# Terms of Reference

**Mid Term Evaluation**

In December 2006, UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major agreement of €528 million that will provide, through the UN development system, support to programmes oriented towards key MDG and related development goals. In addition, Spain committed $90 million directed to launch a new window on Children and Nutrition. The Millennium Development Achievement Fund (MDG-F) seeks to accelerate progress towards attainment of the MDGs in participating countries by supporting policies that promise high impact, scaling-up of successful models, and innovative development practices.

The Fund operates through the UN Country Teams and actively strives to strengthen inter-agency coherence and effectiveness with regards to development interventions. The MDG-F uses joint programming as the main form of development intervention in the field. Currently, there are128 joint programmes in 50 countries on 8 different thematic windows that contribute to progress on the attainment of the MDGs.

**Description of the Window**

**Description of beneficiaries targeted by the window**

The MDGF initiative to be evaluated is the Creative Industries Support Programme (CISP) also referred to as the Joint Programme (JP) because it involves four ministries of the Government of Cambodia, viz. Culture & Fine Arts (lead Ministry); Commerce; Industry, Mines & Energy; Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries and four UN organizations, viz. FAO, ILO, UNDP and UNESCO. CISP was approved in April 2008 in the amount of $3.3 million for three years so it is now at the half-way point in its schedule.

The intention of the programme is to valorize Cambodia’s intangible heritage targeting the value chain including policies, preservation, support to production, quality improvement, entrepreneurships and marketing and access to markets in order to support creative industries and thus contribute to economic and social development. The Creative Industries Support Program is therefore an attempt to link culture and development by capitalizing on the commercial promotion of cultural products and services so as to increase capacity, employment opportunities and revenues amongst local communities with a special focus on women and Indigenous People.

**2. EVALUATION PURPOSE**

As one of the Secretariat functions the MDG-F has developed a Monitoring and Evaluation strategy for the Fund: the MGD-F Programme Implementation Guidelines and the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy “Learning to Improve”. Both documents prescribe mid-term evaluations for all joint programmes lasting more than 2 years.

Mid-term evaluations are formative by nature and seek to improve the implementation process of joint programmes in their second phase. They also generate knowledge, identify good practice and lessons learned that can be transferred to other programmes and contribute to higher level of information in the M&E system. Therefore, findings and recommendations from these evaluations are specifically directed to the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the MDG-F Secretariat.

**3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

**The usual rapid mid-term evaluation** will consist of a systematic and swift analysis of the merit of a joint program based on the scope and criteria enclosed in this TOR through a reliable evidence-based yet abbreviated and light process. This will enable to obtain conclusions and recommendations in a period of approximately 3 months.

**The unit of analysis** of this mid-term evaluation **is the joint programme** defined as the group of its various components, outcomes, outputs and activities as reflected in the joint programme document as well as subsequent modification and alterations occurred during its implementation.

This mid-term evaluation has the following specific objectives:

1. To know about the quality of the design and the internal coherence of the joint programme (the needs it seeks to fulfil and the problems that intends to solve), the external coherence to the UNDAF and National development Strategies and up to what extent national ownership is present in the implementation of joint programmes according to the terms defined by the Paris Declaration and Accra Action Agenda.
2. To know about the implementation of the joint programme, the efficiency of the management system with regards to planning, coordination, and use of the designated resources for its implementation. The evaluator should start by analyzing the processes and institutional mechanisms that allow identifying success factors and limitations of inter-agency work within the frame of One UN.
3. To know about the degree of effectiveness of the programme in terms of; beneficiaries, contribution to the thematic window as well as to the Millennium Development Objectives at local level and/or in the country.
4. Preliminary assessment of the sustainability context including the JP outcomes as well as barriers and counter-measures in order to ensure sustainability

**4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, EVALUATION CRITERIA AND LEVELS OF INFORMATION**

The following questions will be pursued for project design, implementation and sustainability:

**Project Design**

Project design will be addressed under the headings of ‘Relevance’ and ‘Ownership.’ The JP is very ambitious for what it intends to accomplish in only three years. It is understood to be behind schedule at this point. What can be done to speed up implementation or simplify the initiative? Issues to be examined here are:

**Relevance**: The extent to how coherent the objectives of the development intervention are with regards to the beneficiaries’ problems, the needs of the country, the global priorities and the other partners and donors.

