****

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

***Youth Employment and Management of Migration in Serbia***

1. **Introduction and rationale**

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. 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. In August 2007, The MDG-F launched a thematic window on Youth, Employment and Migration (YEM). This window is supporting 14 joint programmes with an allocation of US$80 million.

The MDG-F pursues a result oriented monitoring and evaluation strategy aimed at tracking and measuring the overall impact of the joint programmes. The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation (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.

Since May 2009 the International Labour Office (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) have been providing technical assistance to the Government of Serbia through the Joint Programme *Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration.*

The joint programme (JP) − financed by the Government of Spain through the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) with a contribution of US$6.1 million − is implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development, Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, National Employment Service, Centre for Social Work and Republic Statistical Office. The aim of the joint programme is to address the youth employment and migration challenges of the country by combining employment and social policy objectives and integrating them into long-term national development goals. The Programme also proposes to target disadvantaged youth – especially returnees and their families – through gender-sensitive employment programmes linked to social services.

The monitoring and evaluation rationale is specified in the Joint Programme document, which envisages that the ILO be responsible for monitoring and evaluation outputs in accordance with the Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (see paragraph 8 of the Joint Programme document).

Against this backdrop, the ILO Decent Work Team and Country Office for Central and Eastern Europe (DWT-CO Budapest) is commissioning a summative evaluation of the performance of the Joint Programme according to the terms of the reference specified henceforth.

**2. Description of the YEM joint programme in Serbia**

The joint programme “*Support to National Efforts for the Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration*”, implemented in Serbia from May 2009 to May 2012, is centred on a three-pronged strategy touching upon policies, institutions and programmes that concur to the delivery of integrated employment and social services targeting disadvantaged young women and men exposed to migration, especially young returnees. It builds on three interlinked Outcomes aimed at: 1) mainstreaming youth employment and migration policy objectives into national development strategies, 2) strengthening the capacity of national institutions to develop integrated labour market and social services, and 3) implementing a package of programmes on employment and social services.

Programme interventions target disadvantaged youth 15 to 29 years of age in the Districts of South Backa, Belgrade and Pcinjski that are highly affected by youth unemployment and poverty. The Programme places strong emphasis on capacity development of decision-makers, managers and staff of participating central and local institutions as well as social partners to better design, monitor and evaluate policies, strategies and action-oriented programmes on youth employment. The expected results of the Programme include:

* improved knowledge and understanding of integrated policies and measures to tackle youth employment and migration;
* more prominent focus on youth employment within national development frameworks;
* a national policy on management of labour migration and an improved capacity of the Serbian government to tackle youth migration;
* an inter-institutional system combining employment and social services for disadvantaged youth;
* a comprehensive package of gender-sensitive programmes in the realm of youth employment and social protection available at local level;
* a system for replicating and scaling-up pilot programmes country-wide.

**3. Purpose and methodology of the evaluation**

The purpose of the summative evaluation is to measure the overall performance of the Joint Programme and to assess − in a comprehensive, systematic and objective manner − the overall relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the JP. The final evaluation of the joint programme shall be carried out according to the ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), as summarized in Annex 3.

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Measure to what extent the JP has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase;
2. Appraise the JP degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised;
3. Identify to what extent the JP has attained the development results with respect to the targeted population (direct and indirect beneficiaries, partner institutions);
4. Assess the JP contribution to the objectives set in the YEM thematic window as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform);
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices with respect to the specific topics of the YEM thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform.

The evaluation will be carried out through the review of all available sources of information including desk analysis, survey data and interviews with governmental counterparts and JP partners, direct beneficiaries, partner agencies, JP management and staff.

The sources of information, information gathering methods and timing are specified below. The following set of information sources on the JP will be made available to the consultant:

* MDG-F context documents;
* Joint Programme documents;
* Progress and technical reports;
* Mid-term evaluation report and monitoring reports;
* Key documents (policy analyses, researches, surveys, monitoring reports) produced by the JP;
* Training tools, learning packages and other publications.

**4. Description of tasks**

Under the guidance of the JP Evaluation Reference Group, and in close coordination with the members of the YEM team in Serbia, the consultant will be required to review the progress made in the production of the SMART outputs of the Joint Programme since its onset in May 2009 and appraise their relevance for the achievement of the joint programme outcomes.

The work of the External Collaborator will be guided by the Joint Programme Document (in particular the result framework and the annual workplan); the Monitoring Framework agreed upon by participating UN Agencies; the analytical framework appended in Annex 1; and the technical reports that summarize the achievements attained under each of the component of the joint programme, namely a) youth employment policy and programme development; b) management of migration; c) social protection, social assistance services and integrated service delivery; and d) youth policy development.

***The external collaborator will be specifically required to:***

1. Appraise the quantitative and qualitative information collected to measure the impact of the activities implemented;
2. In collaboration with the members of the YEM team in Serbia, interview stakeholders and conduct field visits to gather information on the performance of the Joint Programme;
3. Systematize and analyze the data and information stemming from the implementation of the activities under the responsibility of each participating UN agencies (see expert reports);
4. Assess the *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact* of the activities carried out according to the analytical framework provided;
5. Draft a summative evaluation report that: i) synthesizes the overall performance of the JP; ii) describes innovative practices implemented, iii) identifies challenges encountered and the strategies deployed to address them; and iv) provides recommendations and lessons learnt during implementation for further action.
6. Finalize the report on the basis of the comments received by the Evaluation Reference Group.

# 5. Language

The output produced by the external collaborator will be written in the English language.

