

TOR¹ for UNDAF CD Evaluation

1. Rationale and Background

The Royal Government of Bhutan (RGoB) and the UN agencies operating in Bhutan² signed the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2008-2012) and the UNDAF operational tool, the common Country Programme Action Plan (cCPAP 2008-2012) in 2007. The documents outline the framework of cooperation between the UN system and the RGoB to support the realization of the Millennium Development Goals and the national development plan; the 10th Five Year Plan (FYP). Five outcome areas for UN support were agreed upon and contributed to the following five overall objectives, namely;

1. To halve poverty by 2013
2. To improve the accessibility, quality and sustainability of the health care delivery system
3. To improve the quality, relevance and coverage of education
4. To foster good governance as a core value for development
5. To enhance environmental sustainability and disaster management

The UNDAF/cCPAP planning process coincided with the drafting of the 10th FYP and the two processes were mutually reinforcing. However, since the newly elected government came only into being in the 1st quarter of 2008, the UNDAF/cCPAP were finalized beforehand with sufficient flexibility built-in to ensure alignment once the 10th FYP was officially adopted by the RGoB. The Country Programme Board (CPB) has the overall responsibility for the UNDAF/cCPAP implementation and monitoring. The Country Programme Board provides supervision and guidance to the theme groups and annually assesses the progress. The joint Country Programme Board, comprised of representatives from the Government and the UN agencies, is co-chaired by the Secretary, GNH Commission and the UN Resident Coordinator.

The five cCPAP/UNDAF Theme Groups pertaining to each development outcome- poverty, health, education, governance, environment and disaster management- were set up to coordinate UN-RGoB system efforts to monitor the cCPAP/UNDAF. The Theme Groups are responsible for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the cCPAP through work plans with implementing partners, and for ensuring that the UN support is timely and addresses the actual need of the government to develop and implement government policies in line with the cCPAP and the RGoB's 10th Five Year Plan. Since 2009, these working groups are co-chaired by the lead ministry and an UN lead agency.

The achievement of development results, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in an equitable and sustainable manner requires that countries have the capacity to perform critical functions, including for policy, planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, and aid coordination. This is important for country ownership of the development process and the achievement of development effectiveness, especially because of the 10th Five Year Plan target of reducing poverty to below 15% from 23% within the UNDAF cycle period.

¹ This TOR has been drafted with reference to the UNDP Evaluation publication 'UNDP Contribution to Strengthening National Capacities – Ownership- 2010'; it also draws from the UNDP (BDP) Capacity Development Group's work on capacity development and measuring capacity development results.

² UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, FAO, IFAD, UNAIDS, OCHA, UNCDF, UNEP, UNESCO, UNIFEM, UNV, UNRC. Other non-signatory agencies like UNCTAD and UNIDO are also part of the process.

The central role of capacity development for national ownership and sustainable development is well recognized, and is a core contribution of the United Nations system to partner countries. In the specific context of the UNDAF in Bhutan, the UN has directed massive efforts to support capacity development. However, the results of this support have never been evaluated in a systematic and comprehensive fashion. The challenge is to look closely at how the UN's capacity development support has contributed to strengthening institutions in Bhutan- institutions which in turn are contributing to the achievement of national development goals, including the MDGs, and as articulated in the 10th FYP.

Therefore, this evaluation provides an opportunity to systematically examine capacity development support to Bhutan over a multi-year period, and provide recommendations on how the UN can ensure that its support is effective, sustainable, country/context-specific (relevant), and nationally owned. The evaluation will focus on results of the support provided during the current UNDAF (2008-2013), but will also be forward looking with regard to the planning of the upcoming UNDAF cycle under the 11th FYP, and will synthesize lessons learned in order to make recommendations for capacity development support in the next programming cycle.

The evaluation will use the following definitions:

- *'Capacity' is the ability of people, organizations, and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully³*
- *'Capacity development' is the process whereby people, organizations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt, and maintain capacity over time⁴*
- *'Capacity development support' is the process that contributes the resources, the strategies, the motivations and the ideas to encourage the development or emergence of abilities⁵*

These definitions reflect the belief that capacity development is an endogenous process that must be country owned. Development partners such as UN can only support or facilitate the process.

