**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

Outcome evaluation “*Post-conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived and employment generated*”

*Under the CPAP 2009-2012*

**Terms of Reference**

**1. Background**

1.1 The Sudan Context

In 2005, the Government of Sudan, led by National Congress Party (NCP), and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) signed a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) formally ending the second phase of the war between the North and the South. The agreement was concluded within the framework of the Inter-Governmental Authority for Development (IGAD), and supported by the regional grouping of East African States, and a troika of countries (USA, UK & Norway). As a result, the Government of National Unity (GoNU) was formed at the national level (comprising members of NCP and SPLM) and a semi-autonomous Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS) was formed in the South. In October 2006 the Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement (ESPA) was signed between the government and the Eastern Front. Although these agreements ended decades of civil war and social unrest, conflict in Darfur created a new front of instability, which has engaged a number of peacemaking efforts over the past few years.

Sudan’s conflicts have generated mounting development and humanitarian challenges, undermining advances in human development. Against this background UNDP Sudan’s strategy reflects the findings of the [*UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*](http://www.sd.undp.org/Doc/CCA-UNDAF-Apr2002.htm) 2009-2012, and is detailed in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for 2009-2012. The CPAP constitutes the legal agreement between UNDP and the Government of Sudan and details the programme design and capacity development strategies. UNDP in Sudan works on the basis of “one country – two systems”. The Country Office, located in Khartoum manages programmes both at the national and regional level, and collaborates closely with the UNDP Regional Office in Juba in Southern Sudan. UNDP has opened 18 sub-offices and project offices across the country, located in Eastern Sudan, Southern Sudan, the Three Protocol Areas and Darfur.

In response to the challenges of implementing the CPA and addressing the pervasive human development deficits across the country, the UNDP Sudan programme has focussed attention on three areas: 1) poverty reduction and achievement of the MDGs, 2) democratic governance, and 3) crisis prevention and recovery.

This mid-term evaluation will focus on outcome 7 of the CPAP, one of 7 outcomes which frame the UNDP programme in Sudan for 2009-2012.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Thematic Area** | **Intended Outcome** |
| I. Poverty reduction and the achievement of the MDGs | 1. Enhanced national and sub-national capacities to plan, monitor, evaluate, and implement the MDGs and related national development policies and priorities. |
| 2. Improved impact of resources to fight HIV/AIDS |
| II. Fostering and consolidating democratic governance | 3. Institutions, systems and processes of democratic governance strengthened |
| 4. National/sub-national/state/local levels of governance expand their capacities to manage equitable delivery of public services |
| 5. Rights upheld and protected through accountable, accessible and equitable Rule of Law institutions |
| III. Crisis prevention and recovery | 6. Strengthened capacity of national, sub-national, state and local institutions and communities to manage the environment and natural disasters to reduce conflict over natural resources. |
| 7. Post–conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived and employment generated. |

For further details on the UNDP crisis prevention and recovery interventions across Sudan, See <http://www.sd.undp.org/security.htm>

2.1 The UNDP Policy Environment

All UNDP programming is designed to build national ownership and capacity, in line with the Paris Declaration and the UNDP Strategic Plan 2008 – 2011. At the same time, CPR programming is developed and implemented in line with the Eight Point Agenda for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (8PA). In the context of increasing UN harmonization, UNDP’s programme is also designed to support progress towards ‘One UN’.

**2. Purpose and Objectives**

2.1 Purpose

The evaluation will review and analyze the progress towards achieving results of the crisis prevention and recovery (CPR) portfolio for the ongoing CPAP (2009-2012), assess the extent to which the relevant projects and programmes have contributed to the achievement of CPAP results and the relevance of the outcome and the associated output achievements to the current context. At the same time, the evaluation will consider the cumulative effect of CPR programming over the period of the Common Country Framework (CCF2) (2002-2006) and the Bridging Programme (2007-2008), drawing on the findings of the CCF2 evaluation.

The evaluation should include an analysis of synergies between crisis prevention and recovery and key human development dimensions, which help support the achievement of the MDGs. Assessment of UNDP in early recovery coordination will be an important component of the evaluation.

2.2 Objectives

The overall objective of this outcome evaluation is, therefore, to evaluate, at the mid-point of the CPAP, progress in restoring infrastructure, reviving the economy and generating income in all North and South Sudan and assess the contribution of UNDP Sudan has been to this progress since 2009.

