

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR

I. Position Information

Post Title:	Final Evaluation Consultant- Joint UN MDG-F Creative Industries Support Programme (CISP)
Practice Area:	Poverty
Post Level:	National or international
Duration of the Assignment:	45 working days from 15th August to 30 th October 2011 (estimation: 10 days working with desk review and meeting with the CISP team, 15 days working in provinces and villages, 10 days meeting with evaluation reference groups and stakeholder and reporting, 5 days reviewing and 5 days finalizing)
Duty Station:	Phnom Penh
Expected Places of Travel	Ratanakiri, Mondulhiri, Preah Vihear and Kampong Thom
Cluster/Project:	Joint UN MDG-F Creative Industries Support Programme, Poverty Unit, UNDP
Supervisor:	Assistant Country Director, Poverty Cluster, UNDP

II. General Context

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F support joint programmes that seek replication of successful pilot experiences and impact in shaping public policies and improving peoples' life in 49 countries by accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other key development goals.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 49 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs, National Ownership and UN reform.

The MDG-F M&E Strategy

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation strategy is under implementation in order to track and measure the overall impact of this historic contribution to the MDGs and to multilateralism. The MDG-F M&E strategy is based on the principles and standards of UNEG and OEDC/DAC regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes.

The strategy's main objectives are:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results;
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the 3 MDG-F objectives, MDGS, Paris Declaration and Delivering as one; and
3. To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

Under the MDG-F M&E strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E system, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and conducting a final evaluation with a summative focus.

The MDG-F Secretariat also commissioned mid-term evaluations for all joint programmes with a formative focus. Additionally, a total of nine-focus country evaluations (Ethiopia, Mauritania, Morocco, Timor-Leste, Philippines, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Honduras and Ecuador) are planned to study more in depth the effects of joint programmes in a country context.

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes will commission and finance a final independent evaluation.

Final evaluations are summative in nature and seek to:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented their activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results.
2. Measure to what extent the joint programmes has contributed to respond to national needs and priorities for development and assess the degree of national ownership developed in its design and implementation
3. Generate substantive evidence based knowledge, on the Culture & Development thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability), including approaches and working methods sensitive to culture and gender specificities.

As a result, the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by these evaluations will be part of the thematic window Meta evaluation, the Secretariat is undertaking to synthesize the overall impact of the fund at national and international level.

III. Scope of Work

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the joint programme, based on the scope and criteria included in this terms of reference.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the joint programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This final evaluation has the following specific objectives:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to respond to the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. To measure joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.
4. To measure the joint programme contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).
5. To measure to what extent the Joint Programme has contributed to national needs and priorities and has translated into national ownership
6. To identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.
7. To provide recommendation relevant for the replication or scale up such project once such model or project is implemented by other agencies

EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

Design level:

- Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the Millennium Development Goals.
- a) How much and in what ways did the joint programme contributed to solve the (socio-economical, gender, cultural and environmental) needs and problems identified in the design phase as well as concerns of all stakeholders, including local communities, civil society and Government?
- b) To what extent this programme was designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly? (see MDG-F joint programme guidelines and final evaluation guidelines)
- c) To what extent joint programming was the best option to respond to development challenges stated in the programme document?
- d) To what extent the implementing partners participating in the joint programme had an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
- e) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?
- f) To what extend did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?
- g) To what extend did the joint programme have an influence over the national policy with regard to concerns of indigenous peoples?
- h) If the programme was revised, Did it reflect the changes that were needed?

Process level

- Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results
- a) To what extent did the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- b) To what extent was the implementation of a joint programme intervention (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency's intervention?
- c) To what extent the governance of the fund at programme level (PMC) and at national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
- d) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
- e) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in general and in delivering as one?
- f) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
- g) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on the joint programme? Was it useful? Did the joint programme implement the improvement plan?

- **Ownership in the process:** Effective exercise of leadership by the country's national/local partners in development interventions

a) To what extent did the targeted population, citizens, participants, local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) have driven the process?

b) To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme?

