**Terms of Reference**

**Outcome Evaluation Mission**

**Outcome Evaluation Title**: Evaluation of the Programme-based Budgeting (PBB) and Sector Strategies component in the UNDP Country Programme 2009 – 2011 with extension 2012.

**Duty Station:** UNDP Mauritius

**Duration of Appointment**: 19 working days

**Expected Starting Date**: August 2011

1. **Purpose of the Evaluation**.

The annexed Evaluation Plan for Mauritius outlines what is to be evaluated during the current UNDP Country Programme which runs from 2009 – 2011 with extension to December 2012.

The Evaluation Plan includes one Outcome Evaluation, which is mandatory evaluation in line with UNDP corporate evaluation policy. UNDP Mauritius will commission an outcome evaluation with regards to the Programmed-based Budgeting (PBB) and sector strategies components in the UNDP Country Programme 2009 -2012, as it is in its third year, with a view to put into practice the lessons learnt for the next Country Programme formulation and to provide adequate programme coverage to help UNDP Mauritius better manage for results.

The evaluation results will be used by the UNDP Country Office Management and by the Government Implementing Partners while formulating the next Country Programme 2013 – 2015

Annex 1: Evaluation Plan for Mauritius

1. **Description of the social, economic and political context.**

Over the past four decades, Mauritius has achieved remarkable progress with sustained economic growth and significant improvement in the standard of living.  Annual rates of growth have averaged over 5 per cent and per capita income is now almost US$7,000.  Mauritius has successfully diversified its economic activities, particularly in agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, and financial and business services. Life expectancy at birth, adult literacy and income distribution have improved significantly to surpass average levels for upper middle-income countries. It ranks among the top performing economies on many fronts.

In 2009, Mauritius was ranked:

* 1st in Mo Ibrahim classification of Good Governance among 57 African countries;
* 17th out of 183 Countries (Previous ranking: 2008 - 29th, 2007 - 49th ), and to 1st position among Sub-Saharan African countries, in the World Bank Doing Business Index;
* 57th out of 132 countries “In Achieving Global Competitiveness” (World Economic Forum);
* 72nd out of 169 countries in the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI).

In September 2008, GDP growth forecast for the fiscal year 2008/09 was 6.2 percent. However, during the budget speech in May, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Empowerment (MOFEE) predicted growth in the range of 2 to 2.2 percent. This estimate has remained stable and credible since then. The fast pace in which expected growth performance for 2009 deteriorated in Mauritius is commensurate with developments across the globe. Between October 2008 and May 2009, real GDP growth forecasts plunged as a reflection of the severe synchronized economic downturn all countries are now facing.

The fiscal outlook deteriorated quickly during 2009 and poses a clear risk, particularly if the world economic recovery is too sluggish. The overall deficit for the 2008/09 fiscal year was 3.6 percent of GDP. Though by no means particularly high in the context of the international crisis, the deficit has been partly contained by low execution rates of capital expenditures in the first half of 2009. More importantly, a bigger impact on the deficit is expected for the coming budgets as the effects of lower revenues and expansionary fiscal policies fully materialize. For the six-month budget during the period July-Dec 2009, the overall deficit was officially estimated to reach 4.8 percent of GDP. In 2010, Government expected the deficit to remain at about 5 percent. However, given the low level of total fiscal revenues in Mauritius (22.9 percent in 2008), high levels of current expenditure (23.6 percent in 2008) and ambitious public investment programme, there were clear downside risks to the fiscal deficit. The Minister of Finance has gone on record stating that anything higher than a 5.5 percent of GDP fiscal deficit was unsustainable. This is a welcome statement as the use of fiscal measures to boost demand and protect vulnerable people must be consistent with medium-term macroeconomic stability. Existing space for conducting counter-cyclical fiscal policy also remains limited by a high level of public debt - Public Debt to GDP ratio will interrupt its declining trajectory and approach the 60 percent threshold recently imposed by the Debt Management Act.

**Reform Framework**

Despite being a small remote island, Mauritius was able to escape grim development prospects over the last 40 years. Between 1968 and 2009, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita grew from US$260 to almost US$7,000.

