

**United Nations Development Programme
Democratic Institutions Programme**

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE DIP MID-TERM EVALUATION

I. BACKGROUND

1.1 Context

The Democratic Institutions Programme (DIP) is a five-year, multi-donor programme administered by UNDP With the objective of supporting the Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP), theme goal "...to develop a fully operational democratic, accountable and responsive constitutional federalism, ensuring citizens empowerment and participation." The PASDEP is the Government of Ethiopia's (GoE) second-generation PRSP, a document which, *inter alia*, recognises the importance of democracy and good governance as necessary preconditions in the fight against poverty.

This Government owned agenda is supported by the UN Country Team as set out in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and Development Partners expressed in the Governance Strategy document of the Development Assistance Group (DAG) Governance Technical Working Group. Both UNCT and the DDAG prioritize strengthening of institutions frameworks of democratic governance in Ethiopia that together contribute towards the overall goal of developing a more capable, responsive, accountable and enabling state. To contribute towards this objective, a five year multi-donor programme in support of seven key democratic institutions was established.

The Democratic Institutions Programme is an institutional capacity building intervention with the aim of:

- Promoting human rights and good governance;
- Enhancing the capacity of democratic Institutions to be effective, sufficient and responsive in promoting and protecting the rights of citizens
- Empowering citizens to be active and effective participants in the democratic process as well as respect for the rights of others.

To achieve these objectives, the DIP has identified the following key institutions as enabling partners: The National Electoral Board of Ethiopia (NEBE), Ethiopian Human Rights Commission (EHRC), Ethiopian Institute of the Ombudsman (EIO), The Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (FEACC), House of People's Representatives (HoPR) and Regional State Councils (RCs), the House of Federation (HoF) and SNNPR Council of Nationalities and the Office of Auditor General and Regional Auditor Generals (OFAG).

1.2 Programme Outcome:

The intended outcome of the DIP is a "well-structured and well-functioning institutions that embody open, transparent and democratic governance which respects the rights of all its citizens as enshrined in the Constitution" (Adapted from the PASDEP, P. 176).

1.3 Programme outputs:

The DIP has the following outputs:

- Prevention, investigation and prosecution of corruption supported and increased awareness of ethics and anti-corruption within Ethiopia.
- Parliament's Capacity for law making and revision strengthened at federal and

regional levels.

- Parliament's consultation/representative function strengthened and technical function in designing in poverty reduction legislation enhanced at federal and regional levels.
- Parliament's oversight functions strengthened.
- Institutional strengthening of electoral bodies including the National Electoral Board of Ethiopia.
- Improved operational mechanisms of national human rights institutions (including Human Rights Commissioner and the Ombudsman office, Ombudsman for Children).
- Human Rights Education: Increased understanding and awareness of governmental, nongovernmental bodies, the judiciary, communities, law enforcement agents, Parliament, grassroots organizations.
- Institutional strengthening of the audit authorities at both federal and regional levels to allow them to carry out their constitutional mandates in accordance with internationally recognized standards.

The DIP as at June 2010 has been implemented for 24 months. A midterm evaluation of the programme is thus due to be undertaken. All DIP stakeholders, GoE, implementing partners, Development Partners and UNDP have been reflecting on ways of making the programme more effective. An institutional capacity assessment of DIP institutions and gender audit have been undertaken to identify possible gaps and propose remedial measures. UNDP as manager of the programme has also been looking at the programme strategy and the governance structure against programmatic efficiency and effectiveness, joint ownership, accountability, results orientation, sustainability and knowledge sharing, engagement and communication. (See Annex 1: Proposal on Revised programme strategy and management arrangements, June 3, 2010).

Development partners have also been looking at the DIP support in light of the Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. DIP donors have in particular emphasized on principles of ownership, harmonization and coordination, mutual accountability, managing for results and the use of local systems. (See Annex 2: Development Partners note on DIP -June 3, 2010)

The DIP MTE also comes at a time when the Development Assistance Group (DAG) is undergoing a review which is expected to take in to account the roles, membership and structure of the Governance Technical Working group. The national elections were held in May 2010 throwing up possible challenges that would be of concern for capacity building of the democratic institutions.