IV. Final Products or Deliverables/Outputs

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the commissioner and the manager of the evaluation:

a. Inception Report (to be submitted within 5 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team)

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The inception report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme. This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers. The report will follow the outline stated in annex 1:

b. Draft Final Report (to be submitted within 7 days after the completion of the field visit, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be shared with evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

c. Final Evaluation Report (to be submitted within 10 days after reception of the draft final report with comments, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the sections establish in annex 2:

Results level

- Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved.

a) To what extend did the joint programme contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected /stipulated in the programme document?

1. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?

2. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals set in the thematic window?

3. To what extent (policy, budgets, design, and implementation) and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to improve the implementation of the principles of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action?

4. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals of delivering as one at country level?

- b) To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?
- c) To what extent did the joint programme had an impact on the targeted citizens?
- d) Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them
- e) 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?
- f) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc)
- g) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholders' (authorities/communities-civil society-NGOs) dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

- a) To what extent the joint programme decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?

At local and national level:

- i. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the joint programme?
 - ii. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?
 - iii. Have operating/technical capacities, legal frameworks or other specific dynamics been created and/or reinforced ensure continuation beyond the joint programme closure?
 - iv. Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
 - v. To what extent has the joint programme triggered national and local dynamics that will last beyond its completion? Has the joint programme helped to establish lasting networks amongst its beneficiaries/partners?
 - vi. To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the building and strengthening capacity of both local partners and beneficiaries which resulted in local ownership beyond the joint programme?
- b) To what extent will the joint programme be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels?
 - c) To what extent did the joint programme align itself with the National Development Strategies and/or the UNDAF?

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO THE CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT THEMATIC WINDOW:

- The Terms of Reference of the Culture and Development Thematic Window clearly state that projects in favour of Culture and development were expected to result in social changes. It is not only the transformation of the culture sector that is expected from the projects, but more widely social, political and/or economic changes that were expected to emerge from the support given to culture taken as a basis for sustainable development. In addition of looking at results, the present evaluation should address the specificities of the culture sector and seek to measure the long-term effects generated by the programmes.
- a) What are the specificities of the cultural sector that have been successfully taken into account in the project?

- b) To what extent did the project contribute to build monitoring and evaluation capacities in the culture sector?
- c) What was the most relevant type of intervention (capacity building, training, etc...) with regard to "culture and development"?
- d) Were partners encouraged to look for resources to ensure the sustainability of the project? (This question concerns the sustainability of projects. Typically project interventions in the culture sector build on the notion that culture activities are subsidised either by national authorities or international cooperation.)
- e) Were all relevant stakeholders involved in the design and in the implementation of the projects? Because of lack of ownership from stakeholders other than government actors, project outcomes (new cultural facilities, new services or new arrangements) often are not transformed into sustainable impacts.
- f) What are the positive and negative unexpected outcomes of the project, and if any in which area? (This question aims at describing, identifying and measuring the project non-outputs, which are a common trait of culture and development projects.

V. Institutional Arrangement

A part from meeting with all relevant stakeholders and partners of CISP, the consultant is expected to meet with the evaluation reference group below:

Evaluation Reference Group:

- MDG-F Joint Programme UN Team (10 persons)
- Ms Ann Lund – UN Senior Coordination Specialist, UNRCO (backstopping)
- Mr. Philippe Delanghe –, UNESCO Culture Programme Specialist (backstopping)
- Mr. Natharoun NGO, Assistant Country Director, UNDP (backstopping)
- Mr. Chuop Paris, FAO Assistant Representative (backstopping)
- Mr. Tun Sophorn, ILO National Coordinator (backstopping)
- Ms. Mercedes San Roman Ruiz – UN Coordinator Officer, UNRCO
- Mr. Vin Laychour – Deputy Director General for Cultural Techniques, Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts
- Ms. Lay Navinn, Director of the Department of Handicraft and SMEs, Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy, Focal Point for the MDG-F Joint Programme
- H. E. Mr. Huot Bunnary, Adviser to the Prime Minister and Deputy Secretary General , Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Focal Point for the MDG-F Joint Programme and member of the PMC
- H. E. Ms Tekreth Kamrang, Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Commerce, Focal Point for the MDG-F Joint Programme and member of the PMC

