

TERMS OF REFERENCE
UNDP Indonesia –Sustainable environment and effective use of energy
Outcome Evaluation

I. INTRODUCTION

As one of the key international development partners in the country, UNDP is challenged to prove that its development programmes are contributing to the country's development achievements, specifically to point out how those effective and well-managed UNDP's projects were able to contribute to the improvement of people's lives in the country.

The growing demand for development effectiveness is largely based on the realization that producing good deliverables is simply not enough. Efficient or well-managed development projects and outputs will lose their relevance if they yield no discernible improvements in development conditions and ultimately in people's lives. Being a key international development agency, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been increasing its focus on achievement of clearly stated results.

In keeping with the shift in focus from outputs to outcomes, UNDP has shifted from traditional project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to results-oriented M&E, especially outcome monitoring and evaluation that cover a set of related projects, programmes and partnership strategies intended to bring about a higher level outcome. To clearly identify how UNDP Country Programme contributes to the development results of the country, it is required to undertake a systematic outcome evaluation exercise. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in a given country context, and the role that UNDP has played. Outcome evaluations also help to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, highlight unintended consequences (positive and negative), recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership building, and generate lessons learned.

II. OUTCOME TO BE EVALUATED

CPAP Outcome #2: By 2010, improved environmental living conditions and sustainable use of energy in Indonesia and establishment of sustainable living conditions in the targeted provinces in Indonesia (for detail see CPAP 20006-2010 document)

The main outputs contributing to the achievements of the outcome are:

- Comprehensive frameworks and effective action plans for regional environment management developed and implemented in priority districts and provinces with critical environment, natural resource management, and poverty reduction challenges that resulted in improved environmental quality and equitable access to natural resources among the poor, leading to improved local livelihoods.
- Policy, regulatory, economic, market, technological and information barriers to the effective use of renewable energy and energy efficiency measures are removed, and

resulted in optimized use of local energy resources; delivery of basic energy services to poor and remote communities, vitalized local economic activities, and reduced national greenhouse gases emission

- National capacities in adhering to the three Rio conventions, namely UNFCCC, UNDBD and UNCCD, as well as other environment related conventions improved

III. CONCEPT and OBJECTIVES OF THE OUTCOME EVALUATION

Outcome evaluations move away from the old approach of assessing project results against project objectives towards an assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions. Outcomes are influenced by the full range of UNDP activities — projects, programmes, nonproject activities and "soft" assistance within and outside of projects. Outcomes are also influenced by the activities of other development actors.

The standard objectives of an outcome evaluation are to extract lessons learned, findings and recommendations. More specifically, the **four standard objectives of an outcome evaluation** and their timing during the Country Programme (CP) cycle are as follows:

- Assess progress towards the outcome (this will be most significantly explored during an outcome evaluation conducted later in the CP, although could be examined early on depending upon the nature of the outcome);
- Assess the factors affecting to the outcome (this could be addressed early, midterm or later in the CP);
- Assess key UNDP contributions (outputs), including those produced through "soft" assistance, to outcomes (this information is yielded at least midway through and later in the CP);
- Assess the partnership strategy (useful information can be culled at any point during the CP).

In other words, four major components — the outcome, substantive influences, UNDP's contribution and how UNDP works with other relevant actors — are examined in depth to varying degrees depending upon the nature of the exercise.

IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES and METHODOLOGY

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Outcome evaluations are informed by three guiding principles: pre-eminence of outcome, flexible blueprints and awareness building. Evaluators, country office and programme staff should bear in mind these principles when they plan, prepare for, undertake and follow up on outcome evaluations.

1. Pre-eminence of outcome

An outcome evaluation aims to improve understanding of the outcome itself — its status and the factors that influence or contribute to its change. It does not look at the process of inputs, activities and other bureaucratic efforts but shifts attention to the substantive development results (outputs and outcomes) that they are aimed at affecting. It also provides real-time answers about the outcome rather than waiting until a project is completed and the outputs produced to ask questions. These answers may be part of a "questioning continuum."

Key differences distinguish outcome monitoring from outcome evaluation. Outcome monitoring involves periodic tracking of inputs, outputs and outcomes. Outcome evaluation involves making judgments about the **interrelationship** between inputs and outputs on the one hand and outcomes on the other. It is also important to note that although the review of contributions by UNDP and its partners is an integral component of such analysis, the precise degree of attribution and accountability among the various actors is not an overriding priority.

2. Flexible blueprints

There is no official blueprint for how to conduct an outcome evaluation. Each must be tailored to the nature of the individual outcome under review as well as the realities of time and data limitations. The role of an evaluator is to pass judgment based on his or her best professional opinion; it is not to collect large volumes of primary data or conduct methodologically perfect academic research. Inherent to the outcome evaluation approach is a rough but universal logic of analysis and reporting. Usually, an outcome evaluation begins with a review of change in the outcome itself, proceeds to an analysis of pertinent influencing factors, and then addresses the contribution of UNDP and its partners. It culminates in suggestions about how to improve the approach to results.

Outcome evaluations are designed to fill a number of different needs, ranging from early information about the appropriateness of UNDP's partnership strategy or impediments to the outcome, to mid-course adjustments, to lessons learned for the next Country Programme cycle.