**I**n the mid-1990s a new vision began taking shape in Mauritius of a higher value added, more diversified, skill and knowledge intensive economy. To realize this, planners recognized they would need to invest massively in human capital and infrastructure, make better use of advanced technologies and reform the regulatory environment to harness the creativity of the private sector. Yet, little was achieved in these areas during the decade which followed. Instead, trend growth slowed as new sectors failed to generate hoped for levels of output and employment while traditional ones lost ground to increasing competition in their export markets. The miracle years of the 1980s receded into history.

In July 2005, Mauritians went to the polls. With the “triple trade shock” – eroding textiles and sugar preferences and rising energy prices – exacerbating the longer term decline, they were in an uncharacteristically pessimistic mood. The outcome of the election was a new Government with a strong reformist platform that touched on virtually every facet of economic and social policy. In the economic sphere, the Finance Minister urged the need to halt the slide in performance by raising competitiveness, promoting higher value added exports, investing in infrastructure and education, and reforming industrial relations. These were well rehearsed themes, but it soon became apparent they did not portend business as usual. The new Government immediately set to work on an ambitious and comprehensive structural reform program intended to raise the efficiency of the private sector and modernize the public sector for a post-regulatory world.

Since 2006, Government has been implementing a comprehensive 10-year economic reform programme based on four pillars, namely: 1/ Fiscal consolidation and improving public sector efficiency; 2/ Enhancing trade competitiveness; 3/ Improving the investment climate; and 4/ Widening the circle of opportunities. These reforms are embodied in a 3-year Performance-Based Budget (PBB) introduced in the 2008/09 budget and have helped in reversing the declining trend in economic performance and strengthened the resilience of the economy.

1. **Description of the subject of the evaluation**

With reference to the 2009 – 2011 Programme and the Intended Results of the annexed Country Programme for the Republic of Mauritius 2009 – 2011, the objective – “To promote broad-based economic and inclusive growth while ensuring equitable access to public goods, services and opportunities for the poor and vulnerable groups” constitutes the baseline for the carrying out of the outcome evaluation, in particular with reference to the Programmed-based Budgeting (PBB) and Sector Strategies component mentioned on page 5 of the “Results and resources framework for 2009 -2011” of the annexed CP 2009 -2011.

This Country Programme is anchored in the Government’s reform programme to achieve a higher broad-based growth with equity, and is in line with UNDP’s strategic Plans.

The CP 2009 -2011 stated that “ The aim of this initiative is to strengthen accountability, improve performance in public finance and administration and improve effectiveness of policies and strategies that are designed to support implementation of the 10-year economic reform programme . UNDP intervention in this area supports the first pillar of the Government reform which is fiscal consolidation and improving public sector efficiency.” (page 4 para 12)

The Results and Resources Framework for the 2009 – 2011 (page 5 Of CP document) mentioned that the country programme outcome and indicator for SB were the following:

**Country Programme Outcome:**

Improved capacity of Government agencies in results based policy making, planning, performance management and public service delivery;

**Country Programme Indicators:**

By 2011, support provided in creating enabling policy framework for PBB and supporting instruments.

Annex 2: Country Programme for the Republic of Mauritius (2009 -2011)

**Actually Adopted Implementation Strategy of the Country Programme component Programmed-based Budgeting**

The project “Strategic Budgeting in the Government of Mauritius (SB)” started in 2007 under the UNDP Country Programme 2005-2008 and was continued under the 2009-2011 UNDP Country Programme. It isexecuted by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development and the Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity and reform Institutions and signed as follows:

Project ID/Title: 00055329 – Strategic Budgeting in the Government of Mauritius

Signature date: The project document was originally signed on 28th September 2007. It was revised and on the 21st December 2009 and extended to 2011.

Country Programme Outputs:

* New budget framework with accompanying changes in the Financial Management Manual (FMM) developed and implemented.
* New GFS-consistent Chart of Accounts adopted and operational
* New Financial Management Information System (FMIS) installed and operational
* National Training programme (NTP) for PBB implemented and all public sector personnel and key stakeholders trained;
* Regional Training plan implemented in collaboration with COMESA,SADC, and CABRI

Outputs Indicators, baselines and targets

* By 2011, support provided in creating enabling policy framework for PBB and supporting instruments;
* Indicators: Organic Budget law, GFS-consistent Chart of Accounts, FMIS, gender-sensitive data utilized in all above.

UNDP Corporate has a system of RBMS (Results-Based Management System) which requires linking individual projects to outcomes in a Programme, based on the above-mentioned Strategic Plan.