2. Objectives

The UNDAF capacity development (CD) evaluation has the following primary aims:

- 1) The evaluation will systematically gather and analyze evidence of the extent to which the UN has been able to deliver capacity development support (with the five UNDAF outcome areas as the frame of reference) which responds to the national development goals of Bhutan (as articulated in the 10th FYP), and **the extent to which the UN's support to CD has produced results** in terms of stronger institutions which have contributed to development results.

³ UN Development Group Position Statement on Capacity Development (UNDG, 2006)

⁴ UN Development Group Position Statement on Capacity Development (UNDG, 2006)

⁵ Definition as stated in *UNDP Contribution to Strengthening National Capacities- Ownership* (UNDP Evaluation Office, 2010)

- 2) Looking forward, based on the evidence of what has and has not worked, the evaluation is intended to help improve **the quality of the UN's support to developing national capacities**, by evaluating the degree to which the UN has been able to deliver CD support that is effective, relevant, sustainable, coordinated, and nationally owned.

3. Methodology and Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will cover the current UNDAF period (2008-2013). For retrospective aspects, the period from 2008 to 2011 will be covered while years 2012, 2013 and beyond will be taken up for the prospective aspects. Data for the evaluation across all TGs will be collected from January 2008 till July 2011. The scope and focus of the evaluation will be grounded in the specific development context of Bhutan, and the evaluation methodology will be informed by discussions with stakeholders, background research, as well as review of previous evaluations and relevant documentation. To the extent possible/appropriate, the UNDAF CD evaluation will take into account and build on previous evaluations (related to capacity development support generally as well as any previous evaluations of UN-supported programs and projects in Bhutan), so as to avoid duplications of effort. The Evaluation Team is expected to identify and review such relevant background documents. In addition, the Evaluation Team will be expected to make a concerted effort to identify (and incorporate into the evaluation framework and methodology as appropriate) position statements and policy documents of RGoB which are relevant to the evaluation of capacity development support. These could include (but are not limited to) policies related to capacity development as such, but also more broadly related to technical cooperation/assistance, aid coordination, development assistance, and so forth.

It is expected that the Evaluation Team will have expertise in UNDAF evaluation generally, as well as in approaches to evaluating *capacity development* results specifically. Given that this evaluation is of UN-wide contributions to capacity development, the Evaluation Team should review key documents related to common UN approaches to capacity development at the country level.⁶ It is also recommended that UNDP's recent work on Measuring Capacity⁷ be taken into consideration in the final design of the evaluation framework.

The Evaluation Team will be required to submit an inception report which presents a detailed evaluation methodology/framework which not only reflects understanding of CD and UNDAF, but also adapts the methodological approach to the context of Bhutan. It is important to point out that the present ToR is intended to provide an overview of the rationale, context, scope, objectives, and management arrangements for the UNDAF CD evaluation, but the Evaluation Team is expected- using this ToR as a frame of reference- to develop a detailed evaluation methodology, one which is based on a comprehensive review of relevant documents as well as inputs from stakeholders.

Given the time frame for completing the CD evaluation, it is recognized that there are some limitations to the scope of the exercise. The CD evaluation will need to be selective and target only some UN capacity development support initiatives during the UNDAF period. Therefore, the first part of the evaluation will involve a mapping of CD initiatives supported by UN agencies over the

⁶ These documents include the 2007 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review; the UNDG Position Statement on Capacity Development; the UNDG Capacity Assessment Methodology; and the UNDAF and CCA Guidelines (UNDG, 2009).

⁷ See 2010 Practice Note "Measuring Capacity" at <http://www.undp.org/capacity>

past three years. The mapping is not merely an inventory of CD initiatives, but should also include information on the nature of the capacity development support (which institutions/organizations were targeted; which sector; duration of program; whether a multi-donor initiative; what type of capacities were the focus [function/technical] etc)

This mapping will be one component of the inception report produced by the Evaluation Team, and will be the basis for identifying a select number of capacity development initiatives for more focused evaluation using the guidance questions listed below.

