**** Terms of Reference

OUTCOME EVALUATION: Governance and Human Rights

Country Programme Action Plan (2007 – 2011)

***Country Programme Outcome # 3:*** Strengthened mechanisms for promoting the rule of law, dialogue, participation in the decision-making process and protection of human rights

**A. Background**

The UNDP Governance Programme (2007-2011) was developed at a backdrop of complex economic, social and political governance challenges. The programme was designed to be flexible enough to take advantage of future opportunities as the country recovers from these challenges. It was developed to address the Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework (ZUNDAF) 2007-2011 priorities in line with the Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA) strategic focus on capacity development for pro-poor growth and accountability (CD-PGA) given the centrality of capacity development for Sub Sahara Africa to achieve its development goals and MDG targets.

The programme was also guided by UNDP’s corporate strategic focus on a) poverty reduction and MDG achievement, b) democratic governance, c) crisis prevention and recovery and environment and sustainable development and e) gender as a cross cutting issue as well as the UNDP’s comparative advantages. This strategic focus prioritized support to capacity development of national institutions of governance within the context of the UNDP CD-PGA.

The Governance programme was developed to support the critical dialogue processes based on the premise that credible and sustainable resolution of the complex political, social and economic challenges facing the country will not be possible without the resumption of an effective dialogue. The programme provided support towards activities geared at ensuring that human-rights based approach were integrated into broad-based stakeholders consultation and participatory decision-making processes. It directed significant support towards strengthening the foundations of democratic governance architecture. The programme was designed to support the three pillars of the State namely the Executive, the Legislature and the Judiciary.

On the Executive side, support focused on institutional capacity strengthening with particular emphasis on the implementation of a results-based management system to improve accountability, transparency and effectiveness in service delivery. Support for the Legislature focused on strengthening the capacity of Parliament to effectively play its legislative, representational and Executive oversight roles. Support to the Judiciary focused on judiciary reforms to promote the rule of law, improve justice delivery and to improve the human rights regime. The programme also prioritized dialogue and conflict management given the country context.

According to Zimbabwe UNDP County Office Evaluation Plan for the current programme cycle 2007-2011, an outcome evaluation will be conducted in the third quarter of 2011. The Outcome Evaluation will focus on the Country Office Programme Outcomes supported under the Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework (ZUNDAF) 2007-2011 Outcome 3.

In recent years, UNDP outcome evaluations have moved away from the old approach of assessing project results against the set objectives, and now focus on assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions and the levels of impact. Outcome evaluations work backwards from the outcome: they take the outcome as their starting point and then assess a number of variables.

**B. Evaluation purpose**

This outcome evaluation is being conducted as a mandatory UNDP requirement to assess the status of the achievement of the stated outcome and ascertain the overall results of the programme supported. The evaluation will enable UNDP and the Government of Zimbabwe to draw lessons, document, share knowledge and experiences from the past support programme in order to better respond to the country’s development priorities in the next programme cycle.

**C. Objectives and scope of the Evaluation**

UNDP would like to take stock of its work, contribution and influence in support to the strengthening of systems, institutions, mechanisms and processes that promote good governance, gender equality, the rule of law and dialogue to ensure that the planned programme and portfolio are relevant to national priorities and support the achievement of the planned outcome. The aim is also to take stock of how UNDP has influenced the partners to contribute to the attainment of this outcome.

* Evaluate the impact of UNDP interventions and support and its contribution in building national capacity for efficient, effective, accountable, inclusive and participatory governance, and service delivery system.
* Assess the appropriateness and relevance of the UNDP strategies in addressing the identified problems and hence contributing to the achievement of the outcome. Assess whether the approach was appropriate in addressing the identified problems.
* Assess if the outcome has been achieved or will be achieved given the activities supported by UNDP.
* Provide appraisal on the validity/relevance of the outcome for UNDP supported interventions, and the extent to which the set results and outcomes have or can been achieved;
* Identify gaps/weaknesses if any in the current Programme design and provide recommendations as to their improvement;
* Identify lessons learnt from previous and ongoing interventions in this area;
* Review and assess the Programme’s partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector, international organizations in Programme implementation and comment on its sustainability;
* Review and assess the efficiency of implementation and management arrangements of the Programme;
* Assess achievements, and their sustainability, undertaken by the Programme up until now;
* Review links/joint activities with other UNDP Programmes and UN Agencies and how these have contributed to the achievement of the outcome;
* Review and assess to what extent gender was mainstreamed in the programme as well as what impact the programme has had on women;
* Provide recommendations if necessary on how best to implement the CPAP outcome and its planned interventions.