1.4 Evaluation Guiding Principles

The DIP MTE would be guided by evaluation principles ensuring: utility focused and a learning tool that creates an opportunity to share insights and knowledge about what worked, what didn't work and why. This process helps all stakeholders to understand the reasons for non performance and offers advice on how to address them. The UNDP evaluation policy maintains that participation in evaluation by stakeholders creates a shared understanding enhances ownership and builds capacity of stakeholders and leads to timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into policies, strategies and decision-making processes and future programme/project development. Evaluation is not fault finding, nor aimed at attributing praise or blame to particular individuals or institutions. Overall, evaluation should aim at independence, objectivity and impartiality of the process and a tool for accountability.

II. Review and Assessment of the DIP to date

Following the approval of the Sub-Programme documents, implementation commenced in June 2008 with five partners namely FEAC, EHRC, HoF, HoPR and EIO. Two other IPs – OFAG and NEBE joined later in 2009. While the five IPs have had 24 months of implementation as at the end of June 2010, OFAG and NEEBE have had less period of implementation. Being a five year programme, DIP would have been implemented for two years by June 2010 thereby necessitating an evaluation to gauge performance, challenges and lessons learned. This would help direct the programme towards achieving the set outcomes.

The capacity of the five IPs (FEAC, EHRC, EIO, HoF and HoPR) has been assessed using a self-assessment method which was very useful in establishing the current gaps and strengths within the IPs. During the same period, a gender audit exercise was undertaken to establish the IPs gender sensitivity. The gaps identified through the self-assessment exercise were matched with appropriate interventions as areas for improvement by the IPs. These gaps would be addressed in the new AWP which have been aligned with the Ethiopian Fiscal year. The report from the ongoing capacity assessment of the Office of the Auditor General would help to determine the type of gaps that exist and appropriate interventions to be incorporated into the 2003/2004 AWP. In the case of the NEBE that did not take part in the capacity assessment exercise conducted in March 2010, the new AWP provides opportunity for conducting one.

It is expected that for the bigger picture of the DIP to emerge through this MTE, the consultants would, among others, review the following document: PASDEP, DIP Umbrella document, Sub-Programme documents, Capacity Assessment Report, DIP Gender Audit Report, HACT report, DIP RBM tools, DAG Governance Strategy document, proposed Management arrangement and emerging initiatives being put forward by both UNDP and the DIP donors.

III. Purpose and Objective of the MTE

The overall objective of the mid-term evaluation is the progress made towards strengthening the capacities of the IPs and achievements made against the planned programmes results. The report from the evaluation exercise would assist the IPs, DIP Donors and the UNDP in determining whether the objectives of the programme are being achieved or not and thus decide the next line of actions to be taken. While the GoE might be considered as the primary audience or beneficiary, the result is also important for the UNDP and donors to determine if strategies deployed are working, value for money and if possible to achieve the overall programme output of contributing to the attainment of the PASDEP goal.

Specifically, the MTE shall:

1. Examine the implications of changing programme environment and their implication for the attainment and management of a fully operational democratic, accountable and responsive constitutional federalism ensuring citizens participation and empowerment.
2. Review the programme management modalities and recommend options for more effective and efficient programme delivery in the next cycle;
3. Review progress towards achievement of programme results and potential impact as appropriate, and identify main lessons learned and challenges faced to move the programme forward as well as corrective mid-course actions needed as appropriate.
4. Assess the extent to which the programme is addressing an integrated systemic approach to capacity development that incorporates the three levels of capacity development and

- Identify challenges, partnerships and opportunities for accelerated delivery of the Capacity Development programme to DIP institutions.
5. Review mechanism of resource allocations among IPs.
 6. Review the extent to which cross cutting issues are incorporated in the programme design and implementation such as mainstreaming of human rights based approach, the role of CSOs, gender and safeguards measures addressing anti-corruption and within the DIP programme.
 7. Harmonization and coordination with other programmes for DIP IPs.
 8. Review internal harmonization, partnerships, synergies and coordination within the DIP IPs, UNDP and donors
 9. Provide recommendation for increased effectiveness and alignment.