# 6. Submission of outputs

The External Collaborator will prepare a report presenting the key findings of the summative evaluation (see Annex 2 for an outline). A software and paper version of the first draft of the report has to be submitted by 10th April 2012 to the Evaluation Reference Group. The final version of the report shall be delivered for clearance by 20th April 2012.

**Annex 1**

**ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK**

**1. Relevance and strategic fit**

* Did the JP activities addressed a relevant need? Were the needs identified continuously checked for relevance? How much and in what ways did the JP contributed to solve the (socio-economical) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
* To what extent this programme was designed, implemented and monitored jointly?
* To what extent joint programming was the best option to respond to development challenges identified?
* Have implementing partners taken ownership of the JP approach since the design phase? To what extent implementing partners had an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
* How is the JP aligned to Serbia’s cross-cutting and sectoral strategies?

**2. Validity of design**

* Were the planned outputs and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific needs or conditions?
* Was the intervention logic coherent and realistic? What was adjusted?
* To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?
* How effectively was the JP in monitoring performance and results?
* How appropriate and useful were the indicators described in the JP document in assessing progress and results?
* Were the targeted indicator values systematically collected and systematized? Was data disaggregated by sex and by other relevant characteristics? Were the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?
* Was information regularly analyzed to feed into management decisions?

**3. Progress and effectiveness**

* Were the SMART outputs achieved? Were they achieved in the quantity and quality specified in the JP design?
* Are JP partners using the outputs? Are the outputs being transformed by JP partners into outcomes?
  + - How effective was the JP in establishing national ownership? Was project management and implementation participatory and did it contribute towards the achievement of the JP objectives? Was the JP appropriately responsive to the needs of the national partners and changing priorities?
    - Was the JP appropriately responsive to economic and institutional changes in the project environment?
    - Did the JP approach produce demonstrated successes?
    - How have the linkages between JP components been designed? In which way do they strengthen and support each other in the achievement of objectives? Is the expertise of each partner Agency maximally taken advantage of in this respect? How can the links and coordination between component activities be enhanced?
    - In which areas is the JP having the greatest achievements? How is the JP building on and expanding these achievements?
    - In which areas is the JP having the least achievements? What are the constraining factors and why? How could they be overcome?
    - What, if any, alternative strategies would be more effective in achieving the JP objectives?

**4. Efficiency of resource use and effectiveness of management arrangements**

* Were resources used efficiently? Were the activities implemented cost-effective? In general, did the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results have been attained with fewer resources?
* Were JP funds and activities delivered in a timely manner by participating agencies?
* Was the joint programme’s management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
* To what extent was the joint programme intervention model (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency’s intervention?
* To what extent the governance at programme (PMC) and national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the JP? 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?
* To what extent and in what ways did the JP increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
* What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing Agencies used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
* What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the JP face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
* To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on the JP? Was it useful? Did the JP implement the improvement plan?
* Have the national partners a good grasp of the project strategy? How are they contributing to the success of the JP?
* How effective is communication between the project team and the national implementing partners?
* To what extend did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?

**5. Impact orientation and sustainability**

* To what extent did the JP contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes stated in the programme document?

1. To what extent and in what ways did the JP contribute to the Millennium Development Goals at national level?
2. To what extent and in what ways did the JP contribute to the goals set in the YEM thematic window?
3. To what extent (policy, budgets, design, and implementation) and in what ways did the JP 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 JP contribute to the goals of delivering as one at country level?

* What types of effects are resulting from the JP in accordance with the sex, ethnic belonging, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population?
* To what extent has the JP contributed to fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF)
* To what extent the JP decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the JP?
* At local and national level:
  + 1. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the JP?
    2. Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the JP or to scale it up?
    3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
* Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
* Are the JP results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions?
* Can the JP approach and results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? Is this likely to happen? What would support their replication and scaling up?
* Were there any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects as a consequence of the JP interventions? If so, how was the JP strategy adjusted?

**Annex 2**

**Format of the report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Executive summary** | Approximately 5 page long, this part of the report should summarize the main finding, conclusions and recommendations of the monitoring exercise. It should also include also a glossary of terms |
| **1. Introduction** | * Brief description of purpose of the evaluation and of the methodological approach used. * Remarks on the limitations of the methodology and problems encountered in information gathering and analysis. |
| **2.Review of implementation** | * Description of the development intervention carried out * JP strategy at approval and during implementation, including agreed revisions * Highlights of main milestones and challenges encountered * Status of implementation, delivery of activities, production of outputs and attainment of outcomes |
| **3. Presentation of findings** | Based on the key questions of the analytical framework, this part of the report should concentrate on key issues and provide clear indication on whether the outcomes of the JP were achieved. |
| **4. Conclusions** | Concluding assessment derived from the findings of the evaluation and main messages. |
| **5. Recommendations** | Recommendations should be presented in a concise and actionable manner, making concrete suggestions for improvements. |
| **6. Lessons learned** | Observations, insights, and innovative practices extracted from the evaluation exercise that are of general interest and contribute to wider organizational learning. This part should also highlight any good practices implemented during the JP. |
| **7. Annexes** | Any additional information deemed relevant for the comprehension of the report. |

**Annex 3**

**ETHICAL PRINCIPLES OF THE EVALUATION**

The final evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

* + - * **Anonymity and confidentiality**. The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
      * **Responsibility**. The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
      * **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
      * **Independence**. The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
      * **Incidents**. If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
      * **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
      * **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
      * **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.