# *Expected outputs and deliverables*

The consultant is expected to produce an Outcome Evaluation Report that highlights the findings, recommendations and lessons learnt, and give a rating of performance. This report should follow the Outcome Evaluation Report Template and include all sections recommended therein (see attached template). The evaluators are also expected to produce an inception report, a draft report and a presentation of the draft report.

## *Scope of the Evaluation*

The evaluation will cover the time from the start of the country programme (2007-2011) up until current date, and cover all relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Questions guiding the evaluation

*Outcome analysis*

* Are the stated outcomes, indicators and targets relevant for the context, needs and priorities of Zimbabwe, and those of UNDP?
* What is the current status and prospects for achieving the outcome with the indicated inputs and within the indicated timeframe and resources?
* Are the outcome indicators chosen relevant and sufficient to measure the outcomes?
* What are the main factors (positive and negative) within and beyond UNDP are interventions affecting the achievement of the outcome? How have or will these factors limit or facilitate progress towards the achievement of the outcome?
* Are UNDP’s proposed contributions to the achievement of the outcome appropriate, sufficient, effective and do they create sustainable conditions?
* How have other partners contributed to the achievement of the outcome and how instrumental has UNDP been in rallying this contribution?
* How has UNDP influenced policy, institutions, cultural factors and gender in addressing the outcome?

*Output analysis*

* + What are the key outputs that have been or that will most likely be produced by UNDP to contribute to the outcome? Can causality linkages (results chain) be demonstrated between production of outputs and achievement of the outcome?
  + Are the UNDP outputs relevant to the outcome?
  + What are the quantity, quality and timeliness of the outputs? What factors impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs?
  + Are the indicators appropriate to link these outputs to the outcome?
  + Have UNDP outputs been produced?
  + To what extent has UNDP’s ability to advocate best practices, and influence integration of international standards into national policies and plans been adopted?

*Output-outcome link*

* Can UNDP’s outputs or other interventions be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcome?
* What are the key contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome?
* With the current interventions in partnership with other actors and stakeholders, will UNDP and the partners be able to achieve the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs?
* To what extent has UNDP’s been able to develop national capacity in a sustainable manner?
* Has UNDP been able to respond to the changing context circumstances with regards to the output such that it remains relevant?
* What is the prospect for sustainability as a result of UNDP interventions related to the outcome?

*Resources, partnerships, and management analysis*

* + Were partners, stakeholders and/or beneficiaries of UNDP assistance involved in  
    the design of UNDP interventions in the outcomes area? If yes, what were the  
    nature and extent of their participation? If not, why not?
  + Are UNDP’s management structures and working methods appropriate and likely to be effective in achieving this outcome?
  + Does the project and institutional arrangements foster sustainability?
  + Has the intervention developed the necessary capacities (both human and institutionally) for sustainability

*Recommendations*

* Based on the above analysis, how should UNDP adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the proposed outcome is fully achieved?
* What corrective actions are recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP  
  work in the same area?
  + How the Programme effectively contributed to the Government in strengthening the governance and service delivery capacities of the state institutions

***Products expected from the evaluation***

The key product expected from this outcome evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report that includes, but is not limited to, the following components:

* Executive summary – maximum 5 pages
* Introduction
* Description of the evaluation methodology
* Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods
* Key findings
* Conclusions and recommendations for the future program implementation (See UNDP Guidelines for outcome evaluators for more detailed information.)

At the start of the evaluation, an inception report will be required, detailing evaluation scope, methodology, including data collection methods as well as approach for the evaluation.