*Specific Objectives are to:*

* Assess progress made in mine action, DDR, arms control and community security (including livelihood) programming to reduction of conflict and restoration of peace and analyze the setting in which real progress towards the MDGs can be made in Sudan.
* Assess the extent to which CPR programmes have been successful in building national capacities.
* Evaluate the differential progress on women, men and youth in the UNDP CPR programmes.
* Assess the effectiveness of early recovery coordination in Sudan and how this has (or has not) contributed to overall progress towards CPR objectives.
* From a longer term perspective (from 2002), make an assessment of overall progress (or lack of progress) on restoring infrastructure, economic revival and income generation and community security, and of the contribution of UNDP to this progress.
* Advise on the suitability of indicators and other verification tools used to measure progress towards outcomes and outputs
* Evaluate the degree to which the programmes adjust and contribute to progress towards One UN.

The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will feed into the mid term review of the CPAP in 2011, and inform the formulation of the next programming cycle 2013-2017.

The CPAP results framework for outcome 7 (below) provides the starting point for the evaluation, identifying desired results and indicators of success which guided project formation and implementation to date. While these results and indicators will be a central feature of the assessment methodology, the evaluation is expected to assess their suitability so as to measure progress towards the achievement of the outcome.

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL OUTCOME:** Post–conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived and employment generated. |
| **Outcome indicators**: Change in human security (mines, small arms, socio-economic) of crisis affected groups. National mine action management and technical expertise in place to address social/economic impacts of mines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Expected outputs** | **Annualised output targets and indicators** |
| National/sub-national capacities strengthened to manage the national mine action programme. | **Indicator:** National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) and Southern Sudan Demining Commission (SSDC) capacitated to implement their mandate and lead the mine action activities  **Indicator:** No. of national de-miners trained/equipped/field deployed for clearance of mine/ERW affected areas.  **Baseline**: 240 JIUde-miners trained/equipped & 110 de-miners field deployed; 446 km of Babanusa-Wau railway line and 234 km of roads in Kassala state. National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) and Southern Sudan Demining Commission (SSDC) established through presidential decrees  **Targets:**  2009-2010: Knowledge of concerned NMAA, NMAC and SSDC staff developed at the technical (mine clearance) and functional level  2011: National authorities capacitated to finance and lead the mine action coordination activities; knowledge of130 national de-miners developed to conduct mine action activities  2012: National authorities capacitated to assume full responsibility of mine action process; 130 JIU de-miners equipped and deployed |
| Reintegration of ex-combatants completed in accordance with the national DDR strategy with support of UNMIS | **Indicator**: Number of ex-combatants and associated groups, demobilized & reintegrated, disaggregated by age, gender and disability;  **Indicator:** Percentage of participants that report successful individual reintegration projects in client satisfaction surveys;  **Baseline**: 1,700 ex-combatants disarmed and demobilized in ESPA areas.  **Target**:  2009:  -2,900 participants, including 200 disabled, disarmed, demobilized and reintegrated in East;  -30,000 participants in CPA areas, including 1900 women and 2000 disabled, participating or completing reintegration.  -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys  -Preparatory support provided to parties in Darfur, DDR of participants, pending political negotiations;  2010:  -60,000 participants, including 4100 women and 15,500 disabled, participating or completed reintegration  -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys  -DDR of candidates in Darfur, pending political process.  2011:  -45,000 participants, including 4100 women and 15,500 disabled, participating or completed reintegration  -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys  -DDR of candidates in Darfur, pending political process.  2012:  -45,000 participants, including 4100 women and 15,500 disabled, participating or completed reintegration  -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys  -DDR of candidates in Darfur, pending political process.  -N/SSDDRCs successfully implementing nationally-owned DDR. |
| Proliferation and circulation of small arms reduced | **Indicator**: Number of state level community security and arms control action plans developed and implemented. Number of communities benefitting from CSAC activities  **Baseline**: No community security and arms control action plans developed. Five small CSAC projects being implemented in BNS, SKS, KRT, RS and Kassala.  **Targets:**  **North:**  2009: 5 sub-projects developed and implement community security and arms control action plans  2010: 10 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans  2011: 20 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans  **South:**  2009: 3 states develop and implement community security and arms control action plans; 1 Platform for Peace  2010: 6 states (cumulative) develop and implement community security and arms control action plans; 3 Platforms for Peace  2011: All 10 states (cumulative) develop and implement community security and arms control action plans |
| Post-conflict recovery accelerated in strategic areas to ensure peace dividends are visible and tangible to conflict affected populations | **Indicator**: Number of recovery projects established and/or people benefiting including returnees and ex-IDPs from recovery and development initiatives through strengthening CBOs/Civil Society and Local Govt. Authorities.  **Baseline**: 10 community-based integrated recovery & rehabilitation projects running.  **Targets**:  2009: Rural livelihood initiatives in 10 states; 100,000 beneficiaries: 30% female; 30% youth  2010: 200,000 beneficiaries (cumulative): 35% female; 35% youth  2011: 300,000 beneficiaries (cumulative): 40% female; 40% youth. |