1. Were problems and their causes (environmental and human) clearly defined?
2. Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the joint programme document?
3. Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention?
4. To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural background? What are the limitations which the project faces regarding adaptation of the existing project document?
5. Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?
6. Is the joint programme the best answer to solve the most relevant environmental problems and socioeconomic needs of the targeted population? Does it cover and reach intended beneficiaries?
7. Is the intervention strategy well adapted to the socio-cultural context where it’s being implemented?
8. To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to a better formulation of programmes
9. To what extent has the program taken advantage of existing initiatives and built upon them?
10. To what extent was the project affected by previous UN programmes (legacy) un-related to the project?
11. How has the project capitalized on other projects of the agencies involved?
12. To what extent does the vision outlined in the document, for the preservation and promotion of creative industries, fit within the context to globalization and the vast changes the country is undergoing?
13. Working at both the policy level at the center and at the grass roots level in the four selected provinces. Is this level of complexity achievable in three years?
14. Relationship/duplication/synergy or the JP with work of other donors and Cambodian government programmes
15. Have all the required types of expertise been identified to assist with implementation, e.g. handicraft design and marketing consultants to assist with implementation?

**Ownership**: The extent to which project stakeholders take a leadership and responsibility for and are committed to the JP.

1. The substance of the project at grass roots level. Is a cultural intervention meaningful and sustainable for the minority peoples or would some other intervention bring better results and to what degree were the local minorities brought into the programme design?
2. To what extent the objectives and intervention strategies of the joint programme are aligned to the National, Regional or local development strategies?
3. To what extent has the opinion and interests of national, local authorities, citizens and other stakeholders been taken into account in designing the development intervention?
4. Has the challenge of minority languages been adequately addressed in the communications and training of the JP?
5. To what extent the targeted population and participants have taken ownership of the joint programme by playing a leadership role?
6. To what extent national and counterpart resources (public and private) have been mobilized to contribute to the objective of generating results and impacts?
7. What are the challenges with Intellectual Property, land ownership and community and civil society organization registrations law and regulations and the reality of their operation and enforcement on the ground, which is sometimes very different from the intent of the legislation?
8. To what extent have the target population and participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place?
9. To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s objective and produce results and impacts? What are the limitations to their involvement?
10. What are the expectations of the counterparts when participating in the Joint Programme and to which extent can these expectations be answered?
11. How is the Joint Programme perceived by stakeholders, partners, beneficiaries?

**Process**

**Efficiency:** The extent to which resources/inputs (financial, human, etc) have been transformed in outputs

1. To what extent does the management structure of the joint programme (organizational structure, information flows, decision making, etc) contribute to outputs and outcomes?
2. To what extent are participating agencies and the national counterparts and the private sector coordinating (government and civil society)?
3. Are there effective and efficient coordination mechanisms in place to avoid overlaps, confusion and work overloads of partners and participants?
4. Are different implementation paces in the joint programmes a problem for delivering results?
5. Are different working methodologies, financial instruments, etc shared among United Nations agencies and joint programmes? If not what are the limitations faced by the programme team?
6. Are agency specific administrative and financial mechanisms adequate to support the project outcomes? If not, to what extent and how are each UN Agency adapting these mechanism to the specificity of the Joint Program and what margin do they have at the country level to do so?
7. The involvement/coordination of the four UN agencies and the four ministries of the Cambodian Government; the requirements of the many individual reporting systems;
8. The management structure for the project. Is this complex structure working effectively and what can be done to make it more effective/efficient?
9. The detailed one-by-one contracting of individuals and organizations to help implement the JP which creates a lot of administration for project management. Can anything be done to simplify or streamline this, e.g. contracting of an executing agency to take on a cluster of related activity or components of the JP?
10. The relation of resources/effort spent on inputs versus outputs in the JP. Can anything be done to put more resources directly toward the grass roots?
11. Is the workload inside and outside the project evenly distributed and if not what can be done about it?
12. Are on-going activities, existing planned training activities and missions as well as the intrusive nature of missions of all non-indigenous people to the target area taken into account in project implementation?

**Results**

**Effectiveness:** the extent to what planned objectives of the development intervention have been achieved

1. Is the programme progressing towards the established outcomes?
	1. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Objectives at local and national level?
	2. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the objectives set by the thematic window on gender equality and the empowerment of women?
	3. To what extent is the Joint Programme contributing to cultural preservation and sustainable management of natural resources?
2. Is the programme on track according to the calendars of delivery? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the products and results?
3. Has the quality of selected products improved as expected?
4. Are the value chains being targeted in a culturally sensitive manner, respecting local cultural limitations with respect to business development? Likewise, is sustainable management of natural resources being taken into consideration?
5. Does the project adequately address the friction between the promotion of the development of new and improved cultural products to meet market demand and the preservation of existing IP traditions used to make these products?
6. Does the project sufficiently safeguard IP culture, in an environment where it has been put under extreme pressure to change, recognizing the fact that IP culture (even in the creative industries) is essentially agricultural in nature, and should remain so?
7. Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms to measure project progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?
8. Is the project providing coverage of the participating population as planned in the joint programme document?
9. What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of products and results?
10. Does management have a formal way of dealing with/solving programme problems?
11. Are outputs of the needed quality?
12. Is the joint programme covering the number of beneficiaries planned?
13. What are the elements that contribute to progress or delay in the implementation process and the attainment of results?
14. To what extent has the programme contributed innovative solutions to solve problems?
15. Have good practices or lessons learn been documented?
16. To what extent has the joint programme contributed to provide visibility and prioritized public policy of the country?
17. To what extent and what type of effects is the joint programme producing in men, women and other differential categories of beneficiaries? (Rural versus urban population, etc)
18. What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified?
19. Are project outputs realistic within the time-frame set taking into account the Cambodian context (referring here to the legislation components, the BDS infrastructure components etc)?
20. In what way has the joint programme contributed towards the issue of culture and development included on the public agenda? To what extent has it helped to build up and/or bolster communication and cooperation among, civil society organizations and decision-makers? Has an effective communications strategy been developed?
21. What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?