***Audience***

## The evaluation is intended mainly for UNDP Zimbabwe CO, UNDP HQ, Government partners and other stakeholders.

**D. Description of the context**

The CPAP outcome on governance comprised of four key outputs which centred on; (1)strengthened governance systems in parliament, judiciary, electoral system and public sector reform, (2) enhanced national capacity for conflict transformation, policy dialogue and consultative processes such as the Tripartite Negotiating Forum, National Economic Consultative Forum (NECF) and poverty reduction forum, (3) strengthened capacity of state to ratify, domesticate and implement outstanding regional and international agreements, conventions and protocols, (4) women’s leadership capacity in all sectors and at all levels strengthened.

The Outcome under evaluation identified governance and human rights as a key thematic are for the realisation of strategic development goals in Zimbabwe. However differences in interpretations, views and perceptions on democracy rule of law and good governance characterised the interpretation context of Outcome 3. Capacity gaps in oversight bodies such as Parliament, the Judiciary and Office of the Ombudsman limited efforts in development initiatives. These limitations coupled with the political and economic crisis experienced in 2007 -2008 impacted on delivery until the forumualtion of the Government of National Unity in 2009. Since then, the country has been going through a period of transformation over the past six years which improved delivery significantly.

The 2007-2011 CPAP mid-term review highlighted some of the major achievements with regard to this outcome as well as some of the challenges in the implementation. These included , the strengthened capacity of governance institutions such as Parliament and the Judiciary, the enhanced capacity of the government on results-based management systems and support to the establishment of Parliamentary Constituency Information Centres (PCICs) and increased support to civil society organisations (CSOs) working in governance. The assessment also noted that CPAP programme implementation contributed positively in the areas of the Constitution-making process, dialogue and conflict resolution, national healing processes as well as the promotion of gender equality. Limited funding for PCICS, inadequate resources required attention to fully realise the demands of governance processes such as the Constitution-making process. The general slow pace of governance processes impacted on progress on some outputs.

The success of the Outcome depended on strong joint collaborative approaches including joint programming with the United Nations country team to ensure that the outcome is achieved through collective interventions in the framework of the ZUNDAF. UNDP sought to strengthen its partnerships with Government, Civil Society Organizations, the Donor Community, UN Agencies, the Private Sector and other development partners. UNDP worked with its key implementing partner, the Government, as well as with Parliament, the Judiciary and other quasi-government entities, the essential aim being to improve coordination, and assist government better manage technical cooperation programmes, for improved ownership and leadership in the formulation and implementation of development activities as guided by the country programme document. Special emphasis was put on harmonization and simplification of programme modalities and reinforcing synergies for greater results.

The evaluation should therefore make qualitative and quantitative assessment of the impact of the outcome on governance rule of law and human rights in Zimbabwe towards the attainment of human development goals.

**E. Methodology**

Overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodologies is provided in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*.

Based on these guiding documents, and in consultation with UNDP Zimbabwe, the evaluators should develop a suitable methodology for this specific outcome evaluation.

During the outcome evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

* Desk review of relevant documents (see attached list and documents)
* Discussions with UNDP Zimbabwe senior management and program staff;
* Interviews of partners and stakeholders;
* Consultation meetings and interviews:
* Interviews with relevant projects’ staff
* Interviews with partners
* In-person interviews and focal groups with local institutions, local authorities, NGOs and a sampling of communities and stakeholders
* Interviews with beneficiaries (eg parliament etc)

**F. Evaluation Team**

The Evaluation Team will consist of two consultants: one international consultant and 2 national experts, one on Gender, one on Governance/Rule of Law and Human Rights. Under the overall guidance of the UNDP Country Director and direct supervision of UNDP Assistant Resident Representative, the Evaluation Team will conduct a participatory outcome evaluation.