2.3 Additional Evaluation Objectives

In addition to informing mid-term discussions on the CPAP, the evaluation will:

* Strengthen UNDP Sudan accountability to internal and external partners by gathering evidence on programmes and progress towards desired results at outcome and output level.
* Identify areas of strength, weakness and gaps especially in regard to:
* The appropriateness of the UNDP partnership strategy
* Impediments to the outcome
* Assess the need for midcourse adjustments
* Lessons learned for the next programme cycle

In order to ensure that programmes remain on target, or are adjusted to remain relevant to current needs and the current context.

* Inform higher level evaluations (e.g. at the country or regional level) and subsequent programming.
* Identify lessons learned and good practice to support learning across UNDP of crisis prevention and recovery programming.

**3. Scope of the Evaluation and Main issues**

3.1 Scope

The evaluation will cover all North and South Sudan and focus on the CPR portfolio of the CPAP. Setting the assessment of progress in the context of the history and current political and socio-economic setting will be important for the analysis and interpretation of results, so the evaluation will draw on existing situational/context/conflict assessments, particularly the work of the Threat and Risk Mapping and Analysis Project in Sudan.

3.2 Issues influencing the evaluation

*Exploring linkages between crisis prevention and key human development features*

In Sudan, deficits in human development are among the biggest obstacles to achieving the MDGs. The evaluation will look at the role of crisis prevention and recovery activities in supporting the effort to achieving MDGs in Sudan. It is hoped that this type of assessment will help set the frame for the “big picture” story which will emerge from the outcome evaluation, in recognition of the significant and inextricable linkages between UNDP’s crisis prevention and recovery portfolio and the other major pillars of the 2009-2012 CPAP.

*Strengthening national capacities, particularly governance and coordination mechanisms, in crisis*, prevention and recovery *response*

Governments (national and local) play a critical role in addressing crisis, prevention and recovery that affects national development goals. In view of the role played by good governance (legal frameworks and policies, administrative and institutional systems, coordination among different government agencies), in risk reduction and crisis prevention and recovery, the evaluation should remain mindful of UNDP’s support to local institutions and community participation in improving crisis prevention and recovery management. The interplay of different local actors and the extent of civil society participation in decision-making will be a key feature of the overall assessment. One possible line of enquiry in the evaluation will be UNDP’s support to furthering coordination efforts and the lessons that can be drawn for strengthening coordination strategies.

*Early Recovery*

UNDP defines early recovery as the application of development principles of participation, sustainability and local ownership to humanitarian situations with the aim of stabilizing local and national capacities. This means that early recovery should start as early as possible during humanitarian action and that early recovery activities should be foundational in nature and designed to ‘seize opportunities that go beyond saving lives and contribute to the restoration of national capacity, livelihoods and human security’. This definition is the basis of resources and guidance provided by the UNDP-led Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Cluster Working Group on Early Recovery (CWGER). It situates early recovery within humanitarian settings and also firmly roots UNDP’s approach to early recovery in humanitarian coordination and funding systems.

Since 2005 the Country Office has placed a greater emphasis on early recovery in Sudan with strong support from the Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery (BCPR). Issues gravitate around questions of livelihoods, housing and social economic infrastructure, social equity, and addressing the root causes of conflict and insecurity and activities have focused mainly on Abyei and Darfur (through the BCPR funded Darfur Area Focus Action Plan).