**Sustainability**: The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

1. Are conditions and premises for sustainability of the joint programme taking place?
	1. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?
	2. Are these institutions showing interest, technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?
	3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
	4. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
	5. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions?
2. To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the joint programme?
3. In what ways can the governance of the joint programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability?
4. Does the structure and nature of the PMC appropriately address timely decision-making needs and guidance for the programme to appropriately react to needs from the field?
5. Besides the PMC, are there any day-to-day decision making mechanisms? If not, does this pose a challenge to the Joint Programme implementation?
6. What good practices and lessons learned would be useful for other joint programmes or other countries?
7. To what extent and in what ways are the joint programmes contributing to progress in United Nations reform?
8. How are Aid Effectiveness principles (ownership, alignment, management for development results and mutual responsibility) taken into account in the joint programme?
9. How are the principles of aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, management for development results and mutual responsibility) being applied in the joint programmes?
10. To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country's public policy framework?
11. To what extent has the programme gained knowledge from other MDG-F projects on an information exchange basis for best practices or lessons learned?
12. What are the costs and benefits of the Joint Programme with regards to the One UN set objective?

**5. METHODOLOGY**

The Mid-term evaluations will use the appropriate methodologies to meet specific requirements on the information, the evaluation questions defined in TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities decided in the reference group of the evaluation. In any case, consultants are required to analyze all relevant sources of information such as annual reports, programme documents, internal reports and summaries, programme archives, national development documents and whatever documents that can outline evidence to assess the worth of the different dimension of analysis. It is expected that consultants will also use interviews as a form of relevant data collection for the evaluation.

The methodology of the evaluation will be described in detail in the inception report and the final report of the evaluation. At a minimum, this will include information in the instruments and tools used to collect information and analyze data (documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires, participatory techniques, etc)

**7. EVALUATION PRODUCTS**

The consultant is responsible to deliver the following products to the MDG-F Secretariat:

**Inception report** (it will be delivered 7 days after the Secretariat hands in to the consultant all documents related to the programme)

The consultants will deliver the inception reports (with a minimum of 5 to maximum of 10 pages) based on desk reviews of documents and archive data. The report will include a calendar of activities and delivery of products. The inception report will propose an initial draft of the Theory of Change of the programmes as a benchmark for comparison during the evaluation and as common start point of agreement between the consultant and the managers of the evaluation.

**Draft of the Final Report** (it will be delivered 10 days after the consultant finalizes the field visit)

The consultant will deliver a draft of the final evaluation report with the same sections as the final report (below). This draft report will include a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 30 pages and an executive summary of 5 pages with the same sections of the final report. This report will be shared with the reference group of the evaluation for questions, suggestions, and further contributions, etc.

**Final Evaluation Report** (it will be delivered 7 days after the consultant receives the draft report with suggestions and comments from the reference group and the MDG-F Secretariat)

The consultant will deliver a draft of the final evaluation report with the same sections as the final report (with a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 30 pages). This report will be shared with the reference group of the evaluation for communication and dissemination and advisory purposes. The report will comprise the following sections:

1. Cover
2. Introduction
	1. Premises, Context, objectives and methodology
	2. Objective of the evaluation
	3. Methodology applied
	4. Limitations and caveats of the evaluation
3. Description of the development intervention
	1. Initial conditions of the intervention
	2. Detailed description of the Theory of Change of the programme
4. Level of analysis: Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions
5. Findings, remarks and lessons learnt (in a prioritized, structured and clear fashion)
6. Recommendations
7. Annexes

**7. EVALUATION ACTORS: ROLES AND RESPONSABILITIES**

The main actors in a mid-term evaluation process are the MDG-F Secretariat as commissioner and evaluation manager, the joint programme management team and the Programme Management Committee that will function as the reference group for the evaluation.