**G. Requirements**

Qualification requirements for the international consultant/team leader:

* Higher education (a degree) in public administration or law or other relevant/related fields
* Extensive experience in conducting evaluations, including on governance, strong working knowledge of UNDP, the civil society sector and working with state public authorities on issues related to good governance.
* Extensive knowledge of result-based management evaluation, UNDP policies, procedures, as well as participatory monitoring and evaluation methodologies and approaches ;
* Experience in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Minimum 7-10 years professional expertise in international development co-operation, good governance, rule of law, human rights and gender mainstreaming for programme evaluation, impact assessment and strategic recommendations for continued support/development of programming/strategies including strong reporting skills;
* Good professional knowledge of the Africa region
* Extensive experience in working with the donors;
* Demonstrated analytical, communication and report writing skills;
* Excellent interviewing, public speaking at high levels;
* Teamwork capacity to work with the target group representatives;

The **Team Leader** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP. Specifically, the team leader, who should have 10 years of experience and in leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams, will perform the following tasks:

* Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology and approach;
* Ensure efficient division of tasks between the mission members;
* Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation;
* Draft and communicate the evaluation report;
* Finalize the evaluation report and submit it to UNDP.

Qualification requirements for the National experts

* An advanced university degree in areas such as public administration, gender studies, and law and at least 3-5 years of professional experience in the area of governance frameworks, public administration, and justice .
* Proven expertise in governance programmes, project/programme management;
* Sound knowledge and understanding of the governance frameworks in Zimbabwe;
* Some experience in conducting evaluations.

The National Experts will, inter alia, perform the following tasks:

* Review documents;
* Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
* Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation;
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report ;
* Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the draft evaluation report.

# H. Timeline and schedule (tentative)

The mission will commence in June 2011. The duration of the assignment is up to 23 working days including writing of the report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe** | **Place** | **Responsible Party** |
| Inception meeting with UNDP, Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan (inception report). Meeting with Reference Group. | 3 days | Harare | UNDP CO and evaluation team |
| Present and refine Inception Report | 1 day | Harare | Evaluation team |
| Consultations, meetings, phone/in-person interviews related to the Programme | 10 days | Harare and surroundings as relevant | Evaluation team |
| Analysis and synthesis and preparation of draft evaluation report | 5 days | Harare | Evaluation team |
| Debriefing and presentation of draft report with UNDP and other relevant stakeholders | 1 day | Harare | Evaluation team |
| Finalization of evaluation report incorporating additions and relevant comments provided by UNDP and stakeholders | 2 days | Harare | Evaluation team |
| Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP CO | 1 day | Harare | International consultant |

**I. Documents for desk review**

UNDP Corporate Policy Documents:

1. Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results
2. UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
3. UNDP Result-Based Management: Technical Note

UN/UNDP Zimbabwe Country Office Documents:

1. Zimbabwe Development Assistance Framework (ZUNDAF) 2007-2011;
2. ZUNDAF 2007-2011 mid-term review
3. ZUNDAF 2012-2015
4. Draft CPD 2012-2015
5. Country Program Document for Zimbabwe 2007-2011
6. Country Program Action Plan for Zimbabwe 2007-2011
7. CP Mid-term review report
8. Annual Work Plans and Progress Reports
9. Programme documents and relevant thematic reports
10. Other documents and materials related to the outcome to be evaluated (from the government, donors, research papers etc.)
11. MDG 2010 Status Report
12. Relevant ROARs

* + 1. **Cost and financing**

The following anticipated costs of the review mission will be financed by UNDP in terms of Project 00070004. 00070005, 00070007

Breakdown of the resources required for:

* National/regional consultants – professional fees
* International Consultant – professional fees, international travel costs and DSA costs
* Local travel costs and DSA

**ANNEX I**

**Outcome Evaluation Report Template[[1]](#footnote-2)**

This is an outline for an outcome evaluation report. It does not follow a prescribed format but simply presents one way to organize the information. Project evaluations should employ a similar structure and emphasize results, although they may differ somewhat in terms of scope and substance.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

* What is the context and purpose of the outcome evaluation?
* What are the main findings and conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned?

**INTRODUCTION**

* Why was this outcome selected for evaluation? (refer back to the rationale for including this outcome in the evaluation plan at the beginning of the Country Programme)
* What is the purpose of the outcome evaluation? Is there any special reason why the evaluation is being done at this point in time? (is this an early, mid-term or late evaluation in the Country Programme)
* What products are expected from the evaluation? (should be stated in TOR)
* What are the key issues addressed by the evaluation? (should be stated in the TOR)
* What was the methodology used for the evaluation? (should be stated in the TOR)
* What is the structure of the evaluation report? (how the content will be organized in the report)

**THE DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

* When and why did UNDP begin working towards this outcome and for how long has it been doing so? What are the problems that the outcome is expected to address?
* Who are the key partners for the outcome? The main stakeholders? The expected beneficiaries?