Ultimately, this evaluation will assess the effectiveness of these initial early recovery initiatives and advise how these may be better defined in terms of design, implementation and monitoring progress.

*Addressing the linkages between conflict and natural resources*

Conflict-prone countries pose challenges for natural resource management efforts. While coordination among UN agencies and partnerships with donor and development organizations are crucial in maximizing the contribution to human development, complex crisis situations require programme strategies that are sensitive to such situations and have an integrated approach. The evaluation will examine the main issues pertinent to UNDP’s programming, paying attention to conflict over natural resources and the manner in which conflict impacts on resource management strategies and policies.

*Conflict Sensitivity*

All programming (including the evaluation design and conduct) in settings of actual or potential conflict need to be conflict sensitive – e.g. reflect an awareness of and be appropriate to the specifics of potential or actual tension. Principles of conflict sensitivity include:

1. All programming needs to be sensitive to the inherent (or overt) tensions or to potential or actual conflicts, and be conducted in such a way to – at a minimum - not heighten tensions and – at best – reduce tensions
2. Security of all involved (programme staff; beneficiaries; and evaluation staff ) needs to be factored into all decisions
3. Crisis settings are characteristically dynamic, and it is not unusual for changes in the setting to happen in short periods of time. Therefore, flexibility needs to be built in around the need to re-visit programming objectives to ensure they are still appropriate to the situation, as well as over the timing and appropriate methods of data collection according to what is feasible and can realistically be achieved
4. All programming should maintain a ‘big picture’ perspective

The evaluation will consider to what extent the CPR portfolio in Sudan has been designed and implemented in a conflict sensitive manner, and to what extent it has heightened or lessened tensions, either as an explicit or an implicit part of the programmes.

*Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women*

The UNDP Strategic Plan 2008-2011 states that “Gender empowerment will be given special emphasis throughout all UNDP activities in crisis-affected countries. The UNDP ‘Eight Point Agenda for Women’s Empowerment’ and ‘Gender Equality in Crisis Prevention and Recovery’ will guide the activities within this area”.[[1]](#footnote-1) Issues of how programmes have been designed and implemented to support this commitment, taking into account the different needs of men, women, girls and boys, need to inform the evaluation in terms of data collection and analysis.

**In light of these issues, the evaluation will seek to respond, at a minimum, to the following questions:**

1. What factors underlie the development situation in respect to the CPAP outcome 7?
2. What progress has been made towards the achievement of CPAP outcome 7?
3. What contribution has UNDP made towards the achievement of the outcome and in this context how has UNDP positioned itself among other CPR actors and partners to add value in response to the needs and changes in the national development context?
4. What unintended consequences have emerged from the UNDP programme interventions?
5. What have been the factors which have impeded progress and to what extent has UNDP’s contribution been curtailed by these factors? Under such circumstances are there actions which UNDP could have taken or should still take to reverse such challenges?
6. What has been the key contribution made by UNDP through "soft" assistance and advocacy in support to achieving the outcome?
7. What are the gaps/weaknesses in the current programme design and management/operational features in so far as they apply to the implementation of projects and programme under the crisis prevention and recovery portfolio?
8. What are the lessons learned from the programme activities thus far and how should these be applied to inform management decisions in order to strengthen UNDP’s programme in the crisis prevention and recovery area, both in determining the direction for the remainder of the current CPAP and for consideration for the new programme cycle?

3.2 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will use the following criteria:

**Relevance:** Assess if UNDP policy goals and programmes in Sudan address the development needs at the country level, particularly in addressing critical gaps in crisis prevention and recovery priorities identified by various stakeholders and aligned to the national priorities. The evaluation will seek to draw lessons from UNDP’s response to national priorities vis-à-vis the Government and other agencies.

**Effectiveness:** Assessment of the performance of UNDP’s support to crisis prevention and recovery in terms of achievement of results. The evaluation will assess the extent to which UNDP’s contribution has strengthened national capacity and contributed to real progress in the eyes of different stakeholders in the relevant areas.

**Efficiency**: The extent to which UNDP has instituted systems and clear procedures to provide coordinated support and the relationship of inputs (financial and staff) to results gained. This will involve looking at the suitability of UNDP operational and financial management procedures in responding to crises prevention and the extent to which these procedures have helped or hindered efficiency and the achievement of results.