* The reference group of the evaluation will have the following functions:
* Facilitate the participation among the various stakeholders during the design phase of the evaluation
* Identify the information needs, the definition of objectives and the scope of the evaluation.
* Express an opinion on the evaluation planning documents ( working plan, agenda of the field visit, communication plan, etc)
* Contribute by inputs for the drafting of the evaluation TOR
* Grant the evaluation team access to all relevant information and documents from the intervention as well as to key informants to interview; participate in a focus group or any other collection method of data and information.
* Review the quality of the evaluation process as well as the products to enrich, to contribute, as well as to ensure that their information needs on the development intervention are met.
* Disseminate evaluation findings and recommendations especially among the organization with the same interests.

As stated in its mandate The MDG-F Secretariat commissions and manages mid-term evaluation by promoting and financing its execution. As evaluation manager the Secretariat ensures a timely and high quality exercise by leading the design of TOR, coordinating and overseeing progress of the evaluation work plan and assessing the quality of the process and products. The Secretariat is also responsible for communicating and disseminating findings and recommendation to evaluation stakeholders.

**8. CALENDAR FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION**

1. **Design Phase (Duration: 10 days)**

The portfolio managers of the Secretariat will send to the Evaluation focal point in the country (manager of the joint programme, coordination officer, etc) a template of a generic TOR for the specific window the joint programme is being financed. The reference group of the evaluation will adapt the TOR to their specific information needs and context of the programme and the country. All MDG-F joint programmes mid-term evaluations will share a set of the same questions in order to aggregate and contribute to show evidence for higher levels of information of the Fund.

The Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation will start a dialogue to complete the dimensions of study and the evaluation questions that not addressed in the generic TOR; either are insufficient or irrelevant to the specific joint programme.

1. TOR is finished and the Secretariat hires a consultant selected from the MDG-F roster.
2. Each portfolio manager is in charge of managing the evaluation with 2 main functions:

Facilitate the work of the consultant by acting as a main communication channel among the evaluation stakeholders (reference group, stakeholders in the country, etc); review and ensure of the quality of the evaluation products (reports and documents)

1. **Implementation phase (duration 53-55 days)**

**Inception report (Duration: 15 days)**

1. Briefing with the consultant **(1 day).** The Secretariat hand the consultant a check list of activities and documents to review. The evaluation process is explained and all questions sorted out.
2. The consultant reviews the documents as listed in the annex and the check list (financial documents, programme document, monitoring reports, etc)
3. The consultant delivers a brief inception report with preliminary conclusions, on the programme’s theory of change based on the desk reviewed performed. This document will also include a detailed work plan (per activity) to carry out the evaluation. (7 days after the Secretariat hands in to the consultant all document related to the programme)
4. The portfolio manager of the Secretariat prepares an agenda for a field visit jointly with the evaluation focal point in the country (interviews, focus groups, document review, visit UN agencies) **(7 days after the Secretariat receives the inception report)**

**Field Visit (Duration 5-7 days)**

1. The consultant travels to the country to observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions stated in the inception report. The agenda establishes the visit in the country and the Secretariat facilitates the consultant’s visit through e-mails, telephonic calls and coordination arrangements and the evaluation focal point in the country.
2. The consultant will have a debriefing session with the main stakeholders with whom he has interacted.

**Final report (Duration 31 days)**

1. The consultant delivers a draft of the final report to the Secretariat that is shared with the reference group of the evaluation (10 days from the day the field visit finalizes).
2. The reference group of the evaluation could suggest changes in data or facts that do not reflect the reality or are incorrect based on evidence that can be contrasted. The evaluator fully exercises its independence; she/he will be the only responsible for the changes in the text of the report. The Secretariat is also entitled to suggest changes to the report in order to ensure quality and reliability of the evaluation exercise **(7 days from the delivery of the final report)**

The reference group of the evaluation can also express its opinion on the different evaluation judgments but these opinions cannot affect the independent judgement of the evaluator to express his/her evidence-based appreciations, findings and recommendations on the programme.

1. The portfolio managers assess the quality of the evaluation report by applying the criteria established in this TOR (included as annex)
2. Once the reference group of the evaluation finishes its contribution and suggestions to the report. The consultant decides which ones will integrate the report and discard the rest by explaining why. The portfolio manager reviews the final copy of the evaluation report that officially sends it to the evaluation reference group, relevant stakeholders and published online. **(7 days from the day the reference group sends their comments on the report)**
3. **Management response and improvement plan: (7 days after the report is delivered to the reference group)**
4. The portfolio manager of the Secretariat initiates a dialogue with the joint programme management to establish an improvement plan that incorporates the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation.
5. The portfolio manager also agrees to a simple dissemination and communication plan in order to spread findings and recommendations to different stakeholders.