3. Awareness building

The current focus on outcome evaluation reflects a new approach to assessment and review in UNDP. UNDP is internalizing results-based management and mainstreaming it throughout the processes and procedures of the organization. As with all large organizations, it will take time for UNDP and its partners to become familiar and comfortable with results-based evaluation. For some time, building awareness about this new approach will be an implicit goal in the conduct of outcome evaluation. Evaluators will play an important role in by sharing lessons learned while applying the methodology at a country level, and thereby helping UNDP refine the methodologies used in outcome evaluations.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the outcome evaluation will accommodate the needs in order to achieve the four (4) objectives of this exercise. There are four (4) steps to be undertaken by the evaluator: (For details methodology, the consultant should follow **UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators**, attached to the TOR)

1. Ascertaining the status of the outcome:
 - a. Identify baseline, indicators and benchmark (desk review)
 - b. Obtain contextual information (desk review)
 - c. Examine Prodocs, CPD, UNDAF (desk review)
 - d. Validate information (interviews, questionnaires)
 - e. Probe the selected indicators
 - f. Undertake constructive critic of the outcome formulation
2. Examining the factors affecting the outcome
 - a. Examine how the outcome has been influenced (desk review, interview)
 - b. Identify major contributing factors
 - c. Examine local sources of knowledge (existing documentation of gov, academia, donors, NGOs, etc)
 - d. Resolve issue of UNDP having an unintended effect or not having intended effect
3. Assessing the Contribution of UNDP
 - a. Determine how coherent UNDP strategy and management focusing on change at the outcome level
 - b. Evaluate the alignment of UNDP planning and management in contributing to outcomes
 - c. Identify the effectiveness of individual outputs (if any) in contributing to outcomes
4. Evaluate partnership for changing the outcome
 - a. Determine any consensus among UNDP actors, stakeholders and partners on the partnership strategy designed was the most effective and efficient model to achieve the outcome
 - b. Learn how the partnership was established and how is the performance
 - c. Review how the partnership strategy affected the achievement of or the progress toward the outcome.

A core outline for an evaluation should present **findings and conclusions** based on the categories of analysis in an outcome evaluation. In addition, the core outline should include the rating of progress on outcomes and outputs and lessons learned and recommendations on how UNDP can improve its approach based on the findings/conclusions

Into the outline described above, evaluators may subsume the evaluative criteria as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, degree of change, sustainability; together with the usual deductive categories (findings, conclusion, and recommendations). Table 1 shows how the criteria may be applied within the core outline of an outcome evaluation report.

Table 1: Application of Evaluation Criteria to the Core Outline for an Outcome Evaluation		
Category of Analysis	Pertinent evaluation criteria	Place in the outline
1. Evidence of change in the outcome	Degree of change	Findings/conclusion
2. Review of factors influencing outcomes	Relevance Effectiveness	Findings/conclusion Lessons learned
3. UNDP contributions to outcome	Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency Degree of change Sustainability	Findings/conclusion Lessons learned Recommendations
4. Partnerships for changing the outcome	Relevance Sustainability	Findings/conclusions Lessons learned

Evaluators need to agree with country offices on the core outline. In addition, they need to agree on supplementary aspects of work organization and report presentation including the methodological approach and use of executive summary and technical annexes.

Gender, Human Right, and Capacity Development.

Gender, Human Right (right based approach) and Capacity development need to be assessed the extent to which the intended outcome has contributed to these three development effectives. Especially for gender, the questions to be asked is that does the outcome reflect the interest, rights and concern of men, women and marginalized group. In the designing the methodology consultant need to group the sample or Focus Group Discussion based on gender that ensure data collected can be specified into gender component. On the human right it need to be assessed how the intended outcome facilitate the claim of right-holder and the corresponding obligation of the duty bearer (UNDP Handbook Planning, Monitoring, Evaluating for Results, page 171-172). Duty bearers particularly group subject to discrimination need to be included in the sample. For capacity Development it needs to be evaluated the extent to which the intended outcome promotes national capacity development. Questions to be asked: Will the intervention / outcome sustainable? Can national system and processes be used or augmented? What are the existing national capacity assets in this area? (The Handbook page # 14).

V. DELIVERABLES

The ultimate product expected from the evaluation: - a detailed report with findings, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of evaluation. The structure of the report should meet with the requirements of the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy.

VI. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT

The evaluation is commissioned by the UNDP Indonesia Country Office under coordination of the Planning and Monitoring Unit (PMEU). A programme officer from Planning Monitoring and Evaluation MEU (PMEU) will be assigned as task manager. The main role of the task manager is the quality assurance for the evaluation includes : a) provide TOR for the evaluation, b) select consultant to conduct the evaluation, c) support interview of respondents. The Environment Unit who own the outcome being evaluated will support the overall activities of the evaluation includes: a) prepare the schedule of the evaluation and arrange meetings with respondents, b) provide copies of the project documents, project QMR, project evaluation and reviews; c) provide budget for the evaluation (to hire consultants) and field visit as necessary. Final report will be reviewed and approved by the *Country Director*.

VII. TIME FRAME and assignment

The evaluator will be an international consultant with strong back ground in monitoring and evaluation with substantive knowledge on Sustainable Environment and Efficient Use of Energy. The evaluation will take place during June – July about 4 weeks (14 effective working days). This will include a preliminary desk review, design of evaluation scope and methodologies, data collection and analysis, and report writing

VIII. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EVALUATOR

- Design evaluation methodology following **UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators** for approval by the Head of PMEU;
- Data collection and analysis, including desk review, field visits, discussion and interview with stakeholders and beneficiaries, and conduct other means of data collection as and when required;
- Present the major findings and the first draft to PMEU and relevance Programme Unit;
- Refinement and editing of report after consultation and validation process with key stakeholders as well as the final comments from programme units and UNDP management;
- Ensure that the report is finalized within maximum 3 weeks after the mission completion.