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The findings and conclusions of the evaluation report should reflect the scope presented in the TOR. There should be some flexibility for the evaluation team to include new issues that arise during the course of the evaluation. The findings and conclusions in the report will take their lead from the nature of the exercise. If the purpose of the outcome evaluation was to learn about the partnership strategy, the findings and recommendations may address issues of partnership more than the other elements listed below. If the purpose was for mid-course adjustments to outputs produced by UNDP, the report findings and conclusions might give some more emphasis to issues related to UNDP’s contribution to the outcome via outputs. The section on findings and conclusions should include the **ratings** assigned by the outcome evaluator to the outcome, outputs and, if relevant, to the sustainability and relevance of the outcome.

The following questions are typical of those that must be answered by the findings and conclusions section of an outcome evaluation. They reflect the four categories of analysis.

**1. Status of the outcome**

* Has the outcome been achieved or has progress been made towards its achievement?
* Was the outcome selected relevant given the country context and needs, and UNDP’s niche? (Presumably, if the outcome is within the CPAP it is relevant; however, the outcome evaluation should verify this assumption.)

**2. Factors affecting the outcome**

* What factors (political, sociological, economic, etc.) have affected the outcome, either positively or negatively?
* How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?

**3. UNDP contributions to the outcome through outputs**

* What were the key outputs produced by UNDP that contributed to the outcome (including outputs produced by “soft” and hard assistance)?
* Were the outputs produced by UNDP relevant to the outcome?
* What were the quantity, quality and timeliness of outputs? What factors impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs?
* How well did UNDP use its resources to produce target outputs?
* Were the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link outputs to outcome or is there a need to establish or improve these indicators?
* Did UNDP have an effect on the outcome directly through “soft” assistance (e.g., policy advice, dialogue, advocacy and brokerage) that may not have translated into clearly identifiable outputs or may have predated UNDP’s full-fledged involvement in the outcome? (For example, was policy advice delivered by UNDP advisors over the course of several years on the advisability of reforming the public service delivery system and on the various options available? Could this have laid the groundwork for reform that subsequently occurred?)

**4. UNDP partnership strategy**

* What was the partnership strategy used by UNDP in pursuing the outcome and was it effective?
* Were partners, stakeholders and/or beneficiaries of UNDP assistance involved in the design of UNDP interventions in the outcome area? If yes, what were the nature and extent of their participation? If no, why not?

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Flowing from the discussion above, the section on recommendations should answer the following question:

* What corrective actions are recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP work in this outcome?

**LESSONS LEARNED**

* What are the main lessons that can be drawn from the outcome experience that may have generic application?
* What are the best and worst practices in designing, undertaking, monitoring and evaluating outputs, activities and partnerships around the outcome?

**ANNEXES**

Annexes are to include the following: TOR, itinerary and list of persons interviewed, summary of field visits, questionnaire used and summary of results, list of documents reviewed and any other relevant material.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 8. A Good Evaluation Report is…** | **A Weak Evaluation Report is…** |
| 1. impartial   credible   1. balanced   clear and easy to understand   1. information rich 2. action oriented and crisp 3. focused on evidence that supports conclusions | 1. repetitious 2. too long 3. unclear and unreadable 4. insufficiently action oriented 5. lacking hard data and relying on opinion 6. poorly structured and lacking focus on key findings 7. lacking comprehension of the local context 8. negative or vague in its findings |

Source: Adapted from DAC review of principles for evaluation of development assistance, 1998

1. This format is also presented in the annex to the Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators ([Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators](http://content.undp.org/go/prescriptive/Project-Management---Prescriptive-Content-Documents/download/Guidelines%20for%20Outcome%20Evals.doc?d_id=150303&g11n.enc=ISO-8859-1)). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)