Annex 3: Project Documents

1. **Evaluation objectives and scope.**

The Strategic Budgeting project will come to an end in 2012 after almost 6 years of implementation. Follow-on projects are planned starting in 2013 under the mandate of a newly formulated Country Programme 2013 -2015 for the Republic of Mauritius.

This evaluation is an **end of programme cycle evaluation** for the following purpose and with the following objectives in mind:

1. To evaluate the impact of the SB project as per the original country programme outcome and related country programme output, with particular focus on the sustainability and cost effectiveness of the key interventions to date;
2. To provide useful lessons learnt for follow-up interventions during the current programme’e extension year until 31 December 2012 and for formulation of the next Country Programme 2013-2015, in particular to generate knowledge about good practices, lesson learnt and weaknesses of the programme/project.
3. To examine how well needs of different groups supported were met by the programme/projects.

Key areas of the evaluation are as follows:

1. Projects design/assumptions made on the onset and realities faced over the projects’ timeframe
2. The joint management and shared resources of the SB related project
3. Relationship with other UNDP projects and contribution towards the Country Programme Outcome, for example with other projects working with improvement of public services , such as the ZEP project and Support to Inclusive Development projects.
4. Coordination of stakeholders
5. Areas of best potential success for further support
6. Gender: assess whether and to what extent the projects took the gender dimension into account and if the project promoted a gender sensitive approach to formulation and implementation (support to Gender Responsive Budgeting)
7. Human Rights: assess whether and to what extent the human rights dimension was taken into account, and if the project promoted a rights-based approach to formulation and implementation.
8. **Evaluation questions**

The following questions need to be addressed:

**Efficiency**: Are the effects being achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same objectives?

**Effectiveness:** Is the programme/project achieving satisfactory progress toward its stated objectives?

**Appropriateness/Relevance**: - is the programme/project the appropriate solution to the problem? Are the programme objectives still relevant? What is the value of the programme in relation to other priority needs and efforts? Is the problem addressed still a major problem?

**Impact:** What difference has the programme made to beneficiaries? What are the social, economic, technical, environmental, and other effects on individuals, communities, and institutions –either short-, medium-, or long-term; intended or unintended; positive and negative; on a micro- or macro-level?

**Sustainability**: is the activity likely to continue after donor funding, or after a special effort such as a campaign ends? Do the beneficiaries accept the programme, are they willing to continue, and is the host institution developing the capacity and motivation to administer it? Can the activity become self-sustaining financially? Will the results continue after the project funding?

1. **Methodology (elements of an approach)**

According to the previously mentioned purpose and objectives of the outcome evaluation and based upon the established indicators, baseline information and specific targets, the methodology should describe:

* Whether and how the evaluation was considered in programme/project design;
* Details of the outcome and outputs indicators that have been proposed/used to measure performance, with associated baseline and target data;
* Information on what monitoring has actually taken place;
* Strengths and weaknesses of the original M & E design and the quality of data that have been generated;
* Availability of relevant global, regional, national data;
* Availability of complementary data (from similar programmes/projects)
1. **Management of the Outcome Evaluation and Expected Deliverables.**

The overall responsibility for managing the outcome evaluation will be with the UNDP Country Office Outcome Evaluation Team, in particular the Senior Programme Manager and the other Officers/Associate/Assistant of the project , under the guidance of the UNDP Resident Representative.

The Country Office Evaluation Team will provide assistance in identifying consultants, participate in briefing and debriefing processes for the evaluation team, provide comments on the draft report and clear the final report before evaluation is completed. The CO Evaluation Team will also facilitate contact to key partners in the country, such as other in-country partners as required.

A presentation of the key findings of the evaluation will be presented at a meeting at the UNDP premises, including some selected implementing partners and government.

The detailed time line and key outputs, i.e. draft report, the final report and presentations that are expected from the evaluators, are spelt out under the chapter 9 “Plan for Evaluation Implementation”

Guidance on the structure of a UNDP evaluation report (expected format) and a quality control checklist for its content have been developed by UNDP Headquartres and are herewith annexed.

Annex 4: Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators

1. **Composition, Skills and Experience of the evaluation team.**

It is anticipated that the outcome evaluation team will comprise the following:

**One International consultant (team leader)**

The team leader is responsible for the quality of the final evaluation. (S)he will author the final evaluation report and lead the evaluation team through the implementation of the evaluation methodology.