In terms of the evaluation methodology, a key consideration is to attempt to *identify capacity development results at the **outcome level***, rather than 'stopping' at the levels of inputs and outputs, across each of the selected initiatives from the mapping:

Measuring [change in capacity] must go beyond an increase in input resources, such as human, financial or physical resources; and go beyond the completion of activities or production of outputs, such as the implementation of training or procurement of tools, as the availability of such resources and completion of such tasks do not guarantee their contribution to development goals. It should look at the change in institutions- are they stronger, better, more resilient?⁸

This means the evaluation must trace 'the story' of a particular institution or system that has improved its performance, identifying **what** specific capacities have been strengthened and **how** this took place (the inputs and processes that led to strengthening of capacities).

In this connection, the key evaluation questions are summarized as follows.

- 1) Assess the **results of the UN's contribution**⁹ to strengthening national capacities for development results in the current UNDAF cycle:
 - What specific capacity development needs were identified in the UNDAF preparation and how were these needs determined? What capacity baselines exist (or do not exist), against which CD results can be measured?
 - What capacity development strategies were employed in order to address the identified needs? What were the UN's **inputs** in terms of capacity development processes (e.g. stakeholder engagement, capacity assessments, change management, etc)?
 - What results can be identified in terms of increased capacity at the **output level**?
 - E.g. better functioning systems, processes, and structures across one or more of the following areas: institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge management, and accountability. Are these likely to be sustained beyond the current UNDAF period? If so, why and if not, why?

⁸ UNDP Practice Note on Measuring Capacity, p. 2

⁹ It is important that the final evaluation report is cognizant of distinguishing between *contribution* and *attribution* of capacity development results to UN interventions. It may be that evidence of capacity development results at the outcome level (institutions able to perform better) is the result of contributions by UN, as well as perhaps other development partners, as well as endogenous processes of capacity development that would have taken place even without external support. In such a complex environment, it is reasonable to identify the *contribution* of UN support without necessarily *attributing* the change in capacity to one input alone.

- What results can be identified at the **outcome level**?
 - E.g. change in institutional performance, adaptability, stability (institutions or systems are performing more effectively or efficiently [for example, in delivering services], in a more consistent and resilient manner)
 - Are these likely to be sustained beyond the current UNDAF period? Why or why not?

2) Assess the **quality of the UN's support** to capacity development with reference to the following:

- *Relevance*: Was the capacity development support relevant and responsive to the country's needs and priorities? Review the significant developments in Bhutan over the UNDAF period and analyze how these factors did or did not have a bearing on the UN's support to capacity development?
- *Coordination and partnership*: To what extent did the capacity development support promote coordination and partnership within the country (between government and other national actors), and among donors?
- *Consistency with desirable practice* (e.g., nationally-owned, multi-stakeholder, based on systematic assessment and understanding of informal behaviors and structures, country-driven design and demand, adapted to country context, supportive of innovation, cognizant of trade-offs and addressing system-wide capacity): How consistent was the capacity development support with desirable practice?
- *Sustainability*: Was UN support to capacity development delivered in a sustainable manner? To what extent did UN capacity development support contribute to the development of a pool of CD service providers in Bhutan? Did UN support utilize existing CD service providers (individuals as well as institutions and organizations in private sector, public sector, civil society/academe) within Bhutan or rely unnecessarily on international expertise?
- *Strategic Positioning*: Did the UN's capacity development support reflect sound strategic positioning, taking into account the UN's relative comparative advantage to other development partners? Why or why not?

4. Expected Outputs and Timeframe

The two main outputs/ documents will be as follows:

- a. *Inception report, with (1) detailed evaluation methodology/framework for endorsement by key stakeholders, and (2) mapping of CD initiatives in Bhutan across UNDAF/cCPAP thematic areas*
- b. *Final evaluation report with findings and recommendations*

The final evaluation report will provide a synthesis and analysis of evidence across all sources of information, and will include concrete examples to support the overarching conclusions. The findings, conclusions and recommendations will also be captured in an executive summary. The

total duration of the assignment is estimated for 45 working days. The draft evaluation report will be submitted to the Evaluation Management Team by the Evaluation Team leader by early **May 2012**. The final report will be approved by the UNCT.