There will be 5 main actors involved in the implementation of MDG-F final evaluations:

1. The Resident Coordinator Office as commissioner of the final evaluation will have the following functions:
 - Lead the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of a final evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination)
 - Convene the evaluation reference group
 - Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR
 - Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team by making sure the lead agency undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluation team
 - Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the MDG-F Secretariat)

- Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation
 - Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various joint programme areas as well as the liaison with the National Steering Committee
 - Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team
2. The programme coordinator as evaluation manager will have the following functions:
- Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation TOR
 - Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group
 - Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data
 - Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation
 - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation
 - Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s);
 - Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation
3. The Programme Management Committee that will function as the evaluation reference group, this group will comprise the representatives of the major stakeholders in the joint programme
- Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets
 - Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design
 - Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
 - Providing input and participating in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference
 - Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods
 - Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products
 - Disseminating the results of the evaluation
4. The MDG-F Secretariat that will function as a quality assurance member of the evaluation in cooperation with the commissioner of the evaluation
- Review and provide advice on the quality the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the adapted TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement.
5. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation study by:
- Fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed

VI. Monitoring and Progress Controls

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the commissioner and the manager of the evaluation:

Inception Report (to be submitted within 5 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team)

Draft Final Report (to be submitted within 7 days after the completion of the field visit, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

Final Evaluation Report (to be submitted within 10 days after reception of the draft final report with comments, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat)

The Assistant Country Director, Poverty Cluster of UNDP is the evaluation supervisor to whom the consultant will be directly responsible to, reporting to, and seeking approval/acceptance of output from.

VII. Payment Milestones

The payment of individual consultant will be made upon the delivery of each output:

1st payment: 20% of total contract will be paid upon the acceptance of detailed workplan and evaluation methodology

2nd payment: 20% of total contract will be paid upon the acceptance of inception report

3rd payment: 30% of total contract will be paid upon the completion of field trips and the acceptance of draft final report

Final payment: 30% of total contract will be paid upon the acceptance of the final evaluation report signed by the Assistant Country Director, Poverty Cluster, UNDP

VIII. Minimum Qualifications Requirement

An unambiguous description of the required degree of expertise and qualifications including:

Education:	Masters Degree in economics, business, development or related fields. Degree or minor in cultural field an asset
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- At least 5 years and extensive experience in conducting monitoring and evaluation of complex projects/programmes with UN agencies or IOs- At least 5 years of experience in the relevant field such as poverty reduction, community development, value chain, cultural and socio-economic development etc.- Excellent knowledge and understanding of Monitoring and Evaluation framework and its M&E methodology (both qualitative and quantitative methods)- Excellent knowledge in data collection, ethical element of it and data analysis- Excellence in writing M&E report with constructive and practical recommendations- Experienced working with indigenous peoples is a strong asset

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 3 year experience working with local NGO/IO in Cambodia
Competencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proven ability in conducting Monitoring and Evaluation of complex project - Excellent track of record in producing quality M&E reports for UN agencies and international organizations - Knowledge of indigenous people's cultures and issues - Comprehensive achievement in final evaluation of development and /or cultural programmes - Knowledge of working with small enterprises, community development, or poverty reduction, and cultural issues - Knowledge of and ability to work with government officials and NGO workers - Be familiar with handicraft sectors, challenges and opportunities - Good knowledge and understanding of environmental and natural resource management - Good knowledge on Gender and its complexity
Language Requirements:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Khmer, English or both - Any Indigenous language is an additional advantage

IX. Criteria for Evaluation of Technical Compliance

As part of transparency, TOR must bear the general criteria, which will be used in evaluating the acceptability and level of technical compliance of the candidates, as well as their corresponding weight.

Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
Technical expertise	30 points
Relevant experiences in conducting M&E	30 points
At least 5 years of experience in the relevant field such as poverty reduction, community development, value chain, cultural and socio-economic development etc	20 points
Knowledge on socio-economic development/ sub-national development framework of the Royal Government of Cambodia and cultural aspect of indigenous peoples	20 points
Total Obtainable Score	100 points

This TOR is approved by:

Signature:

Name and Designation: Natharoun NGO

Date of Signing: 13 July 2011