**Sustainability** This will assess whether UNDP has been able to support development institutions, frameworks and procedures and develop the capacities of national institutions. The evaluation will examine the sustainability of the programmes results and benefits and explore whether UNDP projects and programmes develop/strengthen mechanisms to promote scaling up and replication of successful results.

**Impact**: Examine the impact of the programme in terms of whether the design and implementation of the relevant projects and programmes has facilitated or hindered progress towards the outcomes of the CPAP and UNDAF. Determine whether the current programmes design and implementation will allow for the optimum achievements of the planned impact on the target groups.

**Connectedness**: In conflict/post-conflict settings, it is important to assess not only the progress made against project or programme goals, but the contribution of individual projects to the overall conflict prevention and peacebuilding process. Assessment of connectedness should also include the extent to which projects and programme were complementary or contradictory.

**4. Methodology and Approach**

The evaluation team shall propose the approach, design, methods and data collection strategies to be adopted for conducting the evaluation in the inception report, whereby the evaluation team agrees with the UNDP Sudan office the approach, design, methods and strategy required to successfully complete the exercise. The evaluation will be a transparent, participatory process involving all the development stakeholders at the country level. It will be carried out within the framework of UNDP Evaluation Policy[[2]](#footnote-2) and UNEG norms and standards[[3]](#footnote-3). The methodology should make reference to the OECD Guidelines on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peace building as they are relevant to this situation.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The evaluation team is encouraged to develop a Theory of Change (TOC), which will represent the framework for examining the effectiveness of UNDP’s support to crisis prevention and recovery. Given that this will reflect the thinking behind the choice of specific interventions to address identified gaps and needs; this will need to be developed retrospectively with the help of programme staff, ideally who were there at the time the programmes/projects were developed. The relevance and appropriateness of the TOC will then be tested by the evaluation in terms and may need to be adjusted going forward if the needs/gaps or even the wider context changed.

The evaluation itself will follow 3 distinct phases:

1. Preparation - review of the Terms of Reference, preliminary desk review, meetings with the UNDP programme and production of Inception Report;
2. Conduct of the evaluation – 3 week mission in the field including meeting with donors and relevant stakeholders
3. Follow up – Production of the final Evaluation Report, dissemination of results and organizing stakeholder consultations, development of management response and relevant management actions.

4.1 Preparation

A *programme portfolio review/document review*

This desk review will be carried out prior to the evaluation team arriving in Sudan. Due to the broad scope of UNDP’s work in crisis prevention and recovery a very large number of documents and reports (published and unpublished) are available for review. Some may be subject to only a general review while others will require detailed scrutiny. Key sources of information will include programme and project documents, results frameworks, quarterly and annual reports, evaluations and documents related to relevant work of other organisations. UNDP will create an online repository for these documents so that the evaluation team can access this data before the evaluation mission.

*Stakeholder analysis*

Based on the desk review and professional knowledge of the issues, the evaluation team should conduct a stakeholder analysis which will be carried out to identify organizations working in the area of crisis prevention and recovery in Sudan. With the support of the UNDP Sudan office, this analysis should be used to ascertain which individuals and organizations need to be included as part of the consultation process during the evaluation mission.

*Production of the Inception Report*

Based on the desk review, the Evaluation Team will produce a draft Inception Report. The final inception report will be finalized after initial meetings with the UNDP programme unit and the evaluation manager.

The inception report should outline at a minimum the following issues:

1. A clear purpose and scope of the evaluation, which includes a clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and an outline of the main issues to be examined
2. An outline of the evaluation criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to assess performance.
3. The evaluation methodology, including methods used for collecting data and their sources (which include qualitative and quantitative data collection strategies), including a rationale for their selection, as well as data collection tools with an explanation of their reliability and validity and a sampling plan. The methodology will take into consideration country-level data limitations.
4. An evaluation matrix which identifies the key evaluation questions and an indication of how the team expects these questions to be answered.
5. Evaluation Work Plan outlining tasks, a revised schedule of the evaluation milestones and responsibility of the evaluation team members.