Table 1: Key tasks and timeline in weeks

Key tasks	Timeline in weeks	Week								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Advertisement and procurement of consultants	Mid February									
Consultants on board	Mid March									
Desk Review/ Inception report	March	■	■							
Briefing	March		■							
TOR and Methodology finalization	March		■							
Literature review	March-April		■	■						
Key informant interviews	April			■	■					
Focus group discussions	April			■	■					
Sample surveys	April			■	■	■				
Progress report	April				■	■	■			
Analysis of data, reporting and editing	May					■	■	■		
Draft report	May					■	■	■	■	
Debrief meeting	May						■	■	■	
Stakeholder workshops	May							■	■	■
Finalization of report and way forward matrix	May								■	■

Details of the outputs and deliverables will be further elaborated and agreed with the Evaluation Team before the beginning of the exercise. These details will include specific deadlines, work plan for the Evaluation Team (including any field visits), format and length of the reports, as well as expectations of the Evaluation Team to make presentations, conduct briefings with UNCT, etc.

5. Funding Requirement

Approximately USD 39,000 is needed for the CD evaluation as shown below

Budget details	Amount (USD)	Total (USD)
Fee for international	500 p/day*45days	22,500
Fee for local	200 p/day*45 days	9,000
Travel	2,000	2,000
DSA	150p/day*30 days	4,500
Misc. for workshops and meetings	1,000	1,000
TOTAL		39,000

6. Management Arrangements

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent team with expertise and experience in capacity development, the core functions of national development as described above, and evaluation

methodology. The Evaluation Team will be led by a senior international consultant with demonstrated expertise in capacity development and evaluation methodologies, as well as familiarity with UNDAF and excellent leadership abilities. The international expert will be supported by a second team member, a national consultant who has familiarity with development cooperation in Bhutan, including familiarity with the main development actors who will be consulted during the evaluation (RGoB institutions in key sectors, at national and sub-national levels; UN agencies; other DPs and IPs; key stakeholders and beneficiary groups, etc).

An Evaluation Management Team will also be established and, via the evaluation manager (designated focal point of the Evaluation Management Team), will provide operational and programmatic support, and will ensure coordination and liaison with concerned agencies to the Evaluation Team during the process. The Evaluation Management Team will be comprised of members of the UN M&E group; RCO staff, representation from co-chairs of the UNDAF Theme Group; and GNHC representatives.

A Technical Reference Team will provide substantive support through rigorous technical critique of the reports produced by the Evaluation Team, and will be called on at the request of the Evaluation Management Team, at necessary junctures of the evaluation process. The Technical Reference Team will include UNDP advisors in the Capacity Development Group at the Asia Pacific Regional Center (Bangkok) and Regional Evaluation advisor from UNICEF/APSSC office (Bangkok), other members of the UN M&E group and the co-chairs of the UN Theme Groups. Other technical experts (for example, from other UN agencies) may be requested to provide support or inputs on an ad hoc basis, as necessary.

Overall quality assurance of the evaluation will be the responsibility of the Evaluation Management Team, which will solicit inputs and guidance from the UNCT and the Technical Reference Team, and will liaise directly with the Evaluation Team (leader). The Evaluation Management Team and Technical Reference Team will be established at the outset of the evaluation and will remain active until the completion, final review and dissemination of the evaluation. The role of the teams is to provide strategic, methodological and substantive inputs to enhance the quality of the evaluation. As noted, the Evaluation Management Team has overall responsibility for ensuring the quality of the CD evaluation, including the responsibility for involving RGoB and other stakeholders at appropriate junctures in the process (e.g. sharing the inception report; ensuring that the final evaluation methodology/inception report is endorsed in a consultative manner). The UNCT will also be expected, at the direction of the Evaluation Management Team, to provide and facilitate support needed by the Evaluation Team from different UN agencies.