The development of the evaluation tools and strategies will be of primary importance. The team leader will develop the evaluation questions in consultation with the UNDP Outcome Evaluation Team.

**One national consultant**

The national consultant will give specific insights of the Mauritius Public Service and the interaction between Government, Private Sector and other partners. (S)he will be key in interpreting Mauritian culture to ensure that findings are clear and sound. (S)he will take lead in facilitating organizational capacity reflection focus group among the project partners in order to understand progress that has been made since programme/project inception.

The UNDP Outcome Evaluation Team and the Project Staff, the Project Management Units (PMUs) attached to the related project, will facilitate administrative and logistical support to the consultants’ evaluation team and make sure that project partners and staff (PMUs) are available and participate in different meetings. It includes arranging meetings and transportation support as needed. Project staff and PMU Teams could eventually collect project data in advance of the teams arrival to facilitate time-effective analysis.

**The International consultant s**hould have an advanced university degree in Financial Analysis, MBA, Operational Design or other related qualifications

Work Experience:

* Five (5) years progressively responsible professional work experience at international levels in qualitative evaluations particularly in the area of sustainable interventions.
* Proven working knowledge and experience in the area of programmed-based budgeting
* Proven work experience in use of evaluation methods for identifying measurable target indicators
* Strong conceptual, understanding and analytical skills on social, sector issues, as they link with poverty, gender, human rights and human development;
* Previous experience with UN agencies is an asset.

Skills:

* Strong leadership and planning skills
* Excellent written and presentation skills (English)
* Strong communication skills
* Ability to work in the multi-cultural team environment and to deliver under pressure/meet deadlines
* Ability to network with partners on various levels
* The necessary computer skills with competence in MS office package.

Language

Fluency in English language required.

Knowledge of French an asset

**The national consultant** should have an advance university degree in in Financial Analysis, MBA, Operational Design or other related qualifications

Work experience:

* Experience in conducting evaluation at a national level
* Proven working knowledge and experience in the area of Programmed-based budgeting
* Strong conceptual, understanding and analytical skills on social, sector isues, as they link with poverty, gender, human rights and human development;
* Previous experience with UN agencies an asset

Skills:

* Strong leadership and planning skills
* Excellent written and presentation skills (English)
* Strong communication skills
* Ability to work in the multi-cultural team environment and to deliver under pressure/meet deadlines
* Ability to network with partners at various levels
* The necessary computer skills with competence in MS Word

Language:

Fluency in English language required.

Knowledge of French and Creole languages.

1. Plan for Evaluation implementation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Activity | Estimated time | Key outputs |
| 1 | Preparation by consultants* Review CP 2009 -2011, project documents and progress reports
* Other relevant literature

Preparation (by consultants)* Briefing from UNDP Office
* Agreement on activities and timeframes
* Preparation of meetings/programme
 | 2 days1 day | Familiarization with the project (re. intended outcome)Agreement on timeframes and programme |
| 2 | Meetings and discussions with stakeholders* Discussions with project team (PMU)
* Field visits. This will include interviews and focus group discussions with various stakeholders.
* Meetings with development partners including eventually Project steering committee and other partners
 | 7 days | Document records of interviews and observations with stakeholdersEvaluate findings |
| 3 | Presentation of findings to stakeholders* Hold a meeting with stakeholders including Project Steering Committee, development partners, government and UN agencies to present preliminary findings and recommendations to collect feedback that will help finalise the report, give suggestions and get feedback
* Incorporate feedback into findings
 | 3 days | Present findings to key stakeholders and create forum for participatory feedback |
| 4 | Writing Report* Draft report and final report

Report should be:* Analytical in nature (both quantitative and qualitative)
* Structured around issues and related findings/lessons learnt
* Conclusions
* Recommendations

Present draft form for review by UNDP CO | 3 days | * Draft report delivered to UNDP CO for consideration
* Consideration should be given to producing a final report for public information and donors
 |
| 5 | Submission of Final Report | 3 days after presentation to UNDP CO | A report of maximum 25 pages in word document format with tables where appropriate will be submitted within four working days after the completion of the mission, incorporating comments made on the draft submitted to UNDP CO |
|  | Time allocated to the assignment | 19 days |  |