IV. Evaluation criteria

The objective of the evaluation is to undertake an in-depth analysis of the programme in order to generate comprehensive and specific feedback. The review report must fully and comprehensively examine the following:

1. Assess the **effectiveness** of the programme: The extent to which the programme's stated objectives have been achieved. The effectiveness of the programme should be assessed in accordance with the activities, outputs and outcomes detailed in the results framework enclosed in the programme document. Factors contributing to and detracting from results including the current programme management and coordination arrangement should also be included in the analysis.
2. Assess the **sustainability** of the programme: The extent to which benefits from the project will continue or are likely to continue when the DIP support comes to an end.
3. Assess the **relevance** of the programme: The degree to which the programme has been justified and appropriate in relation to the need and situation on the national/regional/global level.
4. Assess the **efficiency**: The analysis and the evaluation of the overall programme performance, the outputs in relation to the inputs, the financial management and the implementing timetable.
5. Assess **coordination**: The extent to which there has been coordination with similar initiatives such as the JGAM, PSCAP, PBS etc

The MTE report should clearly outline progress, identify the challenges of the programme and make recommendations for building on the strengths and addressing challenges. This being a capacity development programme, opportunities to strengthen the overall capacity development approach should be explored.

V. Methodology:

The MTE process is based on the review of progress against the programme Results Matrices i.e. programmatic achievements are reviewed against the expected results – and analyzed for relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. The MTE would be a systematic, comprehensive and fully participatory and independent process to ensure an objective result from the exercise. In all MTE analytical work, lessons and recommendations shall be grounded in evidence and facts with triangulated information sources that encompass all MTE consultations, stakeholders and partners.

Proposed adjustment of the DIP will be based on the recommendations and lessons learned through the MTE processes and agreed with Government and Donors.

Thus more specifically, the following or more methodologies shall be applicable:

- Desk review of relevant documentation
- Interviews with Stakeholders
- Participatory consultations with key Stakeholders
- Field visits

The following stakeholders (among others) will be consulted:

- a) Ministry of Finance and Economic Development –Multilateral Cooperation Department
- b) Heads of All DIP implementing partners
- c) Management , Technical staff and experts of DIP institutions
- d) Regional office Management, Technical staff and experts
- e) DIP Donors –CIDA, DFID, SIDA, EU, Netherlands , Norway, Austria, Italy, Denmark, Ireland, UN OHCHR, USAID
- f) UNDP – Management, Governance and Human Rights Section, DIP Coordination Unit
- g) UN Agencies and Donors supporting governance programmes in Ethiopia and / undertaking work with DIP institutions

VI. Timeframe and Duty Station

Timeframe: The team of three consultants (two internationals and one national) is required to take up to a total of 45 working days, excluding travel time.

Duty Station: Addis Ababa with travels to the regions.

Budget: \$50,000

VII. The Output(s)

The main output of the review will be a comprehensive report as outlined below:

- Executive summary
- Background/Introduction (A brief description of the program, including, key results, strategies, resources, and the PASDEP)
- Objectives, scope, method and data sources
- Analysis of program progress (comparison of planned and achieved results and resources by sub programme) – including relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and coordination.
- Challenges and opportunities (including assessment of the assumptions)
- Lessons learnt
- Recommendations
- Annexes (as desired)

VIII. Deliverables

1. Inception Report within two weeks of the assignment which will include proposed action plan for completion of the assignment.
2. First Draft Report and presentation of preliminary findings
3. Final Report: The Consultant will submit the final report covering all aspects of the ToRs and integrating inputs provided.
4. Validation workshop/consultative meeting with all stakeholders

IX. Qualification and experience of resource person(s)

A team of three consultants would be required to carry out the assignment. All three would be required to possess the following qualifications.

Education and technical expertise	Experiences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advanced University Degree in Law, Political Sciences, Public Administration or related disciplines,; Ph. D. will have an added advantage; Professional achievements in relevant fields; Ability to work under critical situation with regard to political environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive knowledge in evaluating governance related capacity building programmes 8-10 years experience in the field of democracy and governance reform initiatives in developing countries Candidates with regional/ international experience on elections and conflict resolution would be preferred. Preferably have experiences in working with UN agencies/bi-lateral agencies including experience in evaluating multi-donor initiatives. Women are particularly encouraged to apply.

ACTIVITY	WORKWEEK								
	Wk1	Wk2	Wk3	Wk4	WK5	WK6	WK7	WK8	Wk9
Arrival and briefing of consultants									
Presentation of an action plan									
Inception report: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Submission by consultants Review and feedback from MTESC 									
Desk review of materials/documents									
Consultation with GoE (MOFED/IPs)									
Regional Consultation (NEBE Regional Office/ORAGs/RSC)									
Consultation with DIP Donors									
Preparation of draft interim report: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Submission by consultants Feedback from MTESC 									
Stakeholder's workshop on the draft report									
Preparation and submission of final report									