4.2 Conduct of the Evaluation

Prior to the evaluation field mission, UNDP will designate an Evaluation Manager, who will assume the day-to-day responsibilities for managing the evaluation process and serve as the focal point for ensuring the evaluation runs smoothly. In addition UNDP will identify an Evaluation Reference Group comprised of the key national stakeholders. This group will ensure the national ownership of the evaluation and work closely with the Evaluation Manager to guide the process. It is therefore imperative that the evaluation method ensures that the perspectives of different stakeholders are captured and recommendations are validated through the prism of nationally-owned priorities.

Against this background the field mission will be based on the following modules:

* Inception meeting of the core evaluation team will be held for preliminary discussions with the country office and the Ministry of International Cooperation.
* The main source of information will be through structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews and consultations. In some cases, focus group discussions may be held to capture the dynamic of information sharing and debate, and to enrich the findings. The consultations will involve a wide range of development stakeholders, including government officials, UN agencies, UNDP project managers, donors, NGO, INGOs, and groups of beneficiaries.
* Consultations will involve visits to locations outside Khartoum. Therefore exploration of the reality/ implementation of CPR programme will be carried out mainly through in-depth study involving field visits to selected project sites and analysis of relevant secondary data, in conjunction with partners, stakeholders and staff involved in delivery of the programmes and operation activities.
* Preparing the draft report
* Meeting of the Reference Group and other key stakeholders to present the initial findings of the evaluation at the end of the field mission
* Incorporating comments and producing the Final Evaluation Report

4.3 Follow-up and Learning

The findings of the evaluation report will be reviewed jointly by UNDP and national stakeholders and partners to ensure that the key recommendations are incorporated into the design of new projects and programmes. The UNDP CO will draft a management response outlining how the evaluation findings will be applied.

### 5. Evaluation outputs and time-frame

### The key evaluation outputs include:

* Inception report of the evaluation, which includes the evaluation methodology and evaluation work plan outlining tasks and responsibilities of the evaluation team members (as detailed above).
* Power Point presentation for UNDP, the government counterparts and other stakeholders on the preliminary findings, lessons learned, and recommendations
* Draft full report covering the issues outlined in the terms of reference and inception report including evaluation findings and conclusions, lessons and recommendations.
* Final evaluation report, which should at a minimum include the following components:
* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the evaluation methodology
* Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods and/or implementation strategy
* Key findings
* Conclusions and practical, actionable recommendations for the future program implementation
* Annexes including
  + Itinerary
  + List of persons interviewed
  + Summary of field visits
  + List of documents reviewed
  + Client online survey and/or questionnaire (if any) used and summary of results
  + Any other relevant material that supports evaluation findings and recommendations

1. **Indicative Time-frame of the Evaluation**

The final implementation plan for the evaluation will be outlined in the inception report, but it is expected that the final Evaluation Report should be delivered by 20 November 2010.

Tentative Evaluation schedule

| **Activity** | **Timeframe** | **Place** | **Responsible Party** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Desk review | 6-11 September (6 days) | Home-based | All team members |
| Initial meeting and discussion among the team members | 12 September | Khartoum | Team Leader |
| Conduct meetings with the UNDP programme unit | 13 – 14 September (2 days) | Khartoum & Juba | Team Leader |
| Drafting/ finalizing Inception Report, outlining evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan | 15- 17 September (3 days) | Khartoum | Team Leader |
| Final Inception Report | By 21 September | Khartoum | Team Leader |
| In-country field mission | 19 September 9 October (21 days) | Selected locations throughout Sudan | All team members and UNDP Evaluation Manager |
| Presentation of preliminary findings and Draft Recommendations to senior management and Reference Group | 10 -12 October (2 Days) | Khartoum & Juba | All Team members |
| Finalization of  First draft of full evaluation report | By 28 October (10 days allocated) | Home-based | Team Leader |
| Finalization of second draft, following feedback from UNDP | By 20 November (5 days allocated) | Home-based | Team Leader |

**7. Management of the Evaluation**

UNDP Sudan will institute the evaluation manager function which will act as the focal point for managing the evaluation process. The Khartoum and Juba offices will each nominate their respective evaluation managers, who will provide administrative and substantive backstopping support. The Evaluation Managers will ensure the coordination and liaison with concerned agencies in north and south Sudan respectively, and ensure the evaluation is conducted in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

### 8. Quality Assurance

The Reference Group will comprise of government counterparts and UNDP staff and will provide oversight of the evaluation process, exercising quality assurance. The Reference Group will play an important role in providing strategic, methodological and substantive advice into the evaluation process as well as a peer review for the key outputs including the main report. Meetings of the Reference Group will be specified in the evaluation work plan.

