluation Report should be presented in a solid, concise and readable form and be structured around the issues listed under Part 3 in the present TOR. It should

clearly distinguish the important findings and conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt.

The approval of the Final Report by UNDP is the condition for full payment of the contract.

6. Deliverables

The evaluator is expected to provide the following deliverables for the indicated dates:

- 1. A detailed **Evaluation approach and Work plan** (6 October 2008) describing the approach and methodology that will be used for the evaluation;
- 2. A full **Draft report** (29 October 2008) that will be submitted to UNDP at the end of the mission. This report will be discussed within UNDP and with its partners involved in the outcomes. UNDP will transmit to the evaluator the comments made on this draft within two weeks;
- 3. The **Evaluation Report** (20 November 2008) integrating the comments will have to be submitted to UNDP, (MS Word and PDF format) within one week after receiving comments on the draft report. This report is subject to UNDP approval;
- 4. An **Executive Summary** (20 November 2008) of the Evaluation Report, presented as a standalone document (5 to 10 pages, MSWord and PDF format).

Other hand, all documents, material, questionnaires, surveys or intermediate reports that might be established for the purpose of the mission should be delivered to UNDP.

All the deliverables are reputed to be public documents, owned by UNDP. Therefore the quality is a paramount.

Documents should be in English language (British) and be submitted in MS Office format (MS Word, MS Excel and PDF).

The Executive Summary should also be translated in Dari and Pashto.

7. Team composition

It is likely that the outcome evaluation team will be constituted of one sectoral expert /evaluator (international), drawing on the following competencies, and one government counter-part member. In addition they will be support staff.

- **Government Counterpart Members:** One government counterpart official would join the evaluation as full-time member during the in-country assignment of the international sector expert (evaluator).
- State building and Democratic Governance Expert (Outcome 2), with strong expertise in institutional development and capacity building, who will provide the expertise in the core subject areas of the evaluation as Public administration reform, Local governance, Civil service capacity and Service delivery. (P5 equivalent level)
- **UNDP Programme Officer**, part time will support the team with all relevant materials for desk review, indentify the potential stakeholders/persons to meet and support the expert in analysis during his mission in Afghanistan.

• **Team support** (One national para-professional support personnel) who will undertake data collection at the country-level, as well as administrative and logistical support for the work of the missions. The support personnel will have day-to-day liaison with the selected evaluator (sector expert) and provide all materials requested for desk analysis. The team support should also serve as translator as needed (meeting, interview, documents). She/He will be under the administrative supervision of the M&E Advisor/Head, PCICU.

8. Duration, Procedures and Logistics

Duration

The total duration of the mission would be 35.5 working days (international travels time not included) starting from 4 October 2008.

The evaluation work will be conducted in three phases. The first phase (home based) of Desk Review and data analysis will start as soon as the Evaluator is assigned (early October). During this phase the evaluator will review the relevant documents and reports, prepare the Work plan, collection of data (through national staff) and analysis, and provide initial remarks/inputs to the ADR Mission.

The second phase will start from the day following the evaluator's arrival in Kabul.

The third phase (home based) will start the day the evaluator will receive all the comments on the Draft report (tentative date 8 November)

- Government counterpart: 1.5weeks, during the Evaluation phase in Afghanistan.
- Area Experts: 35.5 working days for preparation, data collection and analysis, evaluation work in Afghanistan plus consolidation and finalization of the Report.
- Programme Officers: 35.5 working days (part time).
- *Team support, Logistic/administrative clerk*: 12 working days (full time for Team support) to support the evaluator mainly during and around the in-country mission.

The evaluators will work 6 days per week; Fridays are day-off.

Logistic and administrative arrangements

While the evaluators would be responsible for the delivery of quality outputs, UNDP will be responsible for organizing and facilitating the evaluation. Programme units staff will also assist the evaluator in performing his tasks.

UNDP will arrange the logistic support upon requisition from the evaluator. Secretariat should be ensured by the evaluator. Transportation support will be provided by UNDP. Printing facilities and presentation facilities for workshops/meetings will be provided by UNDP during the period in country. Internet access will be provided in UNDP country or projects offices (in locations where UNDP is present).

Visa / Security requirements

The Evaluator is responsible to obtain visa for entry and work permission for the duration of his mission. UNDP will provide letters for facilitating visa issuance.

The Evaluator will be subject to UN security rules and procedures in Afghanistan, namely field visits will be subject to Security Clearance.