However, the evaluation will be fully independent and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach to collecting and analyzing data for the outcome evaluation. Ultimately, the findings and recommendations of the evaluation will be those of the evaluation team alone .

**9. Evaluation Team**

The core evaluation team will comprise of three independent consultants, an International consultant (team leader), one national evaluation *specialist* for North Sudan and one national evaluation specialist for South Sudan.

**A. Team Leader (International)**

The *team leader* will take a lead role during the evaluation and coordinate the work of all other team members. The team leader will ensure the quality of the evaluation process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products. The team leader, in close collaboration with the other evaluation team members and the UNDP evaluation managers, will take the lead role in conceptualization and design of the evaluation and shaping the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report. The tasks of the team leader include:

* Develops an inception report and details the design, methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis criteria for selection of projects, required resources), and work plan of the evaluation team.
* Directs and conducts the research and analysis of all relevant documentation;
* Decides the division of labour within the evaluation team and coordinates team tasks within the framework of the TORs;
* Oversees and quality assures the preparation of the study and takes a lead in the analysis of the evaluative evidence;
* Oversees the administration, and analysis of the results of the data collection exercise;
* Drafts the evaluation report, and coordinates the inputs from team members;
* Prepares for meetings with UNDP and other stakeholder to review findings, conclusions and recommendations.
* Leads the stakeholder feedback sessions, briefs UNDP on the evaluation through informal sessions and finalizes the report based on feedback from the quality assurance process;
* Delivers the final evaluation report.

***Required skills and experience:***

* Master’s Degree in a relevant discipline
* At least 10 years of working experience in evaluation of crisis prevention and recovery projects and programmes ,
* Experience with participatory approaches, organizational assessments partnership strategies and capacity development preferred.
* Regional expertise in either Africa or Arab countries
* Experience with regional organizations and the UN system in the area of crisis prevention and recovery.
* Proven experience as an evaluation team leader with ability to lead and work with other evaluation experts.
* Facilitation skills and ability to manage diversity of views in different cultural contexts
* Ability to produce well written reports demonstrating analytical ability and communication skill
* Fluent in English.

**B. *Evaluation specialists*** *(2 National* Consultants for Juba and Khartoum)

The **Evaluation Specialist** will provide the expertise in the crisis prevention and recovery with sound understanding of the Sudan context. The evaluation specialist is expected to

Perform the following tasks:

* Review relevant documents;
* Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology ad provide inputs o the inception report ;
* Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs, and partnership strategy
* Carry out fieldwork and data collection as per the inception report and Terms of reference
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report as agreed on the division of labor with the team leader
* Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the evaluation final report including incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

***Required skills and experience:***

* At least a master’s degree in a relevant field
* At least seven years work experience in the areas of crisis prevention and recovery
* At least 5 years experience in evaluation
* Proven experience in results based management systems
* Strong quantitative and qualitative research skills
* Good analytical ability and drafting skills
* Excellent coordination and team working skills
* Fluent in English.

**10. Reference materials**

At a minimum, the evaluation team should study and make reference to the following documents during the conduct of the outcome evaluation:

* UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
* UNEG Ethical Guidelines For Evaluation
* Evaluation report template and quality standards (UNDP)
* UNDP Results-Based Management: Technical Note
* United Nations Common Country Assessment (CCA) for Sudan (2007)
* United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Sudan (2009-2012)
* UNDP Country Programme Document and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (2009-2012)
* UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) for Sudan ( 2007-2009)
* CPRU project documents, project reports and project evaluation reports.
* CCF-2 and the Bridging Programme documents
* CCF2 Evaluation Report (2009)
* Sudan 5 year strategic Plan
* Other documents and materials related to the outcomes to be evaluated (from the government, donors, etc.)

1. UNDP Strategic Plan, 2008-2011, DP/2007/43/Rev.1, p29 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://intra.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\_id=21 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. http://www.oecd.org/secure/pdfDocument/0,2834,en\_21571361\_34047972\_39774574\_1\_1\_1\_1